



# Inclusive Learning Communities Practice Profile

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction  
Carolyn Stanford Taylor, State Superintendent

# Inclusive Learning Communities Practice Profile

Collaboratively Developed by:

Carroll University Faculty

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Faculty

University of Wisconsin - Madison / Wisconsin Center for Educational Research Staff

State Personnel Development Project / DPI

Research to Practice: Inclusive Communities Project/DPI

Special Education Team/DPI

Title I Team/ DPI

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction  
Carolyn Stanford Taylor, State Superintendent

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Anatomy of a Practice Profile - How It Works .....	4
Practice Profiles .....	5
Professional Collaboration Among Learner Supports .....	5
Inclusive Mindsets .....	7
Learning Culture, Climate and Relationships .....	9
Planning and Facilitation .....	11
Authentic Learner Engagement .....	13
Bibliography Informing Inclusive Learning Communities Practice Profile .....	15

# Introduction

The Inclusive Learning Communities (ILC) Practice Profile describes the essential attributes of a learning environment that is inclusive of each and every learner. Outlining five core competencies, this practice profile document aims to provide both educators and leaders a framework to promote and support inclusive classrooms, schools, and programs. The core competencies include:

- Professional Collaboration Among Learner Supports
- Inclusive Mindsets
- Learning Culture, Climate and Relationships
- Planning and Facilitation
- Authentic Learner Engagement

The ILC serves as a starting point for practitioners to examine their practice and to implement change at a classroom and school level. Educators at every level may find practical use of this tool in multiple ways, including:

- Informing practice of educators. As educators build reflection into their daily practice, this tool can help identify areas of strength and needs for teachers, and also promote goal setting in a specific competency.
- Professional development of educators. As leaders work to build co-teaching teams, this tool can serve as a basis for developing a shared vision of inclusive practice among a district, school or team.
- Training and coaching of educators. As educators and coaches work with preservice teachers or new hires, this framework can build an understanding of inclusive practice and building expectations. Furthermore, this tool can cast a wide net to align colleagues, including support services, to a vision or mission (e.g. guidance, social work, paraprofessionals, psychologist, etc.).
- Building-wide audit. As buildings and districts look to quantify the degree of inclusive practices, this tool can be used to audit current practices and to inform system change.

## Glossary of Terms

**Co-Serving** is the practice in which educators collaborate, consult, co-plan, and reflect to meet needs of all learners. All educators are responsible for all learners.

**Co-Teaching** is the practice in which two licensed educators, often a special education teacher and a general education teacher, share equal responsibility for planning, delivering, evaluating instruction, and learning to meet the diverse needs of students in a shared space.

**Culturally sustaining pedagogy** means incorporating awareness in our teaching about the daily realities and identities of young people we teach.

**Definition of age ranges:** early childhood students are defined as young learners, while students aged 18-21 are defined as transitional learners.

**Educational equity** means that every learner has access to the resources and educational rigor they need at the right moment in their education, across race, gender, ethnicity, language, ability, sexual orientation, family background, and/or family income.

**Educators** are school personnel, including all teachers, building administrators, instructional coaches, paraprofessionals, librarians, and learner services personnel (e.g. social work, school psychology, guidance).

**Learner Agency** is evidenced through learners' engagement in their own learning through voice, choice, and reflection.

### Pathways:

A **learner profile** describes the way a learner learns best, including interests, strengths, and opportunities for growth. It can also include academic, social, and emotional goals. This is often co-created with a teacher.

An **individualized learning plan (ILP)**, often based on a learner's profile, creates a path for learners to follow to reach learning targets. This creates a specific plan for each learner to develop and implement academic, social, or emotional goals.

**Learner goals** are specific objectives learners are working towards meeting. These can include academic, social, behavioral, and emotional goals.

An **individualized education program (IEP)** is the yearlong collaborative plan developed by a team, including the learner and their family, along with general and special education teachers, administrators, and learner services personnel. The IEP indicates the child's annual goals and specifies the special education and related services that the child will receive.

**Proportional Representation in Special Education** means that learners from non-dominant groups are referred and identified at proportional rates to learners representing dominant groups.

**Specially Designed Instruction:** Special Education includes specially designed instruction, related services, supplementary aids and services, and program modifications and supports to meet the unique needs of a student with a disability. Other learners may also benefit from specially designed instruction that meets their unique needs.

A **stakeholder** is an individual or a group invested in learner's academic, social, and emotional life. Stakeholders can include families, teachers, school administrators, staff members, and community members. Stakeholders' ideas and input are evident in the implementation of inclusive learning communities.

# Inclusive Learning Communities Competencies At-A-Glance

1. Professional Collaboration Among Learner Supports
  - 1a. Inclusive Learner-Centered Practices Vision
  - 1b. Co-Planning and Co-Serving
  - 1c. Conflict Resolution
2. Inclusive Mindsets
  - 2a. Employing Equitable Practices
  - 2b. Activating Learner Agency and Voice
  - 2c. Capitalizing on Behaviors and Mistakes
  - 2d. Creating a Community of Learner
3. Learning Climate, Culture, and Relationships
  - 3a. Designing Physical Space and Classroom Structure
  - 3b. Promoting Social and Emotional Well-Being of All Learners
  - 3c. Facilitating Inclusive, Asset-Building Language
4. Planning and Facilitation
  - 4a. Planning Learning Experiences for All Learners
  - 4b. Co-Creating Individual Learning Plans
  - 4c. Targeted, Individualized Assessment and Feedback
5. Authentic Learner Engagement
  - 5a. Establishing Positive Educator-Learner Relationships
  - 5b. Supporting Learner Leadership Opportunities
  - 5c. Developing Learner Success Criteria
  - 5d. Promoting and Supporting Self-Awareness of Learner Disposition

# Anatomy of a Practice Profile - How It Works

## Core Competency

*The specific role of the practitioner*

## Contribution to Systems Transformation

In this section, you will see a description of why each competency is important to achieving the outcome and how it contributes to a greater likelihood that practitioners can operationalize and engage in essential functions.

*This describes the “why.”*

Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
<p>The components provide a clear description of the features that must be present to say that inclusive learning practices are in place. The components break down the competency and provide a more detailed definition.</p> <p><b><i>This describes the “what.”</i></b></p>	<p>This column includes observable behaviors that exemplify educators who are able to generalize required skills and abilities to a wide range of settings and contexts; use these skills consistently and independently; and sustain these skills over time while continuing to grow and improve in their position.</p> <p><b><i>This describes the “how.”</i></b></p>	<p>This column includes observable behaviors that exemplify educators who are able to implement required skills and abilities, but in a more limited range of contexts and settings; use these skills inconsistently or need consultation to complete or successfully apply skills; and would benefit from setting goals that target particular skills for improvement in order to move educators into the “expected/proficient” category.</p> <p><b><i>This describes the “developing how.”</i></b></p>	<p>This column includes observable behaviors that exemplify educators who are not yet able to implement required skills or abilities in any context and often can cause harm to the clients served. Often, if an educator’s work is falling into the unacceptable category, there may be challenges related to the overall implementation infrastructure. For example, there may be issues related to how regions, schools, or districts are selecting or training staff, managing the new program model, or using data to inform continuous improvement.</p> <p><b><i>This describes the “how not.”</i></b></p>

# Practice Profiles

## 1. Professional Collaboration Among Learner Supports

### Contribution to Systems Transformation

When the implementation team shares an inclusive learner-centered vision, it allows for equitable and inclusive learning environments, which promote learning and achievement.

Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
1a. Inclusive Learner-Centered Practice Vision	An articulated mission or vision, co-created with families, is evident around inclusive practices.	There is inconsistent evidence of a shared mission and vision or the mission or vision were not co-created with families.	Tension between multiple philosophies creates confusion.
	School support partnerships and structures exist and are clearly articulated in the mission document (i.e. Student Support Teams, Problem Solving Teams, Intervention Teams).	Limited evidence that school support partnerships and structures are articulated and exist as a foundation for all learners.	Educators do not work in team structures or existing school support teams and structures are siloed.
	The mission and vision documents are visible, available to all stakeholders, and express processes for meeting each and every learners' goals and needs.	The mission and vision documents are available to some but not all stakeholders and learner goals and needs are not specifically addressed.	The lack of aligned mission and vision shifts the focus away from the goals or needs of the learner.
	District policies and funding reflect and support the mission and vision of ILC.	District policy and funding reflect attempts to support the mission and vision of ILC.	Policy and funding perpetuate segregation.
	Families are represented and have a voice on district and school committees.	There is limited or inconsistent representation of families on district and school committees.	Family representation is not sought out for district and school committees, or is not representative of the learner population.



Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
1b. Co-Planning and Co-Serving	All educators are responsible for all learners.	Not all educators consistently demonstrate responsibility for all learners.	Distinct divisions of labor exist as evidenced by the “your kids/my kids” perspective.
	Educators develop the structures (e.g., schedules, time allowed for planning) that allow collaboration with all school support.	There are limited structures (e.g., schedules, time allowed for planning) that allow collaboration with school supports.	Structures discourage or prevent collaboration with school supports.
	Educator teams intentionally foster cooperation and collaboration between school support services staff, families, and community around learner pathways.	There is lack of evidence that educators intentionally act as team members to foster cooperation and collaboration between school support services staff, families, and community.	Educators work independently around learner needs.
	Educators develop a quantitative and qualitative data-sharing system to plan, monitor, adjust, and evaluate the impact of teaching and learning strategies, including interventions.	Educators inconsistently use data for decision-making purposes to plan, monitor, adjust, and evaluate the impact of teaching and learning strategies, including interventions.	Data systems are used to perpetuate the segregation or marginalization of learners.
	Educators routinely leverage learners’ strengths and support their needs when planning and implementing learner pathways.	Educators intermittently leverage learners’ strengths and support their needs when planning and implementing learner pathways.	Learners’ strengths and needs, including implementation of IEP and 504 plans, are not considered in planning.
1c. Conflict Resolution	Educators view conflict as an opportunity to create solutions, a way to build relationships, and a way to develop agency in staff, learners, families, and community.	Educators use staff-directed strategies to resolve conflict and repair relationships.	Educators insist on learners following unilateral rules during conflict situations. Educators avoid conflict or resolve conflict unproductively (e.g., without engaging learners or other stakeholders in conflict resolution).
	Districts make sure that families know that there is a conflict resolution process.	Districts involve families inconsistently in the conflict resolution process.	Districts use the conflict resolution process inequitably.
	Educators are aware of power differential and consider whose voices are heard and whose are not (e.g., reflect on who is benefiting and who is not, maintain confidentiality).	Educators lack confidence and the repertoire to meet the needs of learners during conflict situations, especially as it pertains to power differentials.	During conflict, unilateral power differentials are reinforced and perpetuated.

## 2. Inclusive Mindsets

### Contribution to Systems Transformation

In an inclusive, learner-centered environment, educators believe that all learners can and will succeed and provide opportunities to find the expert learner in every child. By focusing on self-awareness and community-building, the team is able to highlight individual strengths of the learner and the community so that each member is essential to the success of the whole.

Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
2a. Employing Equitable Practices	Learning materials and experiences represent the familial, cultural, and linguistic background of each and every learner.	Learning materials and experiences inconsistently or superficially represent the familial, cultural, and linguistic background of each and every learner.	Learning materials and experiences perpetuate the dominant culture.
	Educators and learners co-create Individualized Learning Plans (ILPs) with ambitious and achievable goals that represent each learner's academic, social, emotional, and physical strengths, interests, and needs.	Educators use a template to develop uniform ILPs that simplify each learner's strengths, interests, and needs.	Educators are unaware of or disregard the individual learning needs of learners.
	All interactions between learners and stakeholders demonstrate that each and every learner is valuable, unique, and able to succeed.	Interactions between learners and stakeholders inconsistently demonstrate that learners are valuable, unique, and able to succeed.	Learner-to-learner and educator-to-learner relationships are friendly, but patronizing or even antagonizing.
	Family partnerships are embedded in system policies and procedures to ensure an environment where every family's culture is welcomed, honored, and integrated into the learning community.	Family input is collected but does not always affect system policies and procedures.	Families are not valued or included as partners; system policies and procedures are created without their input.
	Educators analyze comprehensive data to ensure proportional representation of each and every learner across environments.	Educators use limited data points when determining proportional representation in learning environments.	Educators use data to develop classroom compositions that benefit the educators or administration.
2b. Activating Learner Agency and Voice	Educators ensure learners have a true and authentic voice in their learning as they plan goals, access instruction, and determine means of assessment.	Learner voice and input is invited, but not ensured, often with the educator's agenda and comfort level at the forefront.	Learner voice is absent or superficial and accepted on a conditional basis (performance and/or behavior).
	Learners frequently give meaningful input on classroom products and processes. Educators and learners discuss how choices affect learning.	Learner choices that are less productive result in educator take-back of control.	Educators create assignment expectations without input from learners. Compliance or performance is often mistaken for engagement.
	With guidance and practice, learners co-create a timeline, purpose for, and evidence of learning.	Learners have some flexibility in making daily choices on content, products, or processes within educator established parameters.	Learners do not have choice in content, products, or processes. They are expected to be compliant with educator and system demands.

Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
2c. Capitalizing on Behaviors and Mistakes	Educators understand and respond to behavior as a form of communication.	Educators help learners work through mistakes or problems as opportunities for growth, but continue to think about consequences to deter them from happening again.	Educators see and react to behaviors as scary, detrimental to learning and the learning of others, and needing of punishments.
	Educators and learners understand mistakes as a process for continued growth.	Educators usually facilitate learner understanding of and reflection on behaviors as an opportunity for continued growth and self-awareness.	Educators focus on punishment rather than the problem. They blame and label learners for misbehavior.
	Learners reflect on mistakes to build self-awareness and pursue growth.	Learners rely on adults to collaboratively process their mistakes as growth opportunities.	Learners rely on external feedback.
	Educators apply their knowledge of culturally sustaining pedagogy to consider behavioral, social, and emotional experiences through multiple lenses.	Educators apply a developing knowledge of culturally sustaining pedagogy to consider behavioral, social, and emotional experiences.	Educators perpetuate social and cultural inequities when addressing behavioral, social, and emotional experiences.
2d. Creating a Community of Learners	Community-building experiences are ongoing and intentionally designed to foster learner agency, advocacy, and a sense of belonging.	At the beginning of the school year or semester, some time is set aside for community-building.	No sense of community exists in the classroom.
	Educators facilitate community building through learning experiences, conversations, mutual mentorship opportunities, and problem solving strategies.	Demands of pacing and curriculum take the place of depth and longevity in establishing a community of learners.	The curriculum positions learners as individuals in competition with one another, and in a hierarchical relationship based on performance, behavior, or perspective of the educator.
	Stakeholders engage each member as essential to the success of the whole, as evidenced by respectful communication and rapport.	Educators direct the engagement of stakeholders to build the learning community.	Stakeholders are not engaged in the learning community.

### 3. Learning Climate, Culture, and Relationships

#### Contribution to Systems Transformation

When an environment is intentionally designed and facilitated to support a learner’s social and emotional health and promotes positive language and authentic relationships, together it develops a sense of trust, safety, and belonging. A strong culture and a climate of collaboration create high expectations for the learning of all students.

Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
3a. Designing Physical Space and Classroom Structure	Educators intentionally design the physical learning spaces (e.g., equipment, materials, space, and arrangement) based on an understanding of learner variability. The environment provides accessibility and flexibility for academic, physical, social, and emotional learning.	Educators design a classroom structure to promote and prepare for learning activities, while keeping classroom management strategies in mind.	Physical design or learning space reflects educator as the learning and management authority, is static, prohibits or limits access to learning or reinforces dominant culture or learner ability level. Learners are placed disproportionately in learning environments based on ability, race, gender, social class, etc.
3b. Promoting Social and Emotional Well-Being of All Learners	Educators facilitate and model empathy, understanding, and flexible thinking to foster an environment that supports trust, safety, empowerment, choice, collaboration, and belonging.	Educators strive to make learner connection, but under challenging circumstances, such as learner behavior or poor performance, the relationship becomes strained.	Social emotional needs are ignored or mistaken for disengagement, low performance, or non-compliance. Social emotional needs are seen as detrimental to growth and prohibitive of community. Learners are patronized or shamed.
	Learners use empathy, understanding, and conflict resolution when engaging in peer-to-peer relationships.	Learners inconsistently use empathy, understanding, and conflict resolution when engaging in peer-to-peer relationships.	Learners do not exhibit empathy, understanding or conflict resolution when engaging with peers but rather are competitive or self-centered.
	Educators use a variety of resources (e.g., visual supports, creative programs, family resources) to respond to and support learners’ emotional needs and development.	Educators use a limited range of resources to respond to and support learners’ emotional needs and development.	Educators do not use resources or use resources that negatively affect learners’ emotional and developmental needs.
	Educators consistently communicate clear expectations as a strategy for promoting positive social engagement with and among learners and families.	Educators sometimes communicate expectations as a strategy for promoting positive social engagement with and among learners and families while keeping classroom management strategies in mind.	Expectations are not communicated, or the expectations are rule bound, punitive, inflexible, or applied differently to different learners.

Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
3c. Facilitating Inclusive, Asset-Building Language	Educators' and learners' communication is purposeful, considerate, asset-based, and person-first.	Educators and learners sometimes use asset-based and person-first language.	Educator or learner language is used to assert power and authority.
	Educators and learners recognize and respond to communication that is verbal and nonverbal, whether positive or negative.	Educators inconsistently respond to verbal or nonverbal communication and only affirm positive communication.	Educators' or other learners' language denigrates, controls, and manipulates others. Sarcasm is used as a tool for communicating.
	Educators and learners communicate through various modes (e.g., verbal, written, graphic) to extend thinking and focus on understanding.	Various communication modes are present but are inconsistently or superficially used to extend thinking or focus on understanding.	Educators focus on arriving at the right answer and do not value communicating the thinking process.
	Educators, learners, and families intentionally and consistently use a variety of culturally and linguistically responsive communications.	Educators inconsistently use culturally and linguistically responsive communication methods.	Only dominant communication styles are valued or recognized.

## 4. Planning and Facilitation

### Contribution to Systems Transformation

When educators facilitate inclusive learner-centered environments, learner efficacy, engagement, and self-regulation increase, contributing to mastery of content standards. Collaborative planning between educators and learners to develop Individualized Learner Plans (ILP) promotes self-directed learning, ownership, and agency for meeting learning targets.

Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
4a. Planning Learning Experiences for All Learners	<p>Educators intentionally use a wide range of strategies to plan learner-centered experiences. Learner-centered experiences are characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>thoughtful use of strategies including learner groupings, choice of modalities, and instructional tools, and use of technology;</li> <li>variation in timing and pacing of learning content;</li> <li>co-creation by educator and learners while maintaining academic rigor; and</li> <li>a focus on learners' lived experiences and cultural histories.</li> </ul>	<p>Educators intentionally use strategies to plan learner-centered experiences. Learner-centered experiences are characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a limited variation in strategies;</li> <li>the expectation of learners to move through curriculum at largely the same pace and time frames;</li> <li>a focus on academic rigor at the expense of self-directed learning, ownership, and agency; and</li> <li>social, cultural, or lived experiences are represented in limited ways.</li> </ul>	<p>Instruction is educator driven and does not reflect the individual needs of learners. Learning experiences are characterized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a lack of variation in strategies;</li> <li>the educator's expectations that all learners move through curriculum at the same pace or with rigid time parameters;</li> <li>a focus on developing curriculum that maintains the historical power structure; and</li> <li>curriculum that does not represent learners' social, cultural, or lived experiences.</li> </ul>
4b. Co-Creating Individual Learning Plans	Each and every learner collaborates with educators and other appropriate stakeholders to create an Individual Learning Plan (ILP). ILP-focused growth areas are aligned to IEP goals.	Elearners have learning profiles and are working to develop goals in response. ILP-focused growth areas may lack alignment with IEP goals.	Individual Learning Plans (ILP) are absent or not truly individualized. Individual Education Plans (IEP) are disconnected and unrelated to ILPs.
	Educators and learners use the learner's interests, strengths, and talents as a starting point when creating goals to help learners understand, develop, and communicate their choices and interests.	There is limited evidence that learners' interests and strengths are included in instructional and individual plans.	Learner interests, strengths, and talents are not considered or included in any plans.
	Educators embed a continuum of supports into each learner's experience.	Educators use a limited range of embedded supports.	Supports are very limited, stigmatizing, and negatively affect learner connection to other peers and learning opportunities.
	Learners and families are equal partners in the IEP process.	Learners and families are involved in the IEP process.	Learners and families are not aware of IEP goals. Barriers to participation in the IEP process are not addressed.

Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
4c. Targeted, Individualized Assessment and Feedback	Educators provide multiple opportunities to practice skills and develop learner traits so that learners are able to decide what mode works best for them.	Educators provide a small range of options for practicing skills and developing learner traits.	Educators dictate the mode that learners will use.
	Educators use assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reflect multiple avenues for learners to demonstrate learning;</li> <li>• are personalized;</li> <li>• include diagnostic items intended to adjust the level and type of scaffolding needed;</li> <li>• are integrated into the learning to demonstrate understanding and growth;</li> <li>• always include feedback, whether formative, benchmark or summative; and</li> <li>• include learner reflection and goal setting (e.g. often co-created by learners).</li> </ul>	Educators use limited assessment avenues for learners to demonstrate learning. Assessment choices are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• created by educators;</li> <li>• lacking personalization;</li> <li>• not developed with intent to inform level and type of scaffolding;</li> <li>• not always integrated, as learning sometimes stops in order to assess;</li> <li>• not always accompanied by feedback; and</li> <li>• open to limited opportunities for learner reflection or goal setting.</li> </ul>	Educators use assessments in a way that breeds competition (e.g., via comparison). Assessment choices are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• solely created and evaluated by educators;</li> <li>• ritualistic or limited to standardized assessment measures;</li> <li>• completely separated from learning;</li> <li>• summative without feedback to the learner; and</li> <li>• not connected to learner reflection or goal setting.</li> </ul>
	Educators provide families with assessment information about their children (e.g., include interpretation of results, answers to their questions, suggestions for home support, etc.)	Educators provide families with limited assessment information.	Feedback is limited to required formal measures, such as report cards and IEP updates, or generic communication to families.
	Learners receive ongoing, consistent, supportive, sensitive, and meaningful feedback from educators and peers based on both skill development and learner traits.	Learners receive consistent, targeted feedback solely from educators through periodic discussions based on skills development articulated in ILPs and IEPs.	Learners do not receive meaningful feedback from educators or peers.

## 5. Authentic Learner Engagement

### Contribution to Systems Transformation

When educators consistently ensure authentic learner engagement, learner development and outcomes improve.

Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
5a. Establishing Positive Educator-Learner Relationships	Educators and each and every learner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• celebrate engagement and learning,</li> <li>• ask deep questions,</li> <li>• engage each other in conversations about learning, and</li> <li>• reflect on and process instructional conversations.</li> </ul>	Educators show some—but limited—intentional interest to engage learners in deep conversations (e.g., about their successes, instructional conversations).	Educators promote compliance through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rewards or praise,</li> <li>• punishment and threats, and</li> <li>• teacher directed, one-way instructions.</li> </ul>
	Educators engage each and every learner’s family: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in deep conversations about how and what learners are learning,</li> <li>• by sharing strategies for growth, and</li> <li>• in discussing what is presently being done in the classroom and other learning environments.</li> </ul>	Educators are communicating with families without intentionally engaging them in deep conversations about their children’s growth and instructional strategies implemented in the classroom and other learner environments.	Educators’ relationships with families and learners are conditional, based on behavior and performance.
5b. Supporting Learner Leadership Opportunities	Leadership roles in decision-making groups at the school and in community settings are equitably representative of all learners and their families.	Opportunities are available to all learners to participate in class-wide, school-wide, or community-based leadership groups.	Leadership roles are held solely by members of the dominant group.



Component	Expected Use in Practice	Developmental Use in Practice	Unacceptable Use in Practice
5c. Developing Learner Success Criteria	Educators partner with families, peers, and advocates to facilitate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• learner self-awareness of academic and social emotional strengths,</li> <li>• areas of growth, and</li> <li>• strategies and resources needed to be successful learners.</li> </ul>	Educators inconsistently facilitate opportunities for learners to reflect on their academic and social- emotional strengths, areas of growth, strategies and resources.	Educator blames learner for lack of awareness about their strengths and weaknesses.
	Learners are able to self-monitor and identify strengths and areas targeted for further growth and development, and share those with educators and families	Formal and informal communication from educators to families encourages learners to self-monitor and identify strengths and areas targeted for further growth and development.	Feedback on learner disposition and engagement is only given through required formal measures, such as report cards, IEPs, or communication home.
5d. Promoting and Supporting Self-Awareness of Learner Disposition	Educators guide individual learners or the class in developing success criteria for a given task or learning activity.	Educators sometimes develop universal success criteria for a given task or learning activity for all learners.	Success criteria is built solely by the educator and is focused around learners earning a specific grade or score.
	Educators support learners to find and use appropriate learning and communication tools to meet goals.	Educators provide limited options to learners for learning and communication tools.	Educators prescribe how achievement of goals will be communicated.
	Learners collaborate with others (e.g., peers, family members, advocates) based on needs and interests.	Opportunities for learners to collaborate with family members, peers, and community advocates based on needs and interests are limited.	Learners and families are unclear of learning targets, goals, or expected outcomes.

# Bibliography Informing Inclusive Learning Communities Practice Profile

## Collaborative Consultation

- DeVore, Simone, Giuliana Miolo, and Joan Hader. 2011. "Individualizing Inclusion for Preschool Children Using Collaborative Consultation." *Young Exceptional Children* 14 (4): 31-43.
- Dinnebeil, Laurie, Kristie Pretti-Frontczak, and William McInerney. 2009. "A Consultative Itinerant Approach to Service Delivery: Considerations for the Early Childhood Community." *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* (40): 435-445.
- Dinnebeil, Laurie, William McInerney, and Lynette Hale. 2004. "Itinerant ECSE Teachers in Action." *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation* 15 (2): 167-175.
- Jasmine, Emmanuelle; Gauthier, Anne; Julien, Marjorie, and Hui, Caroline. 2018. "Occupational Therapy in Preschools: A Synthesis of Current Knowledge." *Early Childhood Education Journal* 46:73-82. DOI 10.1007/s10643-017-0840-3
- Friend, Marilyn. 2004. Review of Videos: "Collaborative Planning: Transforming Theory into Practice" and "Collaborative Teaching: The Co-Teaching Model," featuring Richard Villa, Port Chester, NY, National Professional Resources 2002. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation* 15 (1): 117-121.
- Kelley, Michael F. 2004. "Reconciling the Philosophy and Promise of Itinerant Consultation With the Realities of Practice." *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation* 15 (2): 183-190.
- Metz, A., Naom, S.F., Halle, T., & Bartley, L. (2015). An integrated stage-based framework for implementation of early childhood programs and systems (OPRE Research Brief OPRE 201548). Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Meyers, Joel. 2002. "A 30 Year Perspective On Best Practices for Consultation Training." *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation* 13 (1&2): 35-54.
- Miolo, Giuliana & DeVore, Simone. 2016. "Speech Language Pathology and Education Students Engage in Interprofessional Collaborative Practice to Support Children with Special Needs in Preschool Settings." *Journal of Interprofessional Education & Practice* (4): 81-87.
- Richardson-Gibbs, Anne Marie. 2004. "Itinerant Consultation in Early Childhood Special Education: Personal Reflections From a Practitioner." *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation* 15 (2): 177-181.
- Sweet, Mark. 2008. "A Thinking Guide to Inclusive Childcare (for those who care about young children with and without disabilities)." Disability Rights Wisconsin.
- Virginia Department of Education. Revised February 2007. Planning Guide: "Inclusive Placement Opportunities for Preschoolers: A Systems Approach to Preschool Inclusive Practices."
- Wesley, Patricia W., and Virginia Buysse. 2004. "Consultation as a Framework for Productive Collaboration in Early Intervention." *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation* 15 (2): 127-150.
- Wesley, Patricia W., and Virginia Buysse. 2006. "Ethics and Evidence in Consultation." *PRO-ED Topics in Early Childhood Special Education* 26 (3): 131-141.

## Inclusive Learner Centered Environments

- Bui, Yvonne N., Jean B. Schumaker, and Donald D. Deshler. 2006. "The Effects of a Strategic Writing Program for Students with and without Learning Disabilities in Inclusive Fifth-Grade Classes." *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* 21 (4): 244-260.
- Jordan, Anne, and Paula Stanovich. 2001. "Patterns of Teacher-Student Interaction in Inclusive Elementary Classrooms and Correlates with Student Self-Concept." *International Journal Of Disability, Development and Education* 48 (1): 33-52.
- Chicago Public Schools. 2013. "2013 CPS Framework for Teaching with Critical Attributes." [http://www.ctunet.com/rights-at-work/text/2013-CPS-Framework-for-Teaching-w-Critical-Attributes\\_20130930.pdf](http://www.ctunet.com/rights-at-work/text/2013-CPS-Framework-for-Teaching-w-Critical-Attributes_20130930.pdf) (accessed March 1, 2017).
- Gorski, Paul C., and Seema G. Pothini. 2014. *Case Studies on Diversity and Social Justice Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Lawrence-Brown, Diana, and Mara Sepon-Shevin. 2013. *Condition Critical: Key Principles for Equitable and Inclusive Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kozleski, Elizabeth B., and Kathleen King Thorius, Eds. 2014. *Ability, Equity and Culture: Sustaining Inclusive Urban Education Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Iowa CORE. 2010. "Characteristics of Effective Instruction. Student-Centered Classrooms." [http://www.iglls.org/files/classroom\\_brief.pdf](http://www.iglls.org/files/classroom_brief.pdf) (accessed March 1, 2017).
- Clifford, Amos. (Developed for San Francisco Unified School District). 2013. "Teaching Restorative Practices with Classroom Circles." <http://www.centerforrestorativeprocess.com/restorative-practices.html> (accessed February 27, 2017).
- Jobs for the Future and the Council of Chief State School Officers. 2015. "Educator Competencies for Personalized, Learner-Centered Teaching." <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/Educator-Competencies-081015-FINAL.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2017).
- Danielson, M., White, K., and Kramer, K. 2014. "From Conflict to Complement: Embedding Standards Reform in Constructivist Learning." Paper presented at the 2014 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, from the AERA Online Paper Repository. <http://www.aera.net/Publications/Online-Paper-Repository/AERA-Online-Paper-Repository> (accessed February 15, 2017).
- Fahraeus, Anna W. E. 2013. "Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice." *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 13 (4): 1-6.
- Henson, Kenneth T. 2003. "Foundations for Learner-Centered Education: A Knowledge Base." *Education* 124 (1): 5-16. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost.
- Rose, Todd. 2016. *The End of Average: How We Succeed in a World That Values Sameness*. New York: HarperOne.
- Banerjee, Neena, Elizabeth Stearns, Stephanie Moller, and Roslyn Arlin Mickelson. 2017. "Teacher Job Satisfaction and Student Achievement: The Roles of Teacher Professional Community and Teacher Collaboration in Schools." *American Journal of Education* 123 (2): 203-241.
- Frattura, Elise M., and Colleen A. Capper. 2007. *Leading for Social Justice: Transforming Schools for All Learners*. 1st ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.Press.
- Hayes, Cleveland, and Brenda Juárez. 2012. "There Is No Culturally Responsive Teaching Spoken Here: A Critical Race Perspective." *Democracy and Education* 20 (1), Article 1: 1-14.
- Software & Information Industry Association. 2010. "Innovate to Educate: System [Re]Design for Personalized Learning; A Report from the 2010 Symposium. In collaboration with ASCD and the Council of Chief State School Officers. Washington, DC. Author: Mary Ann Wolf.

This report is available from:  
Special Education Team  
Debra Ahrens or Rachel Fregien  
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction  
125 South Webster Street  
Madison, WI 53703  
(608) 266-1781  
<https://dpi.wi.gov/sped>

January 2021

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, creed, age, national origin, ancestry, pregnancy, marital status or parental status, sexual orientation, or ability and provides equal access to the Boy Scouts of America and other designated youth groups