

Four True Things:
Bounded Assent and Charity Economics in Segregated Special Education

Travis Gilly

ORCID: 0009-0007-2954-6313

Real Safety AI Foundation

Illinois, United States

☛ Working paper, September 2026 (v1.0)

ABSTRACT

Segregated secondary special education programs sometimes give a scheduled period of the school day to a school-based enterprise in which students perform uncompensated service inside the institution, and the proceeds fund an activity for the students themselves. Where such an arrangement exists, the institution tends to describe it in four ways: as a life skill, as an elective the student chose, as something the student enjoys, and as the source of funding for an integrated activity in which the student takes part alongside nondisabled peers. This paper takes each description as true and asks what each is true of. The elective is chosen from a menu on which every option is the same kind of thing, which produces what this paper calls bounded assent: agreement given from within a set of options that were all of one kind, by someone who was never shown that the kind itself was the thing being decided. The enjoyment is real and its object is the door, the release from a room the student otherwise does not leave; enthusiasm produced by the deprivation of ordinary access is read back by the institution as a vocational preference. The life skill is real and the money attached to it is a donation, which places the charity model at the center of an institution that owes the student equality. And the integrated activity, which may be the best thing in the building, is asked by the institution to vouch for the rest of the day, and to be paid for by the segregated students in labor while their nondisabled teammates pay nothing. The paper argues that the four descriptions are one structure seen from four sides, that the structure is invisible to every well-meaning actor inside it, and that nothing in the analysis rests on the motives of any student, disabled or not, who takes part.

Keywords: disability studies; special education; segregation; consent; self-determination; bounded assent; school-based enterprise; charity model; inspiration; unified sports; transition services; social inclusion

I. INTRODUCTION

Consider one instance of a design the transition literature describes. A boy in a segregated special education classroom spends ninth period pushing a cart through the building. He stops at each classroom, asks the teacher whether she would like a coffee, makes it at the cart, hands it over, and receives a dollar. The dollars go into a fund that buys uniforms for a sports club in which he plays alongside students from general education. His parents are told this is a life skill. They are told he chose it. They are told he loves it. They are

told the club is one of the most popular in the school, with a waiting list of general education students who want to join.

Every one of those statements is true. This paper is about what they are true of. The instance is offered as an illustration and nothing more; the paper's claims are about the structure, and the structure is described in Section II at the level at which it recurs.

The disability studies literature has developed a vocabulary for institutions that produce, from inside, accounts of themselves that are accurate at the level of the sentence and false at the level of the structure. The charity model describes a relation in which the disabled person is the object of generosity rather than the holder of an entitlement (Bagenstos, 2009, 2020a). Inspiration porn, in the popular usage the term acquired through Young (2012) and the scholarly definition Grue (2016) gave it, describes the representation of disability as a desirable but undesired characteristic, shown as a deficit that can and must be overcome, and presented with an exhortation to the viewer to be inspired. The critique of segregated employment describes settings that produce contentment as an artifact of the absence of alternatives (Moore & Friedman, 2017; Taylor, Avellone, & Wehman, 2022). And the social inclusion literature, especially its most careful strands, has begun to distinguish what integrated programs are designed to produce from what institutions credit them with producing (Bigby, Anderson, & Cameron, 2017; McConkey, Dowling, Hassan, & Menke, 2012).

What has not been done is to put those four vocabularies on a single site and show that they describe one thing. The school-based enterprise in a segregated placement is that site. It is a small practice, its design is documented in the literature, and it contains, in a single period of a single day, the charity relation, the inspirational transaction, the segregation-produced preference, and the conscription of the building's most integrated activity as evidence about its least integrated one. This paper's claim is that they are one structure, that the structure survives the good intentions of every person inside it, and that the field's existing tools are sufficient to see it once they are pointed at the same place.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section II states the method and the standpoint from which the site came into view. Section III takes up the elective and develops the concept of bounded assent. Section IV takes up the enjoyment and argues that the institution reads a response to segregation as a preference about work. Section V takes up the dollar and locates the charity model inside the transaction. Section VI takes up the integrated activity the proceeds fund and asks what the institution is doing when it offers it as evidence. Sections VII and VIII state the paper's limits and the work that would close them. Section IX concludes.

A note on what this paper does not do. The arrangement described here has legal consequences under United States disability and labor law, and those consequences are the subject of separate work. This paper takes as given that the practice is, at minimum, legally contestable, and asks a different question: what the practice is, as a social form, and why the people who run it cannot see it.

II. METHODOLOGY

This paper is an argument from a case to a structure, supported by a literature synthesis. The case is one program, observed at the level of its design. The design has five elements, and the paper's claims attach to the

elements rather than to the program: a scheduled instructional period given to an enterprise; uncompensated service by the students to the institution or its staff; revenue that the institution retains; proceeds directed to an activity for the students themselves; and a segregated home placement whose members select from a menu that is not the general education elective catalog. The particular enterprise in the observed program was a coffee service, and the particular activity funded was a unified sports club, but neither particular is load-bearing. Any enterprise and any funded activity that fit the five elements would produce the same analysis. The program is not named. The school-based enterprise as a form is documented in the transition literature (Cease-Cook, Fowler, & Test, 2015; Fields & Demchak, 2018; Rooney-Kron & Dymond, 2021); how many instances carry all five elements is not known and is not claimed.

The literature was assembled through structured discovery searches on Scite across five clusters: school-based enterprise and work-based learning in special education; competitive integrated employment and its segregated alternatives; informed choice and self-determination in transition; peer-mediated and unified sports programs and their social outcomes; and the charity model, inspiration, and disability representation. Every source cited was checked for editorial notices and retractions before inclusion, and one otherwise relevant source was excluded on that ground. The synthesis privileges systematic and scoping reviews where they exist and single studies where they do not.

A. Positionality

The standpoint from which this paper is written did epistemic work, and the house rule this author follows is that positionality is stated only when it did. The case came into view because the author is the parent of a student in a segregated placement of the design described, and the fact that a period of that student's day was spent on coffee service arrived through the student, after a meeting at which it was not disclosed. That is the first thing the standpoint did: it made the practice visible at all, since the program's own account of itself does not include it.

The second thing the standpoint did was to determine which question got asked. A researcher arriving at the enterprise from the transition literature would ask whether it teaches skills, and would find that it does. A parent arriving at the same enterprise asks what his son is being asked to pay, in what currency, and who else in the building pays it. That question is not the one the literature has been asking, and it is the one that organizes this paper.

The third thing the standpoint did was to make certain material reachable. The account of the student's stated interests, and of the one occasion on which a ceiling was tested and found higher than assumed, comes from a meeting record the author holds as a parent. It is used here at the level of structure only.

What the standpoint does not do is license a conclusion about the population. The students in segregated placements are heterogeneous, and the author's own neurodevelopmental profile is a different one from his son's. The claim is one case, observed closely, and a set of tools from the literature that reach beyond it. It is never a claim to speak for the students in the room.

III. THE MENU: BOUNDED ASSENT

The first description the institution offers is that the student chose the coffee cart. It was an elective. He picked it.

The description is accurate. There was a list, the student was shown it, and the student indicated the coffee cart. The question is what the list contained, and the answer, in the design under study, is that every option on it was some form of unpaid service inside the building. The general education elective catalog, with its business courses, art, music, and computer science, was not the list the student was shown, and the student had been placed in art in a prior semester, so the school's capacity to schedule him into a real elective was not in doubt.

This paper calls what results from such a list bounded assent. Bounded assent is agreement given from within a set of options that were all of one kind, by someone who was never shown that the kind itself was the thing being decided. The student who chooses one service assignment over another has expressed a preference between two forms of unpaid service. He has not expressed a preference for unpaid service over instruction, because instruction was not on the menu, and no one asked him to compare them.

The concept is needed because the institution's consent story trades on an ambiguity that the ordinary word choice does not resolve. In the ordinary sense, the student chose. In the sense that matters for whether the student consented to spend a period of his day working for the building, he did not, because consent presupposes an alternative and there was none of the relevant kind. The unpaid-work literature has organized the field along two axes, the purpose of participation and the level of participatory discretion (Grant-Smith & McDonald, 2017). The elective framing is an attempt to move the coffee cart along the discretion axis by renaming it. Bounded assent is the observation that the renaming moves the label and leaves the position where it was.

The transition and rehabilitation literature has already reached this conclusion in its own vocabulary. Informed choice is a recognized requirement in the movement toward competitive integrated employment, and the requirement is understood to be unsatisfied where the choice set has been constructed to exclude the integrated option (Moore & Friedman, 2017). The disability rights literature on deinstitutionalization makes the same point about residential placement: a stated preference for a segregated setting carries weight only where an integrated setting was available to prefer it over, and a regime that offers only segregated options and then records the individual's acceptance has simulated choice (Bagenstos, 2012, 2020b). Bounded assent is the school-day instance of a pattern the field has seen in workshops and institutions, and it is the same pattern because it is produced the same way: by controlling the menu and then citing the selection.

There is a second feature of the school-day instance that the workshop and institutional cases share and that deserves separate statement. The students in question have, in many cases, no way of knowing that the menu is bounded. A student who has never been shown the general education catalog does not know there is a catalog. A student who has been in the segregated placement since middle school does not know that ninth period, for other students, is chemistry. The menu is bounded and the boundary is invisible from inside it, which means the student's assent is bounded twice: once by what was offered and once by what the

student could know was withheld. The self-determination literature, which defines its construct as acting as the primary causal agent in one's life and making choices free from undue external influence (Wehmeyer, 1999), has documented two things that bear on this. Restrictive environments have been found to diminish the self-determination of the people placed in them (Wehmeyer, 1999; Wehmeyer, Agran, & Hughes, 2000), and the practices recommended for developing student choice, including exposure to the full range of options, are frequently not in use (Wehmeyer et al., 2000; Zhang, Katsiyannis, & Zhang, 2002). Where they are not, the menu is the student's whole world of options, and assent to the best thing on it is assent to the world.

The field has a term for what the bounded menu withholds, and it is older than the self-determination construct. Perske (1972) called for people with intellectual disability to be allowed the dignity of risk: the ordinary human condition of facing a world that is not always safe, secure, or predictable, and of being permitted to choose within it anyway. His closing line was that there can be such a thing as human dignity in risk, and there can be a dehumanizing indignity in safety. He also named the mechanism this paper is describing, half a century early: the clever ways in which virtually total avoidance of risk has been built into the lives of the mentally retarded by limiting their spheres of behavior and interactions in the community, jobs, recreation, and relationships. A menu constructed so that every option is safe, supervised, and inside the building is one of those clever ways. It has removed the risk and, with it, the dignity. Wehmeyer (1998) identified the misinterpretation that makes this removal look like care: the belief, common among people working in disability services, that self-determination is not relevant for people with significant disabilities, or that it means acting independently and succeeding. The corrective is that self-determination is the attempt to exert control, to be a causal agent, and that a definitional emphasis on successful outcomes is inappropriate. A student who is never offered the general education catalog because he might not succeed in a general education elective has been protected from the attempt, which is the thing the construct is about.

None of this requires denying that impairment is real or that some options are unsuitable for some students. Shakespeare (2006, p. 13) argued that the social model had become a good idea that became ossified and exaggerated into a set of crude dichotomies, the dichotomy of impairment and disability among them, and that a credible account has to hold impairment and social barriers together. The argument here accepts that. It does not claim that the segregated student could do anything a nondisabled student could do. It claims that the question of what he could do was never asked, because the menu was constructed so that the answer did not matter. Perske (1972) put the same point in industrial terms, observing workers with intellectual disability on heavy presses and lathes in Swedish workshops: to reshape a task that an ordinary worker would perform, solely because a disabled worker is to perform it, is dehumanizing if the disabled worker is capable of the same task. The coffee cart is a reshaped task. Whether the reshaping was warranted is the question the assessment in Section VIII exists to answer.

IV. THE HALLWAY: ENTHUSIASM PRODUCED BY SEGREGATION

The second description is that the student loves it. He is excited when ninth period comes. He talks about it at home. He likes making the coffee and he likes the teachers and he likes being asked what he did today and having an answer.

This description is also accurate, and it is the one the institution relies on most heavily, because it is the one that sounds most like the student's own voice. A parent who objects to the coffee cart is objecting, apparently, to something his son enjoys, and the institution can present itself as the party on the student's side.

The observation proves nothing about the activity, and the reason it proves nothing is the structure of the student's day. A student in a segregated placement spends the school day in one room, with the same small group, under the same adults, in the kind of restrictive setting that the self-determination research has found diminishes the capacity it is supposed to protect (Wehmeyer, Agran, & Hughes, 2000). The hallway is somewhere else. The main office is somewhere else. The teachers in the general education wing are people he does not otherwise meet. For that student, any activity that involves leaving the room and moving through the building and speaking with adults who are glad to see him is an improvement in the day, and it would be an improvement regardless of the task attached to it. If ninth period were delivering mail, he would love ninth period. If it were watering plants in every classroom, he would love ninth period. The enthusiasm is real, and its object is the access.

The institution's error is to read the enthusiasm as a preference about the work. It is a preference about the room, expressed through the only exit the room provides. And the reading is not innocent, because the institution is the party that built the room. A placement that confines a student to one space for the day, and then offers a single period of movement through the building, and then observes that the student is eager for that period, has manufactured the evidence it cites. The student's response is a response to segregation, and the institution has treated it as if it were a vocational choice.

The point has an empirical shadow in the employment literature. Adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities in competitive integrated employment report better psychological and social outcomes than those in segregated settings, and the reviews attribute the difference in part to the social integration the setting provides rather than to the characteristics of the work (Taylor, Avellone, & Brooke, 2022; Taylor, Avellone, & Wehman, 2022). A student's positive response to an activity that happens to involve leaving the segregated room is evidence of the value of leaving the room. It is not evidence about coffee.

The regulatory framework in the United States makes student preference a required input to transition planning, and the requirement is phrased so that the preferences come first and the plan follows. The gap between that requirement and practice is not new. An examination of more than eight hundred transition goals from the individualized education programs of students with intellectual disability in two states found that not a single goal targeted instruction to promote self-determination, and a national survey of secondary teachers found that most rated self-determination as important and a third did not involve students in educational planning at all (Wehmeyer, Agran, & Hughes, 2000, citing Wehmeyer & Schwartz, 1998). A plan that assigns the activity and then reports the student's enthusiasm as evidence of preference has reversed that order. The institution has, in effect, run the experiment backwards: it has produced a response and then treated the response as the hypothesis. The disability studies contribution is to name what the response is a response to. It is a response to the door.

V. THE DOLLAR: CHARITY ECONOMICS INSIDE AN EQUALITY INSTITUTION

The third description is that the coffee cart is a life skill. The student learns to take an order, prepare a beverage, handle currency, and follow a multi-step routine. All of that is real and all of it is worth learning.

Every bit of it can be taught without a dollar changing hands. The competencies are identical in a simulation. What the dollar adds is a transaction, and the transaction is the subject of this section.

Consider what the dollar is. It is not a price. Nobody is buying coffee at market rates from a high school cart staffed by students with intellectual disabilities. The teacher who hands over a dollar is not a customer in the sense that a customer at a café is one; she is a donor, and the coffee is the occasion for the donation. The enterprise's revenue model is the sympathy the transaction trades on, and the sympathy depends on the donor's awareness of who is pushing the cart.

The disability rights movement identified this relation early and set out to displace it. Perske (1972), drawing on Wolfensberger, described the period in which people with intellectual disability were seen as objects of pity and asked why the field had so seldom thought a person with intellectual disability could be courageous. The charity model positions the disabled person as the object of the nondisabled person's generosity rather than as the holder of an entitlement, and the rights model was built in explicit opposition to it (Bagenstos, 2009). Bagenstos (2020a) has argued that the rights framework's own enactment relied implicitly on a discourse of charity and pity, and that the limits of that discourse explain much of what followed. The coffee cart is a place where the two discourses meet in a single gesture. The institution is legally obligated to treat the student as an equal, and it has built, inside that obligation, a daily ritual in which he receives money from adults because they feel kindly toward him.

The representational literature adds the second half. Young (2012) named the genre from the position of its object, in a piece whose title told the viewer that disabled people are not here for your inspiration. Grue (2016) gave it a working definition with three necessary parts, an image of a person with visible signs of impairment, performing an activity, accompanied by a caption that directs the viewer to be inspired, and then a revised one: the representation of disability as a desirable but undesired characteristic, a deficit that can and must be overcome through display. Grue (2016) also located the genre's roots in the personal tragedy construction of disability that the social model was built to reject (Oliver, 1990), and noted its exhortatory attitude toward the viewer. The sport media literature has documented the specific form the genre takes when disability meets athletics: the disabled athlete is framed as inspirational and worthy of charity rather than as a competitor (Holland & Holland, 2023; see also Goethals et al., 2020, on frames and counter-frames). The enterprise produces every element of Grue's definition at once. A student with visible signs of impairment performs an activity in front of adults, and the caption that directs the viewer to be inspired is supplied by the institution's own account of what the activity is for. The teacher who accepts the coffee experiences the student as inspiring, and expresses the experience as a donation. The donation funds the club. The club is a sport. The student, in uniform, is inspiring again. The loop closes on itself and every point on it is a moment of nondisabled emotional satisfaction with a dollar attached.

Shakespeare (2006) has argued that rights and welfare are not alternatives and that disabled people need

both; the charity model is objectionable as a frame for the relation between disabled and nondisabled people, and welfare provision is a matter of entitlement that a rights framework should secure. The enterprise inverts that. It takes something the institution owes as entitlement, the uniform the nondisabled teammate receives as a matter of course, and converts it into a matter of generosity for the disabled member alone. The welfare is real and the frame is charity, which is the combination the critique was written against.

None of this requires bad faith. The teacher is kind. The donation is sincere. The club is a good club. That is the point of the charity model as a critique: it describes a structure of relation, and the structure persists through the good intentions of the people who occupy it. The institution has adopted the charity model as its business model, and it has done so inside a building whose legal and moral premise is that the student is not an object of charity at all.

The dollar also does something to the institution. Once the proceeds are booked, the institution has an interest in the activity continuing, an interest in the activity expanding, and an interest in the students remaining in it. None of those interests is pedagogical. A party with a financial stake in the student's continued participation is not a neutral party in assessing whether the participation is voluntary, and it is not a neutral party in assessing whether the student has outgrown the activity. The ceiling question, taken up in the conclusion, is the question the institution has the least incentive to ask.

VI. THE CLUB: INTEGRATION AS THE INSTITUTION'S EVIDENCE

The fourth description is the one the institution is proudest of. The enterprise's proceeds fund an integrated activity. In the observed case it was a unified sports club: general education students sign up for it in numbers large enough to produce a waiting list, and they play alongside students from the segregated program in the same uniforms. A parent who sees his son on that field is, quite rightly, moved.

Two things need to be said before anything else, because this section is easy to misread. The club is not the problem, and its members are not the subject. A unified club that draws a waiting list of general education students is the most integrated thing in the building, and it has a long pedigree. Perske (1972) reported Nirje's Stockholm youth clubs, in which college students and young people with intellectual disability were co-members, as a model of putting reasonable risk and ordinary social life back within reach; the design the observed program uses is that design. The students who joined it, from both sides of the line, are doing exactly what a school should want its students to do, and nothing in this paper asks about their motives, evaluates their relationships, or assigns them any part of the structure it describes. They are children, and they showed up. The subject of this section is what the institution does with the fact that they showed up.

The institution does two things with it.

The first is to fund the club from the labor of one set of its members and not the other. The general education student on the roster signed up, received a uniform, and returned to seventh-period chemistry. The segregated student on the same roster signed up, received the same uniform, and spent a period of his instructional day in service to fund it. Both are members. Both wear the shirt. One of them paid for it in class time and the other did not, and the one who paid is the one whose placement is defined by disability.

The institution has taken its most integrated activity and made it the thing the segregated students work to support, and it has done so in a way that leaves their nondisabled teammates untouched. The teammates are not responsible for that arrangement. They may not know it exists. The institution built it.

The second is to offer the club as evidence about the rest of the day. The waiting list is cited as proof that the school is inclusive. The uniforms are cited as proof that the students are equal. The scene on the field is offered to the parent who objects to the coffee service as the answer to the objection: look what the coffee pays for.

This is where the social inclusion literature's most careful strand is useful, and it is useful for a claim about institutions rather than a claim about participants. Bigby, Anderson, and Cameron (2017), reviewing interventions to promote community participation for people with intellectual disability, found that some of the positive claims made for the reviewed programs were not backed up by the data the studies reported, and that a program's reputation as a good thing could stand in for evidence that it had achieved its stated aim. McConkey, Dowling, Hassan, and Menke (2012), in the largest study of unified sports to date, concluded that the program is a credible vehicle for social inclusion within its own operation, and then identified the open question as inclusion in the wider community. A review of the natural supports literature put the policy question in a sentence: whether, after decades of deinstitutionalization, efforts to physically locate people with disabilities within their communities have come at the price of social inclusion (Duggan & Linehan, 2013). Bigby, Anderson, and Cameron (2017) are careful, in the same review, to warn against binaries of presence and participation and against judgments that automatically privilege mainstream places; that warning is accepted here, and it cuts toward the institution rather than away from it, because it is the institution that has treated presence on a roster as proof of participation in the school. The point to take from all three is narrow. A program does what it was designed to do. Institutions are prone to crediting it with what they need it to have done. A unified club was designed to produce integrated contact on a field for a season, and by every account it does. It was not designed to certify that a segregated placement is not segregated, and no study has asked it to.

When the institution offers the club as the answer to the coffee cart, it is asking a program to prove something the program was never built to prove, and it is doing so to a parent who has no way to check. The club's success is real. The institution's use of that success is the move this section exists to name. And the students on the field, all of them, are outside the frame of the critique, which is aimed one level up, at the party that wrote the schedule and decided who would pay for the shirts.

VII. LIMITATIONS

The case is one program. The design is documented in the literature, but the particulars, the daily frequency, the dollar donation, the unified club as the destination of the proceeds, are drawn from one observed instance and are not offered as a survey. A reader who wants to know how many programs share every feature will not find the number here.

The interpretation of the student's enthusiasm as a response to the room rather than the work is an inference from the structure of the day, supported by the employment literature's findings on the social value

of integrated settings. It is not a finding about the student. The student was not interviewed for this paper, and the author's account of what the student enjoys is a parent's account.

The claim in Section VI is about the institution's use of the integrated activity as evidence, and it is deliberately narrow. The paper does not claim that the activity fails at anything, and it makes no claim about what the participants experience or what they think of one another. A reader who wants the paper to say that unified programs do not work will not find that here, because the paper does not believe it and the literature does not support it.

Bounded assent, as a concept, does not distinguish between a menu that is bounded by design and one that is bounded by resource constraint. A school with no capacity to schedule segregated students into general education electives would produce the same bounded menu as one that chooses not to, and the concept describes the student's position in both. The paper has argued that the school in the observed case had the capacity, because it had exercised it, but the concept itself does not depend on that.

Finally, the author's standpoint is a parent's. That standpoint made the site visible and determined the question, and it also carries a risk that the paper has tried to manage and cannot eliminate: that a parent's protective reading of his own child's enthusiasm is mistaken, and that the child's preference for the coffee cart is a preference about coffee after all. The paper's response is that even if it were, the preference would have been formed under conditions the paper has described, and the conditions do not change because the preference turns out to be sincere.

VIII. FUTURE WORK

Two studies would close the paper's largest gaps.

The first answers the limitation on the hallway inference. Section IV argues that a segregated student's enthusiasm for the enterprise period is enthusiasm for leaving the room, expressed through the only exit the room provides. That is testable. A within-subject design that offers students in segregated placements a rotation of out-of-room activities across a term, some service-based and some not, and measures anticipation, affect, and stated preference for each, would establish whether the enthusiasm tracks the task or the door. If it tracks the door, the institution's reading of it as a vocational preference is unsupported. If it tracks the task, Section IV is wrong and should be revised. The design is inexpensive and the population is identifiable.

The second answers the limitation on the case. A survey of secondary special education programs asking four questions, whether a school-based enterprise occupies a scheduled period, whether it generates revenue, where the revenue goes, and whether the students who staff it were shown the general education elective catalog before being scheduled into it, would establish how common the full structure is. The transition literature has surveyed teachers about barriers to work-based learning (Rooney-Kron & Dymond, 2021) and about the availability of career development activities (Carter, Trainor, & Çakıroğlu, 2009). It has not surveyed the menu.

The third answers the limitation that the paper has argued the ceiling was never measured without proposing the measurement. The proposal is a design change offered as an assessment. Give the students

the enterprise. Not the task; the enterprise. A fund to start with, the decision about what to sell and at what price, the ledger, the loss when the price is wrong, and the decision about what to do with the margin. Every input the current arrangement withholds, the students hold; the adults supervise the way the transition literature already says they should supervise a community placement. Then measure. The question the design answers is whether the students can be causal agents in the sense Wehmeyer (1998) intended, and the answer, whichever way it comes out, is a transition assessment, which is the thing the current arrangement never produced. If the students cannot run it, that is data and it belongs in the plan. If they can, the current arrangement was measuring the wrong ceiling. The design costs nothing the institution does not already have, and its single risk is the one Perske (1972) said the students were entitled to.

A fourth piece of work is conceptual rather than empirical. Bounded assent is offered here as a description of a school-day practice, but the structure it names, a choice among variants of a kind that was never itself available to accept or refuse, appears wherever institutions serving disabled people control the option set and then cite the selection. The concept should be tested against the residential and employment cases the disability rights literature has already analyzed, to see whether it adds anything to the informed-choice framework those cases developed, or whether it is a restatement. This author's view is that it adds the observation that the boundary is often invisible from inside, and that the invisibility is a second bounding, but the view has not been tested against the cases.

IX. CONCLUSION

The institution said four things, and each was true. The student chose it. The student loves it. It teaches a life skill. It funds a club where he plays alongside students from general education.

This paper has argued that the four statements describe one structure from four sides, and that the structure is a segregated placement producing, from inside itself, the evidence that it is not one. The choice was bounded, and the boundary was invisible to the person choosing. The love was for the door. The life skill was real and the dollar attached to it was a charitable transaction inside a building that owes the student equality. And the club, which is the best thing in the building, is paid for by the segregated students in labor while their teammates pay nothing, and has been asked by the institution to prove something no program is built to prove.

The paper has offered one term. Bounded assent names agreement given from within a set of options that were all of one kind, by someone who was never shown that the kind itself was the thing being decided. It is a description of what the literature's own tools find when they are pointed at one small practice, and it is not an accusation against any person in the room, least of all the students.

One more thing belongs here, because it is the reason the paper was written. In the observed case, the student's case manager tested his reading at a level, found he exceeded it, raised the level, and found he exceeded that too. It was the only occasion on which anyone raised a ceiling and looked. Nobody has tested whether he could run the enterprise instead of staffing it, because the coffee cart is what the program does, and the program does not ask. Section VIII has said how the test would be run. The disability studies contribution is to notice that the institution has arranged things so that the question does not arise, and that every one of

the four true statements is part of the arrangement. Answering the question is someone else's work.

☛ ☚

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author discloses the use of speech-to-text software (Wispr Flow) and Anthropic’s Claude as assistive technology for a diagnosed neurodevelopmental condition. All intellectual contributions, research questions, theoretical arguments, methodological decisions, and conclusions are solely the author’s own.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Travis Gilly, Real Safety AI Foundation, Illinois, United States. Email: t.gilly@ai-literacy-labs.org.

REFERENCES

- Bagenstos, S. R. (2009). *Law and the contradictions of the disability rights movement*. Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300124491.001.0001>
- Bagenstos, S. R. (2012). The past and future of deinstitutionalization litigation. *Cardozo Law Review*, 34, 1. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2005301>
- Bagenstos, S. R. (2020a). Disability rights and the discourse of justice. *SMU Law Review Forum*, 73, 26. <https://doi.org/10.25172/slr.73.1.5>
- Bagenstos, S. R. (2020b). Taking choice seriously in Olmstead jurisprudence. *Journal of Legal Medicine*, 40(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01947648.2020.1731320>
- Bigby, C., Anderson, S., & Cameron, N. (2017). Identifying conceptualizations and theories of change embedded in interventions to facilitate community participation for people with intellectual disability: A scoping review. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 31(2), 165–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12390>
- Carter, E. W., Trainor, A. A., & Çakıroğlu, O. (2009). Availability of and access to career development activities for transition-age youth with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 33(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885728809344332>
- Cease-Cook, J., Fowler, C., & Test, D. W. (2015). Strategies for creating work-based learning experiences in schools for secondary students with disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 47(6), 352–358. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059915580033>
- Duggan, C., & Linehan, C. (2013). The role of ‘natural supports’ in promoting independent living for people with disabilities; a review of existing literature. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 41(3), 199–207. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bld.12040>
- Fields, C. J., & Demchak, M. (2018). Integrated visual supports in a school-based microenterprise for students with intellectual disabilities. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 42(2), 128–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143418769611>
- Goethals, T., Mortelmans, D., Van den Bulck, H., Van den Heurck, W., & De Schauwer, E. (2020). I am not your metaphor: Frames and counter-frames in the representation of disability. *Disability & Society*, 37(5), 746–764. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2020.1836478>
- Grant-Smith, D., & McDonald, P. (2017). Ubiquitous yet ambiguous: An integrative review of unpaid work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(2), 559–578. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12153>
- Grue, J. (2016). The problem with inspiration porn: A tentative definition and a provisional critique. *Disability & Society*, 31(6), 838–849. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2016.1205473>
- Holland, K., & Holland, S. K. (2023). Inspirational and worthy of charity: (Mis)representations of disability in sport media. *Communication & Sport*, 12(2), 210–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21674795231170542>
- McConkey, R., Dowling, S., Hassan, D., & Menke, S. (2012). Promoting social inclusion through Unified Sports for youth with intellectual disabilities: A five-nation study. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 57(10), 923–935. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2012.01587.x>
- Moore, R., & Friedman, M. J. (2017). The role of informed choice in advancing competitive integrated employment. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 46(2), 245–255. <https://doi.org/10.3233/jvr-160860>
- Oliver, M. (1990). *The politics of disablement*. Macmillan.

- Perske, R. (1972). The dignity of risk and the mentally retarded. *Mental Retardation*, 10(1), 24–27. Reprinted as The dignity of risk in W. Wolfensberger (Ed.), *The principle of normalization in human services* (pp. 194–200). National Institute on Mental Retardation.
- Rooney-Kron, M., & Dymond, S. K. (2021). Teacher perceptions of barriers to providing work-based learning experiences. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 44(4), 229–240. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143420988492>
- Shakespeare, T. (2006). *Disability rights and wrongs*. Routledge.
- Taylor, J. P., Avellone, L., & Brooke, V. (2022). The impact of competitive integrated employment on economic, psychological, and physical health outcomes for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 35(2), 448–459. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12974>
- Taylor, J. P., Avellone, L., & Wehman, P. (2022). The efficacy of competitive integrated employment versus segregated employment for persons with disabilities: A systematic review. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 58(1), 63–78. <https://doi.org/10.3233/jvr-221225>
- Wehmeyer, M. L. (1998). Self-determination and individuals with significant disabilities: Examining meanings and misinterpretations. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 23(1), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.2511/rpsd.23.1.5>
- Wehmeyer, M. L. (1999). A functional model of self-determination: Describing development and implementing instruction. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 14(1), 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/108835769901400107>
- Wehmeyer, M. L., Agran, M., & Hughes, C. (2000). A national survey of teachers' promotion of self-determination and student-directed learning. *The Journal of Special Education*, 34(2), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002246690003400201>
- Young, S. (2012, July 2). We're not here for your inspiration. *ABC Ramp Up*. Australian Broadcasting Corporation.
- Zhang, D., Katsiyannis, A., & Zhang, J. (2002). Teacher and parent practice on fostering self-determination of high school students with mild disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 25(2), 157–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088572880202500205>