



State RISE Part 2: Features Reflection

Focus Area 3: Instructional Practices

Ryndak, D. L., Taub, D., & McDaid, P. (2022). Reflecting on Inclusive Systems of Education: State Level. TIES National Technical Assistance Center, University of Minnesota.

Author Notes:

¹ The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the literature review, authorship, and/or publication of this tool: The literature review and development of this tool were supported by the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant H326Y170004 to the University of Minnesota and Grant H325D170085 to the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Office of Special Education Programs or the U.S. Department of Education.

² We wish to acknowledge the contributions of Kristin Burnette, Donna Lehr, Dale Baker, Somer Matthews, Kari Alberque, Meghan Cosier, Lewis Jackson, and Erik Carter for their efforts related to the literature review, tool conceptualization, and tool development.



RISE Frame of Reference:

- **“All means all”** specifically includes all students with significant cognitive disabilities.
- **Placement** is in same grade general education classes and other inclusive settings in neighborhood schools.
- **Student-centered** strengths-based approaches for inclusive education occur within the general education curriculum, classes, lessons, activities, and routines.
- **Specially-designed instruction** occurs within general education instruction, classes, activities, and routines.
- **Barriers to inclusive education** exist within systems and environments, not within students or staff.



Rise Part 2: Team Process

1. Read and discuss each set of features
2. Rate your system on each set of features using the rubric
3. Determine system priorities

To what extent does your statewide system
have this Set of Features in place to support an inclusive system of education?

1

Some features are in place for **some** students, but **not yet for** students with significant cognitive disabilities.

2

Most Features are in place for **most** students, but **not yet for** students with significant cognitive disabilities.

3

Most Features are in place for **most** students, including for **some** students with significant cognitive disabilities.

4

Most Features are in place for **most** students, including **most** students with significant cognitive disabilities.

5

All Features are in place for **all** students, including **all** students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES



Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

Instructional Practices addresses **internal, district and school collaborative practices** that are essential to the **instructional design** and **delivery** within inclusive education systems. This Focus Area describes instructional practices that are critical to students with significant cognitive disabilities, including **specially-designed instruction, communication and behavior support practices**, and **transition practices** that are embedded within general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines. Finally, it also describes components of state-level systemic change, including **evaluation structures, improvement planning and implementation practices, district leadership, and district personnel practices**.

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.1 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate a MINDSET that:

- 3.1.1 reflects that the goal of instruction is to **empower students** with disabilities to be **fully valued and participating members** of inclusive communities during and after exiting the system of education, rather than to “fix” or eliminate a disability
- 3.1.2 demonstrates a **clear set of values and high expectations for academic and essential skill acquisition** through the provision of inclusive instructional practices
- 3.1.3 reflects a **presumption of competence** of students with significant cognitive disabilities demonstrated through the use of inclusive instructional practices
- 3.1.4 demonstrates an **unwavering belief** in the value of inclusive education for improving student outcomes
- 3.1.5 supports **continuous improvement** in inclusive instructional practices
- 3.1.6 reflects the understanding that modifications of general education instruction and materials should be **only as special as necessary**

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.2 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate INTERNAL COLLABORATIVE PRACTICES that:

- 3.2.1 establish, adhere to, and monitor the use of procedures for **collaborative problem-solving**
- 3.2.2 reflect a commitment to **shared expertise and decision-making, role release, and collective responsibility**, across departments in the use of evidence-based inclusive instructional practices
- 3.2.3 result in **cross-discipline professional learning opportunities** to ensure inclusive instructional practices for students with significant cognitive disabilities are understood and expected across all personnel and departments
- 3.2.4 establish partnerships with **universities and national experts** to increase the use of inclusive education instructional practices

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.3 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate DISTRICT AND SCHOOL COLLABORATIVE PRACTICES that:

- 3.3.1 ensure the **benefits of inclusive instructional practices** for students with significant cognitive disabilities are understood and expected across all personnel and departments in the system of education
- 3.3.2 increase the use of **flexible models of supports and services** that are only as special as necessary are provided within the general education classes, activities, and routines
- 3.3.3 increase effective cross-discipline **co-planning, co-teaching, and co-assessing instruction**, and **evaluating the impact** of collaboration on student learning in general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.3.4 increase systemic advocacy for and monitoring of **family members as equal partners** in the education of their children with significant disabilities with intentionally planned and regular communication and consultation
- 3.3.5 increase **specially-designed instruction** that is co-planned, co-taught, and co-assessed in general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines by a cross-disciplinary team
- 3.3.6 increase the **delivery of related services** within general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines for students with significant cognitive disabilities
- 3.3.7 ensure students with significant cognitive disabilities receive **grades** based on the same general education curriculum as their classmates, with individually determined modifications as needed

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.4 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate a MINDSET that:

- 3.4.1 is based on a clear set of **values and high expectations** for all students, including students with significant cognitive disabilities, to demonstrate progress in the general education curriculum and IEP goals
- 3.4.2 **empowers students** with and without disabilities to be **fully valued and participating members** of inclusive communities during and after exiting the system of education, rather than to “fix” or eliminate a disability
- 3.4.3 ensures the use of **research-based, culturally-relevant, and respectful** instructional practices that meet individual student needs
- 3.4.4 reflects the use of principles and practices of **Universal Design for Learning** by providing multiple individualized means of acquiring and demonstrating learning across general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.4.5 ensures all students participate in **all tiers** of school- and/or district-wide tiered systems of academic and behavior support and interventions
- 3.4.6 reflects the **least dangerous assumption** while preparing all students for inclusive lives during and after exiting school

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.5 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY that:

- 3.5.1 increases the time students with significant cognitive disabilities are **engaged** in instruction within general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines with their age-grade level classmates
- 3.5.2 ensures instructional personnel have **expertise** in practices to meet the learning needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities
- 3.5.3 provides instructional support that is **only as special as necessary** through the use of naturally-occurring support networks, prompts, materials, and reinforcers
- 3.5.4 results in **reciprocal interactions** between students with significant cognitive disabilities and other age-grade general education classmates to support and improve learning
- 3.5.5 uses formative and summative data for **decision-making** related to effectiveness of instruction and progress on general education curriculum goals and IEP goals
- 3.5.6 includes the use of **flexible heterogeneous grouping** within general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.5.7 **uses instructional and assistive technology, and adapted curriculum materials** during general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.6 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate **SPECIALLY-DESIGNED INSTRUCTION** that:

- 3.6.1 uses individualized strength-based **evaluations and assessments aligned with** age-grade level **general education content standards** to determine individualized instructional goals
- 3.6.2 **aligns individualized instructional goals, instruction, and assessment** that are delivered within age-grade level general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.6.3 reflects implementation of **individual student support plans** to ensure progress in general education curriculum and IEP goals
- 3.6.4 embeds instruction in skills leading to **self-determination** for all students
- 3.6.5 promotes **generalization** of instruction across inclusive contexts, people, activities, and materials
- 3.6.6 **uses flexible service delivery models, specialized equipment, accommodations, and modifications** to ensure students' progress on student goals during instruction in age-grade level general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.6.7 **monitors** evidence-based instructional practices for specially-designed instruction leading to engagement and progress in the general education curriculum content and other essential skills during general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.7 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate COMMUNICATION SUPPORT PRACTICES that:

- 3.7.1 monitor and increase the percentage of students who have a **robust system of communication**
- 3.7.2 ensure all students, regardless of age and learning needs, have **consistent instruction on communication skills and access to communication systems**
- 3.7.3 ensure decisions about **vocabulary** on a student's augmentative and alternative communication system are made by the **student, their family, education team members, and classmates**
- 3.7.4 support students communicating by embedding instruction for a **variety of purposes, with varying people, and with multiple ways of communicating** across general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.7.5 ensure all conversational partners **communicate directly** with students regardless of their mode of communication
- 3.7.6 provide funding, resources, outreach, and support for **acquisition of and training on augmentative and alternative communication systems** for instructional personnel, family members, and peers who interact with the student with significant cognitive disabilities

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.8 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate BEHAVIOR SUPPORT PRACTICES that:

- 3.8.1 demonstrate the understanding that challenging behavior is a **method of communication** when addressing learning and behavioral concerns for individual students with significant cognitive disabilities
- 3.8.2 monitor and increase the use of **multi-tiered systems of behavioral interventions and support**, including evidence-based classroom management strategies and alternatives to suspension, expulsion, restraint, and seclusion
- 3.8.3 reflect the **inclusion of all students** with significant cognitive disabilities in all tiers of district- and school-wide systems of positive behavior interventions and supports
- 3.8.4 monitor and increase the **use of evidence-based** positive behavior interventions and supports that **braid practices** from applied behavior analysis, cognitive behavioral intervention, trauma-informed practice, and specially-designed instruction
- 3.8.5 **ensure positive behavior interventions and supports** are provided to reduce challenging behavior that is perceived as a barrier to remaining in or returning to general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.9 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate TRANSITION PRACTICES that:

- 3.9.1 ensure students with significant cognitive disability in **grades 6-8** receive instruction on transition goals within general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.9.2 ensure students with significant cognitive disabilities in **grades 9-12** receive instruction on transition goals with their age-grade level classmates in general education programs, internships, and other opportunities
- 3.9.3 facilitate the participation of **18-21 year old students** with significant cognitive disabilities in post-secondary education and transition services in community-based instruction to meet their transition goals while creating natural support networks
- 3.9.4 facilitate transition services through **collaboration** with the student and their family,
- 3.9.5 facilitate transition services through **interagency agreements, collaboration** with family and community agencies, and **support** to school districts
- 3.9.6 **monitor** evidence-based instructional practices for students' transition leading to belonging in their neighborhood communities, development of natural support networks, and competitive employment

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.10 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate EVALUATION STRUCTURES that:

- 3.10.1 **monitor implementation** of policies and procedures that support the use of inclusive education instructional practices, including the use of teacher and administrator evaluations
- 3.10.2 facilitate and evaluate the **impact of job-embedded professional development** with coaching for all personnel to improve and sustain the use of evidence-based inclusive education practices
- 3.10.3 identifies and **removes state and district systemic barriers** to the implementation of specially-designed instructional practices for students with significant cognitive disabilities during general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.10.4 identifies and **disrupts state and district systemic practices** that result in students with significant cognitive disabilities and other marginalized groups being disproportionately excluded from high quality instruction during general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.11 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate **IMPROVEMENT PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES** that:

- 3.11.1 demonstrate a systemic acceptance and promotion of **change as a normal and positive process** that uses implementation science methods and strategies to promote continuous improvement
- 3.11.2 include **reflection** on inclusive education practices by instructional personnel and other stakeholders
- 3.11.3 engage **families, self-advocates, and allies** in the development and implementation of improvement plans
- 3.11.4 increase use of **evidence-based inclusive education instructional practices** for students with significant cognitive disabilities
- 3.11.5 result in **shared responsibility** for the instruction and progress of all general education students with and without disabilities, including students with significant cognitive disabilities, within general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.11.6 use **funding and other resources** to implement, evaluate, and sustain inclusive education instructional practices

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.12 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate **DISTRICT LEADERSHIP** that:

- 3.12.1 shares responsibility for a **single inclusive system of education** with structures, processes and policies that blend special and general education services
- 3.12.2 **addresses systemic inequities** in the instruction of students with significant disabilities by analyzing district and state data, providing resources and funding, and holding the state and districts accountable for changes
- 3.12.3 **shares responsibility for the instruction and progress** of all general education students with and without disabilities, including students with significant cognitive disabilities, within general education classes, lessons, activities, and routines
- 3.12.4 facilitates and evaluates the **impact of job-embedded professional development with coaching** that support learning by all personnel to increase the use of evidence-based inclusive education practices
- 3.12.5 provides and evaluates the effectiveness of resources and strategies that result in **families' understanding** of and advocacy for inclusive instructional practices
- 3.12.6 increases the availability of **state-approved testing accommodations** based on the principles of UDL for all general education students with and without disabilities

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

3.13 To what extent does your statewide system facilitate DISTRICT PERSONNEL PRACTICES that:

- 3.13.1 ensure all state communications use **person-first language**, unless otherwise specified by self-advocates, and respects diversity of human variability
- 3.13.2 include systematic proactive recruiting, hiring, training, and retaining strategies informed by data and reflective practice, that **ensure qualified personnel** for improving the use of inclusive education instructional practices for students with significant cognitive disabilities
- 3.13.3 provide **state coaches and facilitators** who have experience and expertise in inclusive education instructional practices for students with significant cognitive disabilities and provide technical assistance and coaching for **district administrators and other stakeholders**
- 3.13.4 reflect the **demographic and natural proportions** of the surrounding community, including people with disabilities

1 – **Some** Features; **not yet** applied to students w/ SCD
2 – **Most** Features; **not yet** been applied to students w/ SCD
3 – **Most** Features; including **some** students w/ SCD
4 – **Most** Features; including **most** students w/ SCD
5 – **All** Features; including **all** students w/ SCD

Rating

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

Set	Positive Examples and Areas for Improvement
3.1 Mindset	
3.2 Internal Collaborative Practices	
3.3 State and District Collaborative Practices	
3.4 Instructional Design	
3.5 Instructional Delivery	
3.6 Specially-Designed Instruction	
3.7 Communication Support Practices	
3.8 Behavior Support Practices	
3.9 Transition Practices	
3.10 Evaluation Structures	

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

Set	Positive Examples and Areas for Improvement
3.11 Improvement Planning and Implementation Practices	
3.12 State Leadership	
3.13 State Personnel Practices	

Focus Area 3: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

Summary Table: Sets of Features for <i>Instructional Practices</i>	Rating
3.1 MINDSET	
3.2 INTERNAL COLLABORATIVE PRACTICES	
3.3 STATE AND DISTRICT COLLABORATIVE PRACTICES	
3.4 INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN	
3.5 INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY	
3.6 SPECIALLY-DESIGNED INSTRUCTION	
3.7 COMMUNICATION SUPPORT PRACTICES	
3.8 BEHAVIOR SUPPORT PRACTICES	
3.9 TRANSITION PRACTICES	
3.10 EVALUATION STRUCTURES	
3.11 IMPROVEMENT PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES	
3.12 STATE LEADERSHIP	
3.13 STATE PERSONNEL PRACTICES	

Identifying the Takeaways

Takeaway 1:

Takeaway 2:

Takeaway 3:

Based upon the RISE Part 2 Tool, discuss the features and Sets of Features that:

- are foundational to the rest of the work,
- seem like an “easy win” for the team, and
- align with other initiatives and changes happening in the system.

Takeaways might connect with *Increased Time, Improved Instructional Effectiveness, Increased Engagement, and System Support*, or might focus specifically on what features or Sets of Features your team wants to address. For instance, a Takeaway might be creating a shared inclusive education system vision.

Next Steps

1. Complete Initiative Inventory
2. Complete Inclusive Education Action Plan
3. Begin initial implementation of Action Plan