



Inclusionary Practices in Washington Schools: Findings from the WASA/AWSP Study on Leadership and Practice

*District and School Leader Voices on Building Sustainable Systems of Support for
All Students*

A Project Funded by OSPI's Inclusionary Practices Technical Network

Submitted June 2025

Acknowledgments

This report was made possible through the funding support and leadership of the **Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN)**. We are especially grateful for the collaborative spirit and deep commitment to equity and inclusion demonstrated by leaders and practitioners across Washington state.

We extend our sincere thanks to the executive leadership of the Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA) and the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) for their vision and support of this work:

- **Joel Aune**, Executive Director, WASA
- **Scott Seaman, Ed.D.**, Executive Director, AWSP
- **Kim Fry**, Assistant Executive Director of Learning Innovation and AI, WASA
- **Jack Arend**, Deputy Director, AWSP

Special appreciation goes to the IPTN Project Directors for their leadership and dedication throughout the design and implementation of this study:

- **Amy Wright, Ed.D.**, WASA IPTN
- **Ashley Barker**, AWSP IPTN

We also acknowledge the contributions of our evaluators for the creation of this report:

- **Kathy Shoop, Ed.D.**
- **Rick Eignebrood, Ph.D.**

This project was shaped by the expertise and insight of our Design Team. We are grateful to:

- **Lara Reed-Rivera**
- **Helene Paroff**

Finally, we wish to thank the many district leaders, school administrators, and educators who participated in surveys, interviews, and learning sessions. Their honest reflections, innovative practices, and unwavering commitment to inclusive education are the foundation of this report.

This report is the product of a collaborative effort between WASA and AWSP, produced with support from the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). All rights reserved.

© 2025 Washington Association of School Administrators and Association of Washington School Principals

If we deeply understand the LRE imbalance, carefully examine foundational research, and assess what is currently in place in districts/schools across the state, then we'll know what district/school leaders/teachers and stakeholders need to build a sustainable system enacting the above strategies to improve the learning trajectory for ALL students, (particularly students with significant disabilities and Black students with disabilities.)

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of a survey and a related interview on use of and attitudes about inclusionary practices in Washington state school districts. The data collected revealed what districts do and do not have in place to serve students. Results will be used to help WASA and AWSP leadership better understand the status and future needs of their constituents; information gathered will inform development of a multi-year project to help districts create and sustain systems fully supporting inclusionary practices for all students, particularly historically marginalized students. In addition, results will provide all state education leaders with a clearer vision of the needs of the 295 school districts within Washington state. Conduction of this survey and sharing of the results in this report fulfills one of the requirements of the *WASA/AWSP Inclusionary Practices Project*.

METHODOLOGY

In March 2025, the *WASA/AWSP Inclusionary Practices Project* team conducted a literature review focused on the practices which must be place for districts/schools/classrooms to make and sustain changes in the placement trajectory for all students (particularly significantly disabled and Black students with disabilities. Findings from this literature review, combined with the six drivers identified by the IPTN, informed the creation of 11 interview questions and 16 closely aligned survey items. Of the survey items, nine were measured with a Likert scale, six were short-answer, and one was a forced-choice item. Interview questions and related survey items can be found in the Appendix.

In early April 2025, email invitations were sent to superintendents in 45 stratified (by ESD and class to ensure representation of small and large districts in both eastern and western Washington) and randomly selected Washington state school districts; one of which was identified as a “positive outlier”. Additional invitations went to 9 ‘positive outlier’ districts which had been actively engaged with the 2020-24 OSPI-funded WASA IP

Project and whose LRE scores, strategic plans, and minutes from regular leadership team meetings provided evidence of progress in use of inclusionary practices in their systems. The 54 email messages provided superintendents with information about the interview and provided the name of an interviewer who would contact the district. Four interviewers were given a common script and a common tool to enter responses to use in the process to maintain reliability. Of the 54 districts, 34 (64%) districts agreed to be interviewed. These were conducted via telephone or Zoom beginning in mid-April and continued until early May.

In mid-April 2025, the 16-item aligned survey instrument was sent as a link in an email to **all** WASA and AWSP members. In addition to the initial email, members received several additional prompts before the survey closed in mid-May. The 175 (representing 34% of Washington's public-school districts) survey responses automatically populated a spreadsheet with all information available to the project team. While the surveys were completed by individuals, many of the interviews were conducted with district/school leadership groups. Between the survey and the interview, 38% of districts in Washington state participated in this study.

RESULTS

The WASA/AWSP IP Interview and Survey were done during a 6-week period in the spring of 2025 to better understand the answers to these questions:

1. Based on perception of current practice, what do Washington state school districts need to build/sustain systems to fully support inclusionary practices for all students (particularly those with significant disabilities and Black students with disabilities)?
2. What are the preferred/ideal ways to offer needed support to districts?
3. What can we learn from districts identified as positive outliers?
4. What, if any, response differences exist between district office and building administrators, between Class 1 and Class 2 districts, between districts previously involved in WASA IP Project work and those not previously involved, and between all responses and those from the 10 districts identified as positive outliers?

All 11 interview questions and 16 survey items were aligned with findings from a WASA/AWSP IP best practices literature review and at least one of the six IPTN drivers:

1. Data-Driven Strategies

2. Strategic Use of Resources
3. Evidence-Based Leadership Practices
4. Shared Ownership within the School District System
5. Family and Community Partnership
6. Educator Recruitment/Retention/Support

Results are reported in Tables 1-52 and brief summaries below, organized by interview question and aligned survey item(s), for all respondents and the sub-groups as mentioned above. The connection between each question/item and the above list is presented in italics following each question.

Interview Question 1 (i-1)/Survey Items 1 and 2 (s-1 and s-2)

i-1. *How would you describe the current vision for inclusive education in your district? How is this vision communicated with stakeholders? 3, 4, 5*

Table 1: Interview Responses to Item 1 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, Green=most repeated; Blue=second most repeated; Purple=third most repeated; Gold= not repeated*

ALL		
1. All students should begin in and primarily remain in general education classrooms with peers; 'All means all' 2. Tailor supports and services to the needs of each student About communication: 1. We lack clear/consistent/ timely communication about common vision 2. Placement of inclusive education in district plans, board updates, or policy work is evidence of communication	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1. Needs, barriers, and challenges (staff training/capacity, lack of common system vision, lack of communication, lack of resources) 2. MTSS organizes our efforts and serves as our 'foundational umbrella'	1. Gaps between our vision and our reality (vision not shared system-wide, staff needs more support/ training, poor communication, financial/staff challenges) 2. MTSS is our foundation with UDL as a primary focus. All means all – integrating with other initiatives
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1. Embedding inclusion into strategic plans and district-wide initiatives (board policy, 'the way we do business') 2. Gaps between vision and practice (vision not shared, embraced, or evidenced in practice); a 'work in progress'	1. MTSS is our foundational support to provide appropriate interventions 2. Commitment to placing all students in general education classrooms 'unless demonstrated otherwise'
	Positive Outliers	
	1. Inclusion is embedded in strategic plans, board policies, initiatives, formal planning, frameworks 2. Inclusion impacts actions across the district: business department re: staffing and resources, T and L partnering with SPED, close work with the Board	

Table 1 presents the interview responses to question 1 (vision for inclusive education). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- *The most frequent response among all groups noted a lack of common system vision.*
- *The second most frequent response (#1 for positive outlier districts and IPP veterans) indicates that IP is embedded in district plans, board updates/policies, and formal planning.*

s-1 *My district has a vision for inclusive education.*

s-2 *District stakeholders have been included in your district’s vision for inclusive education.*

Table 2: Survey Responses to Items 1 and 2 by All--(N175)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unknown
1. My district has a vision for inclusive education for students with disabilities.	2%	8%	55%	36%	NA
2. District stakeholders have been included in your district’s vision for inclusive	3%	16%	53%	22%	6%

Table 3: Survey Responses to Items 1 and 2 by District/Building Leaders--Dist (N94), Bldg (N81)

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Unknown	
	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building
1. My district has a vision for inclusive education for students with disabilities.	0%	2%	9%	7%	51%	57%	39%	33%	0%	0%
2. District stakeholders have been included in your district’s vision for inclusive	1%	9%	11%	19%	58%	49%	23%	20%	5%	7%

Table 4: Survey Responses to Items 1 and 2 by IPP Vet/Non-Vet—Vet (N85), Non-Vet (N72), Uns (N15)

	Strongly Disagree			Disagree`			Agree			Strongly Agree			Unknown		
	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure

1. My district has a vision for inclusive education for students with disabilities.	1%	1%	6%	12%	4%	6%	61%	48%	50%	26%	47%	38%	0%	0%	0%
2. District stakeholders have been included in your district's vision for inclusive	4%	1%	6%	22%	8%	13%	51%	51%	75%	15%	33%	6%	8%	5%	0%

Table 5: Survey Responses to Items 1 and 2 by District Class (Size)—Class 1 (N121), Class 2 (N54)

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Unknown	
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2
1. My district has a vision for inclusive education for students with disabilities.	1%	4%	8%	10%	57%	48%	34%	38%	0%	0%
2. District stakeholders have been included in your district's vision for inclusive	2%	4%	15%	15%	51%	54%	22%	19%	6%	8%

Table 6: Survey Responses to Items 1 and 2 by Positive Outlier Districts (N18)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unknown
1. My district has a vision for inclusive education for students with disabilities.	6%	0%	61%	33%	0%
	Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	Most of the Time	Does Not Apply
2. District stakeholders have been included in your district's vision for inclusive	6%	6%	61%	22%	6%

Tables 2-6 present survey responses to question 1 (district vision) and question 2 (stakeholders). Responses are reported for overall, as well as survey response comparisons for district level versus building level, district size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and districts identified as positive outliers in previous IP projects. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The combined agreement and strong agreement percentages for both district vision and stakeholder involvement is very high for overall response summary and for all comparison.*
- The combined disagreement and strong disagreement percentages for stakeholder involvement are somewhat higher for all comparisons.*

- *The combined agreement and strong agreement percentages are the highest for those districts identified as positive outliers. This is especially true for question 2 - stakeholder engagement.*

Interview Question 2 (i-2)/Survey Items 3 and 5 (s-3, s-5)

i-2. *What specific leadership practices have you found most effective in advancing inclusive education in your district?* 3

Table 7: Interview Responses to Item 2 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, **Green**=most repeated; **Blue**= second most repeated; **Purple**=third most repeated; **Gold**=not repeated*

ALL		
1. Build, nurture, and use collaborative teams to learn, make common decisions, and create common structures 2. Use MTSS as an organizer	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1. Develop principals' and admins' understanding of inclusive practices via PD, coaching, networking, flexibility in practice while remaining firm to district goals 2. Create structures and systems to support collaboration and to allow teams to learn and apply	1. Build leadership teams that support leaders, teachers and paras to learn together and allow learning among cabinet members 2. Create supports for implementation (MTSS, teams, continuum of services, focus on core instruction, use of data)
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1. Employ distributed leadership for staff (ALL 'levels') to learn and work together, meet regularly, co-plan/present 2. Build capacity across system with planned and strategic staff (ALL as colleagues) development from experts, specialists, coaches	1. Move from top-down to collaborative building leadership, with teams of teachers and paras, giving them responsibility 2. Build foundational understanding of inclusionary practices, establishing a mind set before pushing best practices
	Positive Outliers	
	1. District and building teams meet regularly with shared leadership across buildings 2. District initiates time, space, and expectations for building leaders to work and learn together	

Table 7 presents the interview responses to question 2 (leadership practices to advance inclusive education). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district 'class'/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- *The most frequent response was 'build, nurture, and use collaborative teams and shared leadership to work and learn together'.*
- *The second most frequent response was 'create supports across the system to build capacity'*
- *Class 1 and IPP non-veteran districts suggested that principals' and administrators' understanding of IP needed to be developed/deepened to create a common mindset.*

s-3. *My district/building leaders collaboratively advance inclusive education across the system.*

Table 8: Survey Responses to Item 3 by All--(N175)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unknown
3. My district/building leaders collaboratively advance inclusive education across the system.	3%	20%	58%	19%	1%

Table 9: Survey Responses to Item 3 by District/Building Leaders—Dist (N94), Bldg (N81)

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Unknown	
	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building
3. My district/building leaders collaboratively advance inclusive education across the system.	1%	2%	15%	24%	61%	55%	23%	16%	0%	2%

Table 10: Survey Responses to Item 3 by IPP Vet/Non-Vet—Vet (N85), Non-Vet (N72), Uns (N15)

	Strongly Disagree			Disagree			Agree			Strongly Agree			Unknown		
	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure
3. My district/building leaders collaboratively advance inclusive education across the system.	4%	0%	0%	19%	21%	25%	61%	52%	69%	14%	27%	6%	2%	0%	0%

Table 11: Survey Responses to Item 3 by District Class (Size)—Class 1 (N121), Class 2 (N54)

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Unknown	
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2
3. My district/building leaders collaboratively advance inclusive education across the system.	2%	1%	21%	17%	57%	58%	17%	23%	2%	0%

Table 12: Survey Responses to Item 4 by Positive Outlier Districts—(N18)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unknown
3. My district/building leaders collaboratively advance inclusive education across the system.	0%	28%	44%	22%	6%

Tables 8-12 present the survey responses to question 3 (system-wide collaboration). Responses are reported for overall, as well as survey response comparisons for district level versus building level, district size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and districts identified as positive outliers in previous IP projects. An examination of the response results indicates the following.

- The combined agreement and strong agreement percentages for system-wide collaboration is high for the overall response summary and for all comparison. However, the percentage of those disagreeing or strongly disagreeing represents approximately 25% of the responses.
- The combined agreement and strong agreement percentages relative to system-wide collaboration are the highest for those districts identified as positive outliers.

s-5. Describe the specific leadership practices you have found most successful in strengthening use of inclusionary practices in your district.

Table 13: Survey Responses to Item 5 by All and Sub-Groups

****Two most frequent responses within each group displayed**

****Comparing responses between groups, Green=most repeated; Blue= second most repeated; Purple=third most repeated; Gold=not repeated**

ALL		
1. Provide targeted professional development with specialized partners in UDL and co-teaching to build capacity 2. Use of shared/distributive team leadership with a clear shared vision	Class 1 Districts (over 2k students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1. Professional development 2. Collaborative structures and partnerships	1. Professional development 2. Staff, parent, admin collaboration and communication
	District	Building
	1. Invest in professional learning to build a common, shared understanding and language 2. Build leadership teams/guiding coalitions and involve stakeholders	1. Professional development (UDL, co-teaching, book study) 2. Create time for intentional collaboration between gen ed and sped staff, grade levels, buildings
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1. Professional development in UDL or coteaching with specific experts 2. Establish clear vision/plan which includes/aligns inclusion	1. Collaborative teaming across levels and departments 2. Targeted professional development
	Positive Outliers	
	1. Implement an inclusive environment (clear definitions, communications, UDL training, co-teaching team models, focus on students) 2. Use of systemic approaches to implementation, (common vision, explicit plans, roadmaps, etc.) following implementation science	

Table 13 presents the survey responses to question 5 (leadership practices). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The most frequent response was offering professional development to build common tools and language and creating and supporting collaborative teams across the system.
- Establishment of a shared vision/plan was noted by IP veterans.
- Implementation while maintaining a systemic approach was the most common response by positive outliers.

Interview Question 3 (i-3)/Survey Item 4 (s-4)

i-3. How does the district/building leadership collaboratively engage in reflection about inclusion both within the buildings and within the district community? 4, 5

Table 14: Interview Responses to Item 3 by All and Sub-Groups

**Two most frequent responses within each group displayed

**Comparing responses between groups, *Green*=most repeated; *Blue*= second most repeated; *Purple*=third most repeated; *Gold*=not repeated

ALL		
1.Lack of system-wide or intentional reflection beyond IEP meetings 2. Challenged by staff turnover, time, demands on staff, and staff resistance	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1.Lack of system-wide reflection on IP 2.Collaborative teams are meeting but not doing much critical review	1.Challenged by lack of time, established process for reflection, and demands on staff 2. Collaborative teams are meeting but not doing much critical review
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.Many district leadership teams have a problem-solving focus; staff PLC meetings have time for reflection 2. While reflection is happening, it is not happening across the system	1.Challenged by time, demands on staff, and staff resistance 2. Some districts report use of tools which include a reflective process, but this is not done fully or across the system
	Positive Outliers	
	1 Districts report a systemic need for more structure and intentionality in reflection about the ‘big picture’ 2. Collaborative teams/structures are in place and functioning well across the system, but all need more reflection	

Table 14 presents the interview responses to question 3 (collaborative reflection by leaders). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The most frequent response indicated a lack of system-wide reflection re: IP – ‘teams are meeting but are not doing much critical review’.*
- Non-veteran districts and Class 2 districts felt particularly challenged by time, demands on staff, staff resistance, and turnover.*
- IPP veteran and positive outlier districts reported a desire for more structure/intentionality for reflection about the ‘big picture’.*

s-4. District/building leaders collaboratively engage with stakeholders in reflecting about inclusion.

Table 15: Survey Responses to Item 4 by All--(N175)

	Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	Most of the Time	Does Not Apply
4.District/building leaders collaboratively engage with stakeholders in reflecting about inclusion	2%	26%	51%	18%	3%

Table 16: Survey Responses to Item 4 by District/Building Leaders—Dist (N94), Bldg (N81)

	Never		Seldom		Some of the Time		Most of the Time		Does Not Apply	
	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building
4.District/building leaders collaboratively engage with stakeholders in reflecting about inclusion.	1%	4%	24%	28%	60%	43%	15%	21%	0%	3%

Table 17: Survey Responses to Item 4 by IPP Vet/Non-Vet—Vet (N85), Non-Vet (72), Uns (N15)

	Never			Seldom			Some of the Time			Most of the Time			Does Not Apply		
	Vet	Non -Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non -Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non -Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non -Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non -Vet	Not Sure
4.District/building leaders collaboratively engage with stakeholders in reflecting about inclusion.	4%	1%	6%	34%	21%	6%	44%	56%	62%	15%	21%	25%	2%	1%	0%

Table 18: Survey Responses to Item 4 by District Class (Size)—Class 1 (N121), Class 2 (N54)

	Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	Most of the Time	Does Not Apply
--	-------	--------	------------------	------------------	----------------

	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2
4.District/ building leaders collaboratively engage with stakeholders in reflecting about inclusion.	3%	1%	25%	27%	50%	52%	18%	1%	2%	0%

Table 19: Survey Responses to Item 4 by Positive Outlier Districts—(N18)

	Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	Most of the Time	Does Not Apply
4.District/building leaders collaboratively engage with stakeholders in reflecting about inclusion.	6%	6%	28%	56%	0%

Tables 15-19 present the survey responses to question 3 (system-wide collaboration) and question 4 (stakeholder collaboration). Responses are reported for overall, as well as survey response comparisons for district level versus building level, district size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and districts identified as positive outliers in previous IP projects. An examination of the response results indicates the following.

- The combined some of the time and most of the time percentages for stakeholder collaboration is high for the overall response summary and for all comparisons.*
- However, approximately a quarter of the responses indicated that this never or seldomly occurred for all comparisons except for those identified as positive outliers.*

Interview Question 4 (i-4)/Survey Item 6 (s-6)

i-4. How has the district been able to sustain a focus on inclusionary practices during changes in district or building leadership? 4

Table 20: Interview Responses to Item 4 by All and Sub-Groups

****Two most frequent responses within each group displayed**

****Comparing responses between groups, *Green*=most repeated; *Blue*= second most repeated; *Purple*=third most repeated; *Gold*=not repeated**

ALL		
1.Minimal turnover or have a strong system for hiring or onboarding 2. IP deeply embedded in district culture	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1.IP work is connected to the system frameworks and strategic plan 2. IP-friendly leaders chosen and supported during onboarding (mentors, etc.)	1.All agree that consistent leadership helps us focus; some note the district ‘starts over’ with each new hire 2.Districts say they are refining systemic approaches to IP via MTSS, RTI, etc., but in the learning phase
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.IP deeply embedded in district culture; consistent district-wide practices continue regardless of personnel changes 2.District actively look for leaders which have a shared focus and understanding of IP	1.Challenged by dealing with frequent turnover and superintendents new to the role 2.System challenges to begin/maintain IP
	Positive Outliers	
	1.Importance of having structured hiring systems in place to maintain continuity re: IP focus 2.New leaders are expected to understand and support IP work	

Table 20 presents the responses to interview question 4 (sustaining focus during leadership changes). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- There was strong similarity in responses from all, class 1, positive outlier, and IPP veteran districts; the most frequent response indicated that IP work is embedded to the strategic plan and hiring practices.*
- The second most common response indicated that IP is integral to district culture, with leaders selected for their knowledge of and support for IP.*
- Class 2 and non-veteran districts both responded that while consistent leadership helps us focus, we are challenged by turnover and leaders new to the role.*

s-6. Your district has sustained its focus on inclusionary practices during changes in district of building leadership

Table 21: Survey Responses to Item 6 by All—(N175)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unknown
6. Your district has sustained its focus on inclusionary practices during changes in district or building leadership.	3%	12%	38%	35%	12%

Table 22: Survey Responses to Item 6 by District/Building Leaders—Dist (N94), Bldg (N81)

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Unknown	
	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building
6. Your district has sustained its focus on inclusionary practices during changes in district or building leadership.	4%	3%	9%	15%	44%	32%	35%	35%	0%	14%

Table 23: Survey Responses to Item 6 by IPP Vet/Non-Vet— Vet (N85), Non-Vet (N72), Uns (N15)

	Never			Seldom			Some of the Time			Most of the Time			Does Not Apply		
	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure
6. Your district has sustained its focus on inclusionary practices during changes in district or building leadership.	4%	1%	1%	15%	6%	0%	29%	32%	4%	24%	29%	8%	13%	4%	3%

Table 24: Survey Responses to Item 6 District Class (Size) - Class1 (N121), Class 2 (N54)

	Never		Seldom		Some of the Time		Most of the Time		Does Not Apply	
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2
6. Your district has sustained its focus on inclusionary practices during changes in district or building leadership.	2%	2%	13%	10%	41%	29%	33%	40%	10%	15%

Table 25: Survey Responses to Item 6 by Positive Outlier Districts (N18)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unknown
6. Your district has sustained its focus on inclusionary practices during changes in district or building leadership.	6%	6%	56%	17%	17%

Tables 21-25 presents the survey responses to question 6 (sustaining focus). Responses are reported for overall, as well as survey response comparisons for district level versus building level, district size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and districts identified as positive outliers in previous IP projects. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The combined some of the time and most of the time percentages for sustaining focus is high for the overall response summary and for all comparisons. However, approximately a quarter of the responses indicated that this never or seldomly occurred or did not apply for all comparisons.
- IPP veteran districts had higher percentages of responses indicating that sustaining focus happened at a seldom or did not apply level.

Interview Question 5 (i-5)/Survey Item 7, 8, 9 (s-7, s-8, s-9)

i-5. How do you measure the impact of inclusive practices on both students with and without disabilities? What outcomes do you track? 1, 3

Table 26: Interview Responses to Item 5 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, Green=most repeated; Blue= second most repeated; Purple=third most repeated; Gold=not repeated*

ALL		
1.LRE is the primary measurement tool; awareness it's not enough 2. Awareness of necessity of system-wide assessment/ measurement; understanding that inclusion is more than 'being in the room'	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1.LRE is the primary tool; awareness is not enough 2. Dissatisfaction in system-wide assessment/measurement gaps	1.Early stages of developing measurement systems 2. LRE is the primary tool; awareness it is not enough
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.LRE is the primary tool; awareness it is not enough 2. Dissatisfaction in system-wide assessment/measurement gaps	1.Understand the need for measurement but struggling to build/maintain a system 2. Attempt to strengthen Tier 1 strategies to keep students in general education classes
	Positive Outliers	
	1.LRE is the primary tool; awareness it is not enough 2. Dissatisfaction in system-wide assessment/measurement gaps	

Table 26 presents responses to interview question 5 (measuring impact). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district 'class'/ size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- Most groups reported use of LRE as the primary tool while also noting they believe they need additional measures.
- Class 1, IPP veteran, and positive outlier districts all spoke of dissatisfaction with their current assessment practices.

- *Class 2 and non-veteran districts spoke about their struggle to build/maintain a measurement system.*

s-7 How does your district measure the impact of inclusive practices both on students with and without disabilities?

Table 27: Survey Response to Item 7 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed.*

***Comparing responses between groups, **Green**=most repeated; **Blue**= second most repeated; **Purple**=third most repeated; **Gold**=not repeated*

ALL		
1.Use of LRE data 2.Not sure/uncertain/we don't/still working on this	Class 1 Districts (over 2k students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1.Use of LRE data 2.No known metric/not yet established/not sure/we don't	1. Use of LRE data 2. Academic performance/achievement data (SBA, iReady, NWEA, IEP monitoring)
	District	Building
	1.Use of academic performance data (MAP, SBA, iReady, achievement scores.) 2. Use of LRE data	1.Use of academic performance data (SBA, NWEA tests, grades) 2.Use of LRE data
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.Use of LRE data 2.Academic performance and achievement data (universal screeners, iReady, SBA)	1.Academic performance data (SBA, grades) 2.No established metric/not yet established/not sure/we don't
	Positive Outliers	
	1. No systemic process to focus on impact instead of placement rates. 2.Use of LRE and general education placement	

Table 27 presents the survey responses to question 7 (measurement of inclusive practices). Responses are reported as overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- *The most frequent response was using LRE data, followed by ‘academic performance data’.*
- *The third most frequent response was that there was ‘no known system-wide metric’.*
- *The most frequent response from positive outliers was ‘we have no real measure of impact; we are just measuring placement’.*

s-8 In your district students with significant disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities

s-9 In your district Black students with disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities

Table 28: Survey Responses to Items 8 and 9 by All—(N175)

	Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	Most of the Time	Does Not Apply
8. In your district students with significant disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	1%	25%	55%	17%	1%
9. In your district Black students with disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	0%	13%	25%	47%	20%

Table 29: Survey Responses to Items 8 and 9 by District/Building Leaders—Dist (N94), Bldg (N81)

	Never		Seldom		Some of the Time		Most of the Time		Does Not Apply	
	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building
8. In your district students with significant disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	0%	2%	9%	7%	51%	57%	39%	33%	0%	0%

9.In your district Black students with disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	1%	9%	11%	19%	58%	49%	23%	20%	5%	7%
---	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	----

Table 30: Survey Responses to Items 8 and 9 by IPP Vet/Non-Vet - Vet (N85), Non-Vet (N72), DNA (N15)

	Never			Seldom			Some of the Time			Most of the Time			Does Not Apply		
	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure	Vet	Non-Vet	Not Sure
8. In your district students with significant disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	0%	1%	0%	26%	26%	19%	49%	62%	56%	22%	10%	19%	1%	0%	6%
9.In your district Black students with disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	0%	0%	0%	6%	8%	13%	22%	30%	13%	44%	49%	56%	27%	12%	19%

Table 31: Survey Responses to Items 8 and 9 by District Class (Size)- Class1 (N121), Class 2 (N54)

	Never		Seldom		Some of the Time		Most of the Time		Does Not Apply	
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2
8. In your district students with significant disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	1%	0%	29%	17%	56%	54%	13%	25%	0%	4%
9.In your district Black students with disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	0%	0%	10%	1%	31%	10%	48%	46%	11%	42%

Table 32: Survey Responses to Items 8 and 9 by Positive Outlier Districts - (N18)

	Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	Most of the Time	Does Not Apply
--	-------	--------	------------------	------------------	----------------

8. In your district students with significant disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	0%	39%	50%	11%	0%
9. In your district Black students with disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.	0%	17%	22%	44%	28%

Tables 28-32 present the survey responses to question 8 (participation in general education) and question 2 (Black students with disabilities). Responses are reported for overall, as well as survey response comparisons for district level versus building level, district size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and districts identified as positive outliers in previous IP projects. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The combined some of the time and most of the time percentages for participation in general education by both students with significant disabilities and Black students with disabilities is the most common response for the overall summary and for all comparison.*
- The fact that some of the time is the most common response for general education participation should be of some concern.*
- Not surprisingly, a large percentage of the smaller districts indicated that question related to Black students did not apply.*

Interview Question 6 (i-6)/Survey Item 10, 11 (s-10, s-11)

i-6. How do you prepare and then continually support general education and special education teachers re: inclusionary practices? 1, 2, 3, 5

Table 33: Interview Responses to Item 6 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, **Green**=most repeated; **Blue**= second most repeated; **Purple**=third most repeated; **Gold**=not repeated*

ALL		
1. Structured, on-going professional development (PLCs, UDL, system-wide focused PD days) 2. Building a collaborative culture and mindset re: adult responsibility for students	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1. Structured, on-going professional development (PLCs, UDL, system-wide focused PD days) 2. Building a collaborative culture and mindset re: adult responsibility for students	1. Building a collaborative culture between general ed and special ed staff 2. Structured, on-going professional development (Coaching, PLCs, MTSS, UDL, system-wide focused PD days)
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1. Structured, on-going professional development (multi-year PD plans, PLCs, UDL, system-wide focused PD days) 2. Building a collaborative culture and mindset re: adult responsibility for students, co-teaching	1. Building a collaborative culture and mindset re: adult responsibility for students 2. Structured, on-going professional development (coaching, PLCs, UDL, integration of administrators as 'lead learners')
	Positive Outliers	

1. Structured, on-going professional development (multi-year PD plans, PLCs, UDL, system-wide focused PD days)
2. Building a collaborative culture and mindset re: adult responsibility for students, co-teaching

Table 33 presents the responses to interview question 6 (prep and support of teachers). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- *All groups reported that they are using structured, on-going PD via PLCs, about UDL. Most mentioned system-focused PD days; several mentioned MTSS.*
- *All groups reported they are working to build a collaborative culture/mindset about adult responsibility for all students.*
- *Most positive outlier districts mentioned multi-year PD plans.*

s-10 *The district adequately prepares general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices*

s-11 *The district continually supports general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices*

Table 34: Survey Responses to Items 10 and 11 by All—(N175)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unknown
10. The district adequately prepares general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	6%	38%	46%	10%	1%
11. The district continually supports general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	4%	27%	51%	18%	NA

Table 35 Survey Responses to Items 10 and 11 by District/Building Leaders—Dist (N94), Bldg (N81)

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Unknown	
	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building	District	Building
10. The district adequately prepares general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	0%	2%	9%	7%	51%	57%	39%	33%	0%	0%

11. The district continually supports general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	1%	9%	11%	19%	58%	49%	23%	20%	5%	7%
--	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	----

Table 36: Survey Responses to Items 10 and 11 by IPP Vet/Non-Vet --Vet (N85), Non-Vet (N72), Uns (N15)

	Strongly Disagree			Disagree			Agree			Strongly Agree			Unknown		
10. The district adequately prepares general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	4%	1%	6%	34%	21%	1%	44%	56%	63%	15%	21%	25%	2%	1%	0%
11. The district continually supports general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	5%	1%	6%	18%	8%	0%	34%	44%	25%	28%	40%	50%	15%	5%	19%

Table 37: Survey Responses to Items 10 and 11 by District Class (Size)-- Class1 (N121), Class 2 (N54)

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Unknown	
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2
10. The district adequately prepares general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	8%	1%	45%	19%	41%	56%	4%	23%	0%	0%

11. The district continually supports general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	4%	1%	36%	4%	45%	62%	12%	33%	0%	0%
--	----	----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	----

Table 38: Survey Responses to Items 10 and 11 by Positive Outlier Districts (N18)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unknown
10. The district adequately prepares general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	6%	5%	44%	0%	0%
11. The district continually supports general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.	6%	28%	67%	0%	0%

Tables 34-38 present the agreement response summary for survey questions 10 (preparation) and 11 (continuous support).

- Approximately eighty percent of responses either agree or strongly agree that their districts prepared and continuously supported both general and special education teachers in the implementation of inclusionary practices.*
- Districts that have previously participated in IP projects were somewhat less likely to agree that districts provided adequate preparation in inclusionary practices (approximately 70%).*
- Districts identified as positive outliers had the lowest level of agreement for both questions.*

Interview Question 7 (i-7)/Survey Item 12, 13 (s-12, s-13)

i-7. Has your district used specific strategies to successfully include students with more significant disabilities? If so, which? 1, 2, 3, 5

Table 39: Interview Responses to Item 7 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, **Green**=most repeated; **Blue**= second most repeated; **Purple** = third most repeated; **Gold**=not repeated*

ALL		
	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)

1.Shifting from self-contained to inclusive classrooms with supports to match student needs breaking silos 2.Increasing capacity of gen ed staff via PD and increasing sped/gen ed collaboration	1.Using collaborative teaching and changes in structure to Increase gen ed staff capacity via aligned master schedules, MTSS, ongoing support, and emphasizing sped/gen ed blending 2.Need for and resource challenges of increased adult support	1. Shifting from mindset of segregated to inclusive model 2. Need for increased adult support staff (paras)
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.Shifting from self-contained to inclusive classrooms with supports (co-teaching, continuums of service) to match student needs 2.Increasing capacity of gen ed and sped staff via collaboration PD, ongoing support, time	1. Shifting from mindset of segregated to inclusive model 2.Creating strong support and communication systems between sped, specialists, admin, and gen ed
	Positive Outliers 1.Shifting from self-contained to inclusive classrooms with supports to match student needs: breaking silos 2. Using collaborative teaching and changes in structure to Increase gen ed staff capacity via aligned master schedules, MTSS, ongoing support, and emphasizing sped/gen ed blending	

Table 39 presents the responses to interview question 7 (strategies to include students with significant disabilities). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The most frequent #1 response was: ‘we are shifting from self-contained/segregated to inclusive models’
- IP veteran, positive outlier, and ‘all’ groups also noted they were using specific supports such as co-teaching or a continuum of service to match needs of students.
- The most frequent #2 response was: ‘creating staff collaboration/blending opportunities’
- Two of the groups reported a need for increased support staff.

s-12. Your district has used specific strategies to successfully include students with more significant disabilities

Table 40: Survey Responses to Item 12 by All - (N175)

	Yes	No	Unsure
12. Your district has used specific strategies to successfully include students with more significant disabilities.	56%	41%	3%

Table 41: Survey Responses to Item 12 by District/Building Leaders—Dist (N94), Bldg (N81)

	Yes Dist.	Yes Bldg	No Dist	No Bldg	Unsur e Dist	Unsur e Bldg
12. Your district has used specific strategies to successfully include students with more significant disabilities.	49	48	29	42	2	10

Table 42: Survey Responses to Item 12 by IPP Vet/Non-Vet—Vet (N85), Non-Vet (N72), Uns (N15)

	Yes Vet	Yes NVet	No Vet	No NVet	Unsur e Vet	Unsur e NVet
12. Your district has used specific strategies to successfully include students with more significant disabilities.	40	45	42	25	3	1

Table 43: Survey Responses to Item 12 by District Class 1 or 2 (Size)—Class 1 (N121), Class 2 (N54)

	Yes C1	Yes C2	No C1	No C2	Unsur e C1	Unsur e C2
12. Your district has used specific strategies to successfully include students with more significant disabilities.	54	61	42	39	2	0

Table 44: Survey Responses to Item 12 by Positive Outlier Districts – (N18)

	Yes	No	Unsure
12. Your district has used specific strategies to successfully include students with more significant disabilities.	50%	50%	0%

Tables 40–44 present the survey responses for survey question 12. This question asks whether district uses specific strategies to include students with significant disabilities.

- *Overall, approximately sixty percent of respondents indicated that their district is using specific strategies.*
- *Smaller districts were slightly more likely to report the use of specific strategies.*
- *Districts that had not previously participated in an IP project also indicated a slightly higher use of specific strategies.*
- *Fifty percent of the districts identified as positive outliers responded that their district used specific strategies to support the inclusion of students with significant disabilities.*

s-13. If your answer to Question 13 was “yes” which strategies have been used?

Table 45: Survey Responses to Item 13 by All and Sub-Groups

****Two most frequent responses within each group displayed**

****Comparing responses between groups, *Green*=most repeated; *Blue*= second most repeated; *Purple*=third most repeated; *Gold*=not repeated**

ALL		
1.Paraprofessional support and staffing 2.PD re: UDL/Differentiation; Implementation	Class 1 Districts (over 2k students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1.Collaboration via co-teaching, team planning/teaching, and push-in models 2. Use of UDL	1. Paraprofessional support 2.Collaborative planning and teaching with regular team meetings
	District	Building
	1.Paraprofessional PD and support 2. Collaborative planning, teaching, scheduling	1. Paraprofessional staffing and support 2. Collaborative planning and teaching (co-teaching)
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.Collaborative planning, teaching 2.Use of UDL and differentiation in curriculum and instruction	1.PD in UDL and instructional support 2.Collaborative teaching models
	Positive Outliers 1.Designing programs which focus on inclusion and integration 2.Collaborative planning, teaching, scheduling *Many positive outlier responses also acknowledged ‘we are not doing this well...YET’	

Table 45 presents the survey responses to question 13 (strategies to include students with significant disabilities). Responses are reported as overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The most frequent response was ‘collaborative teaching and planning’, followed by ‘para-pro staffing and support’ and ‘professional development in or use of UDL/differentiation.’*
- It is worth noting that the third most frequent response was that there was ‘no known system-wide metric’.*
- The most frequent response from positive outliers was ‘designing programs which focus on inclusion and integration’.*

Interview Question 8 (i-8)/Survey Item 14 (s-10 and s-11) as previously presented in tables 34-38

i-8. *What professional learning models do you currently use to support inclusive education (coaching, co-teaching, communities of practice, etc.)?* 4, 6

Table 46 Interview Responses to Item 8 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, **Green**=most repeated; **Blue**= second most repeated; **Purple**=third most repeated; **Gold**=not repeated*

ALL		
1.PLCs, with a variation in implementation quality 2.Co-teaching, with external support	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1.PLCs, with some noting gen ed/sped members of common teams 2. Co-teaching, with a variation of successfulness	1.PLCs, with variation in implementation quality 2. Challenges re: collaboration, particularly at the secondary level
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.PLCs, with gen ed/sped collaboration, data analysis, planning, and implementation 2.Co-teaching, with a variation of successfulness	1.Variety of team models, including PLCs, mentoring, BEST 2.Use of frameworks (UDL, MTSS)
	Positive Outliers	
	1.PLCs, with gen ed and sped collaboration to plan 2.Co-teaching, with a variation of successfulness	

Table 46 presents responses to interview question 8 (professional learning models). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The most frequent #1 response was the use of PLCs.*
- The second most frequent response was co-teaching or teaming.*
- Class 2 districts noted a challenge with collaboration at the secondary level.*
- Non-veteran districts report using frameworks as their learning model.*

Interview Question 9 (i-9)/Survey Item 14 (s-14)

i-9. Besides funding, what are your district's barriers to inclusive education, particularly for students with significant disabilities and Black students with disabilities? 1

Table 47: Interview Responses to Item 9 by All and Sub-Groups

****Two most frequent responses within each group displayed**

****Comparing responses between groups, Green=most repeated; Blue= second most repeated; Purple=third most repeated; Gold=not repeated**

ALL		
1.Staff mindset/resistance 2.Lack of qualified staff/time to deeply learn	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1.Staff mindset/resistance 2.Lack of qualified staff/teacher autonomy re: PD	1. Lack of qualified staff 2. Staff mindset/insufficient 'training'
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.Staff mindset/resistance/hidden biases 2.Practical Issues: lack of staff, time, teacher autonomy re: PD, schedules	1.Lack of qualified staff 2.Lack of sufficient time for PD (UDL)
	Positive Outliers 1.Staff mindset/resistance 2.Practical Issues: lack of staff, time for collaboration/PD, schedules	

Table 47 presents responses to interview question 9 (barriers to IP, particularly for students with significant disabilities and Black students with IEPs). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district 'class'/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The most frequent #1 response staff mindset/resistance.*
- The second most frequent response was lack of qualified staff.*
- IP veterans and positive outliers reported practical issues (lack of staff, time, schedules) as a barrier.*

s-14 Besides funding and time, what are your district's barriers to inclusive education, particularly for Black students with disabilities and students with significant disabilities?

Table 48: Survey Responses to Item 14 by All and Sub-Groups

****Two most frequent responses within each group displayed.**

****Comparing responses between groups, Green=most repeated; Blue= second most repeated; Purple=third most repeated; Gold=not repeated**

ALL		
	Class 1 Districts (over 2k students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)

1.Staff mindset and beliefs 2.Inadequate preparation of staff	1.Inadequate preparation of staff; need for PD 2. Staff mindset, beliefs, low expectations for students	1.Staff mindset, beliefs, resistance 2.Inadequate preparation and turnover of staff
	District	Building
	1.Staff mindset, beliefs, resistance 2.Inadequate preparation of staff	1. Inadequate preparation of staff 2. Staff mindset and beliefs
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.Staff mindset and beliefs 2.Inadequate preparation of staff	1. Staff/personnel turnover/shortages 2. Staff /stakeholder mindset, beliefs, resistance
	Positive Outliers 1.Inadequate preparation of staff 2.Staff mindset and beliefs	

Table 48 presents the survey responses to question 14 (identification of district barriers to inclusive education, particularly for Black students with disabilities and students with significant disabilities). Responses are reported as overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- *The most frequent response was ‘staff mindset/beliefs’, followed by ‘inadequate staff preparation.’*
- *The most frequent response from positive outliers was the same as above.*
- *Non-veterans noted ‘staff turnover/shortages’ as their most frequent response.*

Interview Question 10 (i-10)/Survey Item 15 (s-15)

i-10. *If you could dream ‘big’, what do you think needs to be in place for the full implementation of inclusion for all?*

Table 49: Interview Responses to Item 10 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, Green=most repeated; Blue= second most repeated; Purple = third most repeated; Gold=not repeated*

ALL		
1. More staff and adequate funding 2. Ongoing and embedded PD/coaching/teaming, PD for leaders	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1. More staff and adequate funding 2. Ongoing and embedded PD/coaching/teaming/observing best practices in other schools	1. Ongoing and embedded PD/coaching/teaming, PD for leaders (to better support IP) 2. More staff and adequate funding
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1. More staff and adequate funding 2. Ongoing and embedded PD/coaching/teaming, PD for ALL to build skills (beyond theory)	1. Ongoing and embedded PD/coaching/modeling 2. More staff and adequate funding
	Positive Outliers	
	1. More staff and adequate funding 2. Comprehensive systemic and structural change (in beliefs, in separation of programs, in inflexible scheduling, in misguided testing requirements)	

Table 49 presents responses to interview question 10 (dream big re inclusion). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The most frequent response was more staff and more funding.*
- The second most frequent response was ongoing and embedded PD.*
- The second most frequent response for positive outlier districts was a comprehensive change to the system and structure of the educational/school system.*

s-15 If you could ‘dream big’, what do you think needs to be in place for the full implementation of inclusion for all students?

Table 50: Survey Responses to Item 15 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, **Green**=most repeated; **Blue**= second most repeated; **Purple** = third most repeated; **Gold**=not repeated*

ALL		
1.Additional staff (sped, para-pros/support staff, co-teaching) and resources (better physical space and assistive technology) 2. PD/Skill building for ALL staff in UDL, IP	Class 1 Districts (over 2k students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1.PD (job-embedded, UDL, IP) and training for ALL staff 2. Adequate staffing (more para-pros, co-teaching)	1. Adequate staffing (more sped teachers, more support/para-pros) 2.PD (UDL) for gen ed teachers; sped endorsements
	District	Building
	1.Staff PD (UDL, job-embedded, for ALL system-wide 2. Funding and resources (to support staff and planning time)	1.PD and training for all (on-going, job-embedded, comprehensive, UDL) 2. Resources for staffing and support (more staff, lower class sizes)
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.More staff (sped, support/para-pros co-teachers) and resources (smaller classes, planning time for teams) 2.Build capacity via PD for ALL (UDL, IP)	1. Ongoing system-wide PD for ALL staff (IP, UDL, co-teaching) 2.Staffing and resources (more sped teachers, para-pros, staff, smaller classes)
	Positive Outliers	
	1.Increase staff (more sped staff, more co-teaching staff) 2.PD (on-going, for ALL, emphasis on UDL implementation)	

Table 50 presents the survey responses to question 15 (what needs to be in place for full implementation of inclusion for all) practices). Responses are reported as overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The two most frequent responses were ‘adequate staffing and resources’ tied with ‘on-going PD for all district staff in UDL and IP’.*
- The second most frequent response from positive outliers went beyond UDL PD to ‘UDL implementation.’*

Interview Question 11 (i-11)/Survey Item 16 (s-16)

i-11. Is there anything I didn't ask you that needs to be addressed?

Table 51: Interview Responses to Item 11 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, **Green**=most repeated; **Blue**= second most repeated; **Purple** = third most repeated; **Gold**=not repeated*

ALL		
1.Support and resources for practical implementation (examples, regional partnership meetings, site visits, artifacts, evidence) 2. Sustained leadership and PD support for those leaders (in sped, in state law)	Class 1 Districts (2k or more students)	Class 2 Districts (fewer than 2k students)
	1.Support and resources for practical implementation 2. Strong system/leadership support/involvement/championing	1.Sustained commitment from state and system leaders to support IP and staff, esp. principals 2.Adequate resources and staff
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1.Support and resources for practical implementation to help us move beyond theory to concrete action (artifacts, classroom examples, regional partnership meetings, hands-on tools) 2.Increased leadership support to build and maintain capacity of building leaders	1.Sustained commitment from state and system leaders to support IP and staff, esp. principals 2.Adequate resources and staff
	Positive Outliers	
	1.Support and resources for practical implementation beyond theory (classroom examples, regional partnership meetings, videos, artifacts, evidence) 2. Strong leadership support and management as staff engages in actual change/staff mindset adjustments	

Table 51 presents responses to interview question 11 (what else do you want to say). Responses are reported for overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building level, district 'class'/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The most frequent #1 response was 'we need support and resources (regional partnerships, site visits, artifacts, classroom visits) for practical implementation.*
- The second most frequent response was 'we need strong sustained leadership and management within the district and state.*
- Class 2 and non-veteran districts want sustained commitment from state and system leaders and adequate resources/staff.*

s-16 Is there anything not asked earlier that you'd like to address?

Table 52: Survey Responses to Item 16 by All and Sub-Groups

***Two most frequent responses within each group displayed*

***Comparing responses between groups, **Green**=most repeated; **Blue**= second most repeated; **Purple** = third most repeated; **Gold**=not repeated*

ALL		
1. Need support systems (improving IEPs, adding para-pros, increasing collaboration and partnership networks among educators) 2. Need better PD (ongoing, coaching, support to practically implement IP) 3. Need help dealing with implementation challenges: financial, time, reaching ALL staff 4. Need support with personnel: recruitment/retention, turnover, insufficient prep, staff buy-in 5. Need support re: system, structure and policy issues (IEP processes/ language, sped/gen ed connections, MTSS, legal requirements such as LRE)	District	Building
	1. Need more PD resources/supports (ongoing, coaches, learning walks, collaboration time) 2. Systemic challenges: must coordinate/connect funds (esp. at secondary), need to help ALL understand that IP is not a sped initiative, need to make implementation a system priority, not dependent on staff/buildings	1. Need more PD (for admin re: legal and building capacity, for gen ed for UDP, IP, and co-teaching) 2. Need more resources and staff (para-pros, leaders) to staff models to support IP
	IPP Veterans	IPP Non-Veterans
	1. Resource restraints 2. Need high-quality PD, on-going support, systemic practical implementation guidance and better understanding of the law	1. Resource restraints (esp. with SD students; current expectations are 'unstainable', HR must be involved) 2. Need more comprehensive PD for all (about the law, behavior support plans)
	Positive Outliers	
	Need help with practical challenges: 1. Resource restraints (time and money) 2. Adult/community barriers (reaching all teachers, overcoming resistance, increasing community involvement and support)	

Table 52 presents the survey responses to question 16 (what else would you like to address?). Responses are reported as overall, with responses from these groups offered for comparison: district level versus building

level, district ‘class’/size, previous participation in IP projects (vet vs non-vet), and former IP project districts identified as positive outliers. An examination of the response results indicates the following:

- The two most frequent responses were ‘we need resources’, followed by ‘we need more/better PD for all.’*
- The most frequent response from positive outliers and district leaders was the same as above; those groups’ second most frequent response was ‘implementation in the system’.*

The results section of this report began with a description of the purpose of the 11-item interview and related 16-item survey done in the spring of 2025. Interview and survey responses are reported in tables 1-52 and in summaries organized by interview question and survey item for all respondents and the sub-groups as mentioned earlier. Because the interview was conducted via phone with the interviewer speaking with a self-selected willing group of district representatives, those responses might be considered group responses, with all present aware of the answers. The survey was sent to all individuals who are members either of the Washington Association of School Administrators’ Association or the Association of Washington State Principals; as such, these responses are considered individual responses, done privately by one person.

Initial findings reveal frequent themes of agreement between interview and survey items 91% of the time. Additionally, several sub-groups emerged as frequent outliers: the class 2 districts and IPP non-veteran districts often had similar responses which differed from that of the larger group; and the same was true for the IPP veteran districts and positive outlier districts. The results, including information about the areas of disagreement between the groups as mentioned, will be shared in more detail in the discussion section.

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the status of the use of inclusionary practices in Washington state public school districts to establish an evidence-based foundation for construction of a technical assistance project aligned with district needs. Forty-five participants from thirty-four districts constituted the interview participants and 175 individual survey participants represented the wide variety of state school districts. With rural and urban, Class 1 and Class 2, and eastern Washington and western Washington participants, this study provides both a broad vision of district successes, frustrations, and needs and a narrow version, with data presented by ‘all’ and by particular groups. This report goes beyond the *Least Restrictive Environment* data to learn what educational leaders at both district and building levels are doing and thinking.

In April and May of 2025, the *WASA/AWSP Inclusionary Practices Project* conducted an interview and connected survey to address four questions created after a literature examination to review the practices districts and schools must use to fully implement inclusionary practices for all students (particularly significantly disabled and Black students with disabilities). The four questions are listed below, with answers for each question using evidence from the interview and survey results.

1. Based on perception of current practice, what do Washington state school districts **need** to build/sustain systems to fully support inclusionary practices for all students (particularly those with significant disabilities and Black students with disabilities)?

- Districts need to bring the district vision to life with the help of all stakeholders.
- All leaders need to have a common understanding of inclusionary practices to work as a team across a system.
- Districts need to regularly engage in system-wide reflection about their work re: inclusionary practices.
- Districts need a broad culture of support for inclusionary practices (in their planning, in their human resources documents and protocols).
- Districts need a robust method of measuring impact and then using resultant data to maintain or improve practices for all students, particularly students with significant disabilities and Black students with disabilities.
- Districts need to determine what teachers need to know and be able to do to fully implement inclusionary practices and then create collaborative learning opportunities to answer needs.
- Districts need support in understanding and use of strategies to include students with significant disabilities in general education settings.
- Districts need long-term universal support to move staff mindset, so all believe that each student is their responsibility.
- Districts need fully prepared staff and adequate resources to fully implement inclusionary practices across a system.
- Districts need long-term focused support, resources, and professional development.

2. What are the preferred/ideal ways to offer needed support to districts?

- Respondents want strong and sustained system leadership and commitment at the state and district levels.
- Respondents want administrators who fully understand and support inclusionary practices, who have a sustained focus on inclusionary practices, who intentionally reflect about the work, who are fully prepared to do the job, and who collaborate/learn with colleagues.
- Respondents want multi-year plans in place for ongoing, job-embedded professional development in UDL and inclusionary practices and they want this PD to be concurrent with implementation actions.
- Respondents want that PD to include regional partnerships, site/classroom visits, and artifacts.

3. What can we learn from positive outlier districts?

Positive outlier district participants noted:

- They have a clear district vision which includes stakeholders.
- Their responses note a desire to maintain a system approach while implementing inclusionary practices.
- Reflection by their leaders is taking place but they want it to be more intentional.
- They are measuring placement of students but are not adequately measuring impact.
- They voiced a need for more staff preparation and support.
- The use of multi-year PD plans was frequently mentioned.
- They expressed uncertainty regarding the use of specific strategies to include students with significant disabilities.
- They feel that time and school schedules are barriers to inclusion.
- They desire a comprehensive change to the state and district educational systems.
- They want to move beyond PD to implementation with connected PD to support the work of the system.
- They have a need to increase community involvement.

4. What, if any, response differences exist between district office and building level administrators, between Class 1 and Class 2 districts, between districts previously involved in WASA IP project work and those not previously involved, and between all responses and those from the 10 districts identified as positive outliers?

- Larger districts and non-veteran districts noted that administrators need to fully understand IP to have a common mindset across a system; these two groups also noted a higher use of specific strategies to successfully include student with significant disabilities than all other groups.
- Smaller districts and non-veteran districts responded that their administrators are challenged to collaboratively reflect about inclusion due to resistance, turnover, and time. These two districts also reported that any consistency in focus is challenged by high administrative turnover and administrators who are new to the role. Finally, these groups also cited a need for sustained commitment and adequate resources from the state for implementation to occur.
- Almost half of small districts responded ‘does not apply’ to the question about barriers to inclusionary practices for Black students with IEPs; small districts also noted a challenge of use of professional learning models (such as PLCs) at the secondary level.
- Non-veteran districts were the only group to name ‘frameworks’ at their processual learning model; these districts also noted staff shortages/turnovers as their most frequent response to a question about barriers to implementation.
- Like positive outlier districts, veteran districts want a structured way for reflection to occur; veteran districts also noted ta challenge with sustaining a focus on inclusionary practices during changes in leadership. Veteran districts also had a lower response than all other groups regarding the level of preparation/support for general education and special education about inclusionary practices.

For the past two years, Washington’s OSPI has maintained a focus on six components essential to the success of inclusionary practices in K-12 settings. To complement this thinking, the results can be viewed through the focus of each component, as seen in the following table.

Table 53: Findings as Related to IPTN Drivers*With related interview question in italics*

Drivers	What Districts Need	Positive Outlier Feedback
Data-driven strategies <i>4, 5, 6, 8</i>	Metrics for tracking Common tools beyond LRE Intentional tools for cross-district reflection Coaching/support in use of tools and data	Measuring impact is not the same as measuring placement
Strategic use of resources <i>5, 6</i>	Strong sustained state and district leadership Help as a system while we implement	Create multi-year PD plans Wider use of specific strategies to include SSD
Evidence-based leadership practices <i>1, 2, 4, 5, 6</i>	Wide understanding and use of vision by all Intentional tools for cross-district reflection	Bldg. and district leaders collaborate about inclusion across the system Job-embedded PD while implementing
Shared ownership w/in school and district system <i>1, 2, 3, 7</i>	Common admin understanding of IP Change resistant mindset among staff Help with mindset challenges at secondary Broad culture of support across system	Bldg. and district leaders collaborate about inclusion across the system
Family and community partnership <i>1, 2, 5</i>	Family/community involvement Broad culture of support across system	Create and share vision with all stakeholders
Educator recruitment, retention, support <i>4, 6</i>	More support staff More qualified staff Less admin turnover Fewer 'green' admin Resources and support for PD for all (regional partnerships, site/classroom visits, artifacts) PD beyond frameworks	More preparation and support of staff

To more fully realize the connection between this report and the work of IPTN, Table 54 offers a deeper view of the learnings and recommendations from both sources.

Table 54: Alignment of WASA/AWSP Report Recommendations with IPTN Year 2 Learnings and Recommendations

Legend:

- **R#:** IPTN Year 2 Recommendations (organized by theme)
- **L#:** IPTN Year 2 Learnings (captured from CoPs and field insights)
- Domains include: TA (Technical Assistance), Shared Ownership, Strategic Resource Use, Educator Retention, and Data

Recommendation from the WASA/AWSP Report	Aligned IPTN Year 2 Learning/ Recommendation	Connection
Engage Leaders as Learners District and school leaders should actively participate in inclusion-focused PD.	R1 (Educator Retention): Align leaders around a shared vision and provide ongoing PD on inclusive practices.	Emphasizes leadership modeling and accountability for system-wide learning.
Contextualize PD With Practice-Based Tools Use artifacts, site visits, and concrete examples.	L1–L4 (Technical Assistance): PD must go beyond theory to include co-planning, team learning, and visible practice.	Operationalizes IPTN’s call for grounded, real-world implementation supports.
Provide Differentiated, Role-Specific PD Design learning for teachers, paras, and administrators.	R2 & R3 (Shared Ownership): Embedded PD and strengthening inclusive teams R3 (TA): PD should address bias and empower all roles.	Matches IPTN’s emphasis on cross-role professional learning and mindset growth.
Prioritize Coaching and Ongoing Support Include embedded coaching and reflection structures.	R3 (Shared Ownership): Provide tiered, job-embedded mentoring and coaching. R3 (Educator Retention): Provide tiered coaching and mentoring.	Reinforces IPTN’s belief in job-embedded supports to shift practice and culture.
Align PD With System Goals Embed inclusion in strategic plans, policies, and school improvement plans.	R3 (Educator Retention): Alignment of structures, vision, and leadership teams. R1 (Shared Ownership): Inclusive scheduling enables co-planning and shared learning.	Both emphasize coherence between system structures and professional learning.
Promote “All Means All” as a Core Value Establish inclusive education as a foundational district commitment.	L4 (TA): Mindset shifts require confronting bias and presuming competence. R3 (Shared Ownership): Aligning vision and practice is key.	Shared belief systems are foundational to both sets of recommendations.

Interrupt Bias, Racism, and Ableism Use PD to confront deficit thinking and promote equity.	R4 (TA): PD must address deficit thinking, racism, and ableism. L3 (TA): Leadership must promote co-design and reflection with those most impacted.	Clear alignment on the need to address root causes of exclusion in belief systems.
Embed Reflection Into Team Structures Establish tools and time for reflection on beliefs and actions.	R5 (TA): Feedback loops that include student and staff voice. L1–L2 (Data): Reflect beyond compliance using belonging and experience data.	Calls for structured reflection beyond compliance monitoring are echoed across both sources.
Model Equity-Driven Leadership Leaders should demonstrate inclusive decision-making across domains.	R3 (TA): Adaptive leadership is needed to model equity. L3 (TA): Promoting power-sharing, reflection & co-design.	Leadership behaviors must match the inclusive values being taught and expected.
Build Collective Ownership Across Roles Shift inclusion from a “special ed issue” to a shared responsibility.	L2 (TA): Shared ownership and alignment of instructional goals. R2 (TA): Time and systems for general and special educators to co-lead.	Systemic inclusion depends on shared accountability and distributed leadership.

Note: All IPTN references are drawn from "IPTN Year 2 Learnings and Recommendations Summary (June 2025)"

In addition to interview/survey data, the four interviewers individually responded to these questions:

- What major themes about needs did you hear in the interviews?
- What questions did you have about the content of all the interviews?

The most common responses:

Themes

1. Districts need additional support and resources (for side-by-side coaching, for networking, for scheduling, for tools).
2. Districts note the importance of connecting inclusionary practices to strategic plans and within other frameworks (MTSS).
3. Districts see staff resistance as a ‘primary barrier to inclusion’, particularly SSD and students with behavioral issues.

Wonderings

1. How do we provide the support, tools, resources districts need, based on each district’s phase of learning/adoption/implementation? How do we help them be less isolated in their learning?

2. How do we best build capacity of leaders at both district and buildings, so they move from isolated and walled to a sustainable system strong enough to withstand leadership/staff changes?

One additional wondering: it is interesting to note that, even though statewide data suggests differently, most districts feel/think they are doing a satisfactory job meeting the needs of Black students with disabilities as per the survey results reported in Tables 28-32.

Limitations

Participants: interviews were conducted by phone or Zoom with 12 of the 34 participating districts meeting as a group to respond. Most of the participants were district office leaders. It cannot be assumed that the responses represented the thoughts of all participants or of building leaders. Surveys were sent to all WASA and AWSP members, so most respondents were building leaders and many were assistant principals. Again, the results may be skewed to reflect the view of building administrators, particularly those new to the role.

Time: surveys were sent via email and made available at professional meetings from mid-April to mid-May; interviews were conducted at the same time. The school/district calendar between spring break and the end of the school year is not the most favorable time to conduct research with district and building leaders; this year they were dealing with state testing, difficult budget decisions, and staff reductions along with the regular end-of-the-year duties. As such, their responses may have been colored by the demands of their work environments.

General Implications

This WASA/AWSP Study highlights the critical role that district and school leaders play in building sustainable, inclusive education systems. Findings confirm that meaningful progress toward inclusion is not achieved through isolated initiatives but through aligned leadership practices, coherent professional development, and intentional culture-building efforts. When leaders model equity-driven mindsets, invest in job-embedded professional learning, and promote shared ownership across roles, inclusive practices become systemic rather than situational. However, the study also reveals persistent barriers such as fragmented leadership, deficit mindset, and limited structures for collaboration, all of which must be addressed through coordinated support, policy alignment, and capacity-building at all levels.

Recommendations and Next Steps for System-Level Action

- **Make Inclusion a Systemwide Commitment**
Clearly define inclusive education as a priority across district vision statements, strategic plans, and school improvement efforts.
- **Use Data That Reflect Student Experience**
Expand data practices to include measures of belonging, dignity, and student voice alongside traditional compliance indicators.
- **Support Ongoing Mindset Development**
Provide learning opportunities that help educators and leaders recognize and address ableism, racism, and deficit thinking.
- **Align State and Regional Partnerships**
Strengthen coordination among organizations such as WASA, AWSP, and OSPI to ensure consistent messaging, tools, and supports.
- **Invest in Long-Term Technical Assistance**
Secure sustainable funding to provide districts with the time, staffing, and professional learning needed to build inclusive systems. Districts need differentiated technical assistance that aligns leadership at all levels, builds systems for sustainable change, and centers inclusion in everyday practice, not as a separate initiative, but as foundational to student success.

CONCLUSION

Washington state's 2025 teacher of the year, Kim Broomer, was recently featured in the WEA newsletter. Broomer is a fierce supporter of inclusion and the use of strategies which support learning of all students daily in her kindergarten classroom where about 25% of her students have IEP's. She is also aware of the importance of maintaining a system focus to the work: "These are not natural numbers," she says. "If other area schools continue to push all of their students with special needs to Ruby Bridges, we will become a segregated special-education school, not an inclusion school."

In the article, Boomer describes how teachers often are ill-equipped to embrace inclusion, and many decision-makers believe it is just too costly, "It is not," explains Broomer. "Our school has the same funding as any other school, we just use our funds differently, prioritizing collaboration and connection."

The interview concludes, "This work must center those furthest from educational justice," Broomer says. "Schedules for specialists must be created based on the needs of the students not on what the teachers like most." Broomer admits it is a mindset shift, but her own school is proof that it works.

<https://www.washingtonea.org/weareblog/post/feeling-moved-to-better-kim-broomer-2025-washington-state-teacher-year/>

Kim Broomer's impassioned thoughts about supporting inclusion for all students by adequately equipping teachers and staff, encouraging collaboration and connection, changing mindsets, and guaranteeing that the work of inclusion is resourced across a system align with the findings of this report. The question is:

What if we really meant it?

Appendix A: WASA/AWSP IP Project 2025 Interview Process

WASA/AWSP IP Project 2025

Interview Process

.....
Project Focus (IPTN and WASA/AWSP):

1. DATA-DRIVEN STRATEGIES
2. STRATEGIC USE OF RESOURCES
3. EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES/LEADERSHIP
4. SHARED OWNERSHIP
5. FAMILY AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

6. EDUCATOR RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

ToA: If we deeply understand the LRE imbalance, carefully examine foundational research, and assess what is currently in place in districts/schools across the state, then we'll know what district/school leaders/teachers and stakeholders need to build a sustainable system enacting the above strategies to improve the learning trajectory for ALL students, (particularly students with significant disabilities and black male students).

Interview Process

Selection of Samples:

Group 1 (Positive Outlier Districts): 7-10 districts/schools representing both sides of the state, class A and class B districts, and urban/rural districts which have either demonstrated noticeable positive improvement in LRE data in the past 4 years or have demonstrated consistently positive LRE data during the past year.

This group will serve as a lighthouse of successful practice.

Group 2: We suggest that 45 subjects are randomly selected to participate in this phase of data-gathering, with the hope that 30 will participate. Selection of the 45 should be aligned with state percentages for location (east, west, north, south, or via ESD), size (class A or B), and type (urban, suburban, rural). Rick and I are happy to select the districts; we suggest you then determine who in each will be interviewed, with the final number consisting of an equal number of district-office leaders and building leaders.

Pre-interview steps: (see table page 2).

We suggest that 4-5 'friendly' 'highly engaged' districts (eg., Mercer Island, Rochester, Selah, Burlington, Walla Walla, Franklin Pierce) be used for practice after initial practice has taken place within the project members.

Interview content:

To begin each interview, we suggest the following information be gathered:

- District/school name
- Interviewee role
- Length of time in current role
- Previous connection to OSPI's IP work

We suggest the interview last no more than 30 minutes.

Interview steps:

Green shading indicates item common to both references

BEFORE THE INTERVIEW	
BURKE AND MILLER	GALL, GALL AND BORG (see more detail below)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-testing the interview protocol • Communicating with potential participants (introductory letter) • Determining audio-taping techniques • Pre-determining data analysis needs and logistics of gathering data (numeric code for each interview on paper and audio recording) • Scheduling each of the interviews (share questions) • Introducing yourself in the call (remind subject of importance and usefulness of their participation) • Informing participants of confidentiality, purpose of the data, and estimate of interview's length (but NOT that it is voluntary) • Identifying necessary form of note-taking • Communicating whether and/or how the results will be shared 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define purpose • Select sample • Design the format • Develop questions • Select and prepare interviewers • Pilot test
DURING THE INTERVIEW	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying appropriate interviewer style • Getting the participant to talk freely • Creating different types of questions • Giving useful feedback to participants, without distorting potential data • Considering interview length concerns; offer the minimal number of questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct interview, gain trust, rapport • Analyze data

1. Define the purpose to determine the sample (Key informant interviews and survey interviews)
2. Select the sample (random, non-random, or stratified random)
3. Design the interview format (quantitative: pre-specification of variables so all respondents are exposed to a near-identical experience with opening, closing, and questions on a script); qualitative: broader questions with little of no specification of variables)

Structured, semi-structured, unstructured

4. Developing questions: closed or open form questions. Use a guide.
5. Selecting and preparing interviewers: all should practice with each other and should conduct practice interviews to receive feedback.
6. Pilot-testing: test to determine if any terms in the questions are ambiguous; test the opening to determine which best welcomes and prepares the interviewee; evaluate methods/accuracy of recording data.

DURING THE INTERVIEW

7. Conducting the interviews: interviewer should know how to present him/herself to connect to respondents (establish rapport; gain trust); note taking/recording?
8. Analyze the data: themes, frequency of responses, differences between respondent type (leadership role, length of time in the district, type of district, history of participation in IP work via OSPI, etc) and responses.

For an online survey/questionnaire, we suggest a similar sample along with a persuasive cover letter.

.....

Burke and Miller. (2001). *Phone Interviewing as a Means of Data Collection: Lessons Learned and Practical Recommendations*. Forum Qualitative Social Research, Volume 2, No. 2.

<https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/959/2094>

Gall, Gall, and Borg, (2003). *Educational Research*: pgs. 237-251

Appendix B: WASA/AWSP IP Project 2025 Interview Questions

Interview questions and their connection to the IPTN focus:

1. How would you describe the current vision for inclusive education in your district? How is this vision communicated with stakeholders? **3, 4, 5**
2. What specific leadership practices have you found most effective in advancing inclusive education in your district? **3**
3. How does the district/building leadership collaboratively engage in reflection about inclusion both within the buildings and within the district community)? **3,4, 5**
4. How has the district been able to sustain a focus on inclusionary practices during changes in district or building leadership? **4**
5. How do you measure the impact of inclusive practices on both students with and without disabilities? What outcomes do you track? **1, 3**

6. How do you prepare and then continually support general education and special education teachers re: inclusionary practices? **1, 2, 3, 5**
7. Has your district used specific strategies to successfully include students with more significant disabilities? If so, which? **1, 2, 3, 5**
8. What professional learning models do you currently use to support inclusive education (coaching, co-teaching, communities of practice, etc.)? **4, 6**
9. Besides funding, what are your district's barriers to inclusive education, particularly for students with significant disabilities and black students with IEPs? **1**
10. If you could dream 'big', what do you think needs to be in place for the full implementation of inclusion for all?
11. Is there anything I didn't ask you that needs to be addressed?

Appendix C: WASA/AWSP IP Project 2025 Survey

WASA/AWSP IP Project 2025

Survey

15 items (8 with 4-point scales; 2 with dichotomous scales; 6 with short answer)

.....

This survey is a key part of our joint research effort to understand how district and school leaders across Washington are implementing inclusionary practices. By gathering your insights, we aim to identify both the strengths and challenges in creating inclusive systems that support all students. Your responses will directly inform the development of tailored technical assistance, ensuring that the support provided to districts is grounded in real needs, practical realities, and your leadership perspective.

What is inclusive education?

- One in which every student is valued and fully supported as an active and engaged participant in their school.
- All students, including students with extensive support needs, are supported to succeed in making academic progress, building friendships, and engaging in extracurricular activities along with grade-level peers.

Name

District

Position

Years in your current role

Previous participation in WASA/AWSP Inclusionary Practices Projects

1. Your district has a vision for inclusive education for students with disabilities.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Unknown

2. District stakeholders have been included in your district's vision for inclusive education.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Unknown

3. Your district/building leaders collaboratively advance inclusive education across the system.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Unknown

4. District/building leaders collaboratively engage with stakeholders in reflecting about inclusion.

- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Seldom
- Never
- Does not apply

5. Describe the specific leadership practices you have found most successful in strengthening use of inclusionary practices in your district:

SHORT ANSWER (3-4 sentences)

6. Your district has sustained its focus on inclusionary practices during changes in district or building leadership.

- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Seldom
- Never
- Does not apply

7. How does your district measure the impact of inclusive practices both on students with and without disabilities?

SHORT ANSWER (3-4 sentences)

8. In your district students with significant disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.

- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Seldom
- Never
- Does not apply

9. In your district Black students with disabilities are participating in general education at the same frequency as other students with disabilities.

- Most of the time
- Some of the time

- Seldom
- Never
- Does not apply

10. The district adequately prepares general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Unknown

11. The district continually supports general education and special education teachers in their use of inclusionary practices.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Unknown

12. Your district has used specific strategies to successfully include students with more significant disabilities.

- Yes
- No

If so, which strategies have been used:

SHORT ANSWER (3-4 sentences)

13. Your district uses a professional learning model to support inclusive education (coaching, co-teaching, communities of practice, etc.).

- Yes

- No

If so, what model been used:

SHORT ANSWER (3-4 sentences)

14. Besides funding and time, what are your district's barriers to inclusive education, particularly for Black students with disabilities and students with significant disabilities?

SHORT ANSWER (3-4 sentences)

15. If you could 'dream big', what do you think needs to be in place for the full implementation of inclusion for all students?

SHORT ANSWER (3-4 sentences)

16. Is there anything not asked earlier that you'd like to address?

SHORT ANSWER (3-4 sentences)

Appendix D: Summary of Findings from Interviews and Survey

With related IPTN Driver in italics

Legend:

- *C1: Class 1 districts; C2: Class 2 districts*
- *IPP V: IP Project districts—those who participated in WASA'S IP Project 2019-2024*
- *NV: districts which did not participate in WASA's IP Project 2019-24*
- *PO: positive outlier district*

Q1: Vision/how communicated with stakeholders? 3,4,5

- Interviewees and Survey Participants: Agreement that there is a vision; it is in strategic plans, etc. Interviewees felt there was no clear system vision.
- Less agreement that there is a high level of engagement among stakeholders within and outside the district.
- PO districts had strongest agreement in existence of vision and of sharing vision with stakeholders.

Q2: Leadership practices most effective in advancing IP in your district? 3,4

- Interviewees and Survey Participants Agreement re: building and supporting collab teams, shared leadership and learning, common tools across the system

- C1 and NV: admin need to fully understand IP to have common leadership mindset
- IPP V: clear shared vision/plan
- PO: maintain system approach and implement

Q3: How do building and district leadership engage together to reflect about inclusion w/in buildings and cross-system? 3,4,5

- Interviewees felt there was a lack of system-wide reflection
- High % of survey participants responded ‘most or some of the time’
- 25% survey responded seldom or never
- NV and C2: challenged to do this by time, turnover, resistance
- IPP V and PO: want structure to make reflection intentional
- 84% of PO indicated some or most of the time

Q4: Does district sustain IP focus during leadership changes? 4,6

- Interviewees: IP work embedded in plan, hiring practices culture, leaders job description
- Survey: sustained some and most of the time most frequent for ‘all’
- 25% survey responded seldom or never
- IPP V : high percentages report seldom or did not happen for sustaining focus
- C2 and NV: realize that consistency helps but are challenged by turnovers and ‘green’ admin.

Q5: How do you measure impact of IP on students w and w/o disabilities? What outcomes are tracked? 1,3

- Most frequent (MF): LRE used but not good enough
- Second most frequent (2MF): Academic performance data
- Third most frequent (3MF): no known system metric for tracking
- 3 groups expressed dissatisfaction with current practices
- Survey participants—said outcomes are tracked some and most of the time

- 42% of C2 said 'Black students...' did not apply
- Frequent response: SWD in GenEd 'some of the time' (concerning)
- PO: we are measuring placement but not impact

Q6: How are gen ed and sped teachers prepared/supported re IP ? 1,2,3,5

- All report collab pd re: shared responsibility for students: MF PD mentioned is system-focused and PLCs
- 80% of 'all' agree they are supporting gen ed and sped in implementation
- IPP V had lower level of agreement than all
- PO mentioned used of multi-year plans
- PO had lowest level of agreement with survey re: preparing and supporting

Q7: Used specific strategies to successfully include SSD? Which strategies? 1,2,3

- 60% of survey--Agreement that strategies are in use
- 50% of PO responded their district used specific strategies
- NV: Higher use of specific strategies.
- C2 noted higher use of specific strategies more than C1
- MF: moving to inclusive/integrated models
- 2MF: creating opportunities for staff collaboration/blending
- 2 groups noted need to increase support staff

Q8: Pro-learning models used to support IP? 2,4,6

- MF: PLCs
- 2MF: coteaching or teaming
- C2 districts note challenge at secondary level
- NV districts note use of frameworks as the learning model

Q9: Besides funding, what barriers?

- MF: staff mindset/resistance
- 2MF: lack of qualified staff/poor prep
- NV noted staff shortages/turnover as their MF
- IPP Vets and PO reported practical issues (time, schedules)

Q10: Dream big...what needs to be in place for full implementation of IP for all?

- Adequate staff and resources
- Ongoing and job embedded PD in UDL and IP
- 2MF for PO—comprehensive change to state and district ed system; move beyond pd to implementation with connected pd for support

Q11: What else would you like to address?

- MF: we need resources and support for PD for all (regional partnerships, site visits, artifacts, classroom visits)
- 2MF: we need strong sustained state and district leadership
- C2 and NV: sustained commitment from the state and adequate resources