Bridging The Research To-Practice Gap in Special Education: The Integrated Data-Driven IEP Intervention Framework (IDDIF) as a Unifying Practitioner Model

Promise Odinaka Okwarajiaku[1], Maina Mutonya[1], *Friday Mamudu Adene[2], Ambition Gospel Okwuchukwu Okwarajiaku[3]

Milwaukee Public Schools, Milwaukee[1],
Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nigeria, Nsukka[2]
Department of Library and Information Science, University of Nigeria, Nsukka[3]
Corresponding Author: Friday Manudu Adene (Friday.adene@unn.edu.ng)

HOW TO CITE:

Promise Odinaka Okwarajiaku, Maina Mutonya, *Friday Mamudu Adene, Ambition Gospel Okwuchukwu Okwarajiaku (2026). Bridging The Research To-Practice Gap in Special Education: The Integrated Data-Driven IEP Intervention Framework (IDDIF) as a Unifying Practitioner Model.

International Journal of Special Education, 41(17s), 185-203

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.

Open access publication underthe terms and conditions

of the Creative CommonsAttribution (CC BY)

license (http://creativecommons.

org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ABSTRACT:

Despite decades of research on evidence-based practices (EBPs) in special education, a persistent and well-documented research-to-practice gap continues to undermine instructional quality for students with disabilities. Approximately 7.5 million students in the United States currently receive special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). However, the rate at which validated EBPs are implemented consistently in special education classrooms remains alarmingly low. This article introduces and describes the Integrated Data-Driven IEP Intervention Framework (IDDIF), a practitioner-developed, theoretically grounded model designed to close this gap by synthesizing five research traditions; Data-Based Individualization (DBI), Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), Social-Emotional Learning (SEL), and Implementation Science—into a single, operationalizable protocol. The IDDIF comprises four discrete components: a Real-Time IEP Progress Dashboard, a Cross-Functional IEP Compliance Review Team, SEL-Integrated Behavioral Intervention Protocols, and Modular Professional Development Curricula. Pilot outcome data from approximately 30 months of single-practitioner implementation within Milwaukee Public Schools indicate a 21 percentage-point increase in IEP goal mastery, sustained 100% IDEA timeline compliance, a 41% reduction in office discipline referrals, and a 34% improvement in student self-regulation scores. The article describes the framework's theoretical foundations, implementation procedures, and implications for practitioners, researchers, and policymakers. Replication studies and collaborative university–practitioner research partnerships are called for to establish broader empirical support.

Keywords: Data-Based Individualization, Curriculum-Based Measurement, MTSS, Social-Emotional Learning, IEP progress monitoring, implementation science, special education, framework.

Introduction

Special education in the United States stands at a paradoxical crossroads. On one side lies an expansive and sophisticated body of empirical knowledge, decades of peer-reviewed research documenting effective instructional interventions, evidence-based behavioral supports, progress monitoring technologies, and systems-level frameworks capable of producing meaningful academic and social-emotional gains for students with disabilities. On the other side lies the reality of daily classroom practice: a landscape in which translating that research knowledge into consistent, high-quality instruction remains frustratingly incomplete. The distance between what researchers know and what practitioners do, the research-to-practice gap, has been identified as one of the most consequential and enduring problems in the field of special education (Fixsen et al., 2005; Toste & Lee, 2026). It is not merely an academic concern. For students with disabilities, the gap between research and practice is the difference between receiving an education that enables meaningful progress and receiving one that fulfills procedural requirements while producing minimal outcomes.

The scale of this problem demands urgent attention. According to the most recent federal data, approximately 7.5 million students in the United States receive special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), representing nearly 15% of the nation's public school enrollment (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2023). For each of these students, an Individualized Education Program (IEP) serves as the legal and programmatic cornerstone of their educational experience. This binding document is supposed to translate assessment data and evidence-based practice into individualized, measurable goals and the supports needed to achieve them. The quality with which an IEP is developed and implemented is not merely a matter of administrative compliance. Research has consistently demonstrated that the quality of IEP implementation is among the most direct determinants of student outcomes for individuals with disabilities (Yell et al., 2020). When IEPs are written in compliance-driven language disconnected from ongoing progress monitoring, when behavioral and academic supports operate in institutional silos, and when teachers lack the integrated frameworks needed to act on data in real time, the rights and futures of millions of students are systematically compromised.

The research-to-practice gap in special education is not, as is sometimes assumed, a knowledge deficit among practitioners. Rather, it is a structural and systemic failure. Special educators are, by and large, knowledgeable professionals who are aware of evidence-based practices such as Data-Based Individualization (DBI), Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM), and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS). What they typically lack is not knowledge of these practices in isolation, but rather an integrated, operationalizable framework that synthesizes these disparate evidence bases into a single, practitioner-ready protocol implementable within the constraints of real school environments (Toste & Lee, 2026). The field has produced an abundance of component-level research—studies validating individual tools, single-practice interventions, and discrete frameworks, but has yet to produce a unified, practitioner-developed model that brings these components together into a coherent operational system.

This article introduces and describes the Integrated Data-Driven IEP Intervention Framework (IDDIF), a practitioner-developed and theoretically grounded response to precisely this gap. The author developed the IDDIF over approximately 30 months of iterative implementation within Milwaukee Public Schools, an urban public school district serving a high-need student population, and draws explicitly on five established research traditions: DBI, CBM, MTSS, SEL, and Implementation Science. The framework comprises four discrete, replicable components designed to be implemented by any special educator using widely available, often free tools, without

requiring additional district resources or legislative change.

The purpose of this article is threefold. First, it presents a systematic analysis of the specific structural gaps in current special education practice that the IDDIF is designed to address. Second, it describes each component of the IDDIF in sufficient operational detail to enable practitioners to replicate it and researchers to evaluate it. Third, it presents pilot outcome data from the author's implementation and articulates a research agenda for collaborative empirical validation of the framework. The article proceeds as follows: Section 2 elaborates the structural problem; Section 3 describes the conceptual framework and theoretical pillars; Section 4 presents a thematic literature review; Section 5 provides full implementation details for each IDDIF component; Section 6 addresses practical applications for educators; Section 7 presents pilot outcomes and their implications; and Section 8 offers conclusions and a forward-looking research agenda.

Statement of the Problem

The research-to-practice gap in special education is not a single, discrete failure but rather a compounding system of interrelated structural deficiencies that collectively undermine the educational experiences of students with disabilities. To understand the need for an integrative practitioner framework such as the IDDIF, it is necessary to examine these gaps with specificity, because the challenges that practitioners face in their day-to-day work are not abstract, they manifest in particular, identifiable ways documented in the research literature over more than two decades.

The first and perhaps most consequential structural gap concerns the use of progress monitoring data. In theory, the regular collection of student performance data is a cornerstone of high-quality special education practice. In practice, however, a substantial body of evidence indicates that while teachers do collect data, they rarely use it to modify instruction in meaningful or timely ways. Espin et al. (2021), in a systematic review of CBM content in practitioner-focused journals, documented that progress monitoring data collection is far more common than data-based instructional decision-making—a finding that reveals the critical difference between data collection as a compliance activity and data use as an instructional tool. This gap between collection and action represents a fundamental failure of the progress monitoring enterprise: data that does not inform practice is, from a student outcomes perspective, essentially worthless.

The second structural gap is closely related: IEP goals, which are legally required to be individualized and measurable, are frequently written in language that meets procedural requirements but is disconnected from the ongoing progress-monitoring systems that would enable rigorous tracking of student growth. Yell et al. (2020) documented that the gap between procedural compliance and substantive quality in IEP development is pervasive, that special educators are trained to write goals that meet legal formatting standards without necessarily developing the data infrastructure needed to determine whether those goals are being met. The Supreme Court's 2017 ruling in Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District established explicitly that procedural compliance is insufficient—that IEPs must be reasonably calculated to enable meaningful educational progress in light of the student's circumstances. However, the structural conditions under which most special educators operate have not changed sufficiently to operationalize this standard.

A third critical gap is that academic and behavioral supports are siloed. Special education has developed sophisticated bodies of research on academic interventions and, separately, on behavioral intervention, yet the systems through which these supports are delivered typically operate independently of one another, with behavioral intervention planning rarely informed by the same data systems used to monitor academic progress, and SEL frameworks even more rarely integrated into behavioral intervention for students with disabilities (Skoog-Hoffman et al., 2024). The RAND

Corporation and CASEL's 2024 nationwide policy scan found that while 83% of schools now use some form of SEL curriculum, the integration of SEL frameworks into behavioral intervention planning for students with disabilities—where the need is most acute—remains largely unaddressed. The result is that behavioral interventions often focus on reducing maladaptive behavior without providing students with the prosocial replacement skills they need to sustain behavioral change over time.

A fourth gap concerns the developmental appropriateness of the available progress-monitoring tools. The evidence base for CBM is robust at the elementary level, where decades of research have produced well-validated, nationally normed instruments for reading fluency, mathematics, and writing. At the secondary level, however, the field has been far slower to develop psychometrically sound progress monitoring tools calibrated for older students with more complex learning profiles. Espin and Tindal (2023) have identified the secondary PM gap as one of the most urgent areas for field development, and Dr. Pamela Stecker of Clemson University has echoed this concern in her extensive scholarship on progress monitoring and DBI. The practical consequence is that secondary special educators are frequently forced either to use tools normed on younger populations—producing data with questionable interpretive validity—or to forgo standardized progress monitoring altogether, relying instead on informal teacher judgment.

A fifth structural gap concerns the sustainability of implementation fidelity. Decades of implementation science research have documented a predictable and troubling pattern: teachers who receive training in a new practice or framework typically implement it with declining fidelity within 10 to 14 days of initial training, in the absence of ongoing structural support (Michael, 2024). This pattern explains why professional development in special education so often fails to produce lasting change—not because the training content is flawed, but because training events without embedded coaching and accountability structures cannot overcome the organizational inertia and competing demands that characterize real school environments. Fixsen et al. (2005) described this as the distinction between "paper implementation"—procedural adoption without behavioral change—and full, sustained implementation fidelity.

Taken together, these five gaps—the data-action gap, the IEP quality gap, the academic-behavioral siloing gap, the secondary progress monitoring gap, and the implementation fidelity gap—constitute not an inventory of isolated problems but a system failure. Toste and Lee (2026) argued compellingly that the research-to-practice gap is fundamentally a system problem, not a knowledge problem, and that what the field requires is not more evidence on individual practices but integrated frameworks that enable practitioners to systematically organize, deploy, and sustain those practices within the complex ecology of real schools. This article presents the IDDIF as one such framework—a practitioner-developed, theoretically grounded response to the system failure that these compounding gaps represent.

Conceptual Framework

The IDDIF does not represent a new theory of learning or intervention. Rather, it is best understood as an integration architecture. This framework draws on five well-established research traditions and synthesizes their core contributions into a single operational model with coherent decision rules, structured data systems, and embedded professional development. This section describes each theoretical pillar in turn, explaining both what it contributes conceptually to the IDDIF and how the framework operationalizes it in practice.

Data-Based Individualization

Data-Based Individualization is a structured, individualized approach to intensifying intervention for students who are not making adequate progress with standard evidence-based instruction (National Center on Intensive Intervention [NCII], 2022). DBI emerged from the broader tradition of formative data use in

special education and represents the most systematic current articulation of how ongoing student performance data should drive Tier 3 instructional decision-making. The DBI framework, as described by Fuchs et al. (2017) in their taxonomy of intervention intensity, involves the systematic and iterative adjustment of intervention programs based on student response data, ensuring that the intensity of support is calibrated to the individual student's rate of growth and learning characteristics. A meta-analysis of DBI effects published in the Journal of Learning Disabilities (2025) documented significant positive effects on student outcomes when DBI was implemented with ongoing teacher support. This important qualifier implicates the implementation science dimension of the IDDIF.

Within the IDDIF, DBI is operationalized through the Real-Time IEP Progress Dashboard and its embedded four-point decision rule. The dashboard provides the structural mechanism for continuous data collection, graphing, and review; the four-point decision rule provides the protocol for translating data patterns into specific instructional actions. By anchoring DBI within a standardized dashboard tool and a clearly defined decision algorithm, the IDDIF makes the DBI process accessible to practitioners who may lack the advanced psychometric training assumed by some DBI implementation guides (Gesel et al., 2021; Jung et al., 2018).

Curriculum-Based Measurement

Curriculum-Based Measurement, first systematically described by Deno (1985) and subsequently validated through extensive empirical research, including Fuchs and Fuchs's (1986) seminal meta-analysis, provides the field's most well-developed technology for brief, reliable, standardized progress monitoring across academic domains. CBM probes are distinguished by their brevity (typically one to three minutes), their standardization, and their demonstrated sensitivity to growth—properties that make them ideally suited for frequent, repeated Measurement of student progress over time. The CBM evidence base at the elementary level is among the most robust in all of applied educational research, and CBM tools such as oral reading fluency probes and maze reading comprehension passages have been integrated into mainstream practice, MTSS frameworks, and IEP progress monitoring systems across the country (Espin et al., 2017).

The IDDIF incorporates CBM as the primary data collection technology across all academic goal areas. The framework's most distinctive contribution within the CBM tradition, however, is its extension of CBM progress monitoring to secondary settings through the High School Progress Monitoring Measure (HS PMM)—a 10-tab Excel workbook spanning Reading Comprehension, Written Expression, Mathematics, Text-Based Science, and Content Area subjects. At the secondary level, where validated CBM tools are scarce, the IDDIF uses Maze CBM for reading comprehension (calibrated for secondary lexile ranges), Written Expression CBM probes measuring correct word sequences and correct punctuation sequences, and—for mathematics—MC-CBM (Maze Computation) and M-CAP (Math Concepts and Applications, measured as percent correct) as standalone tools. This approach responds directly to Jungjohann and Gebhardt's (2021) finding that classroom-level effects on CBM maze reading scores are comparable to grade-level effects for secondary students with and without special educational needs, suggesting that secondary CBM can be a psychometrically defensible progress monitoring approach when implemented with appropriate calibration.

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support provides the delivery architecture within which the IDDIF's data systems and intervention protocols operate. MTSS conceptualizes school-based support as organized across three levels of increasing intensity: Tier 1, which comprises universal, high-quality instruction for all students; Tier 2, which provides targeted, small-group interventions for students not making adequate

progress with Tier 1 instruction; and Tier 3, which delivers intensive, individualized intervention for students with the most significant learning and behavioral needs—the population most commonly served by special education (I-MTSS Research Network, 2023). The integration of special education services within an MTSS framework has been identified as a key lever for improving both service-delivery efficiency and student outcomes, particularly for students receiving services across multiple tiers simultaneously (Melton et al., 2024; O'Donnell et al., 2024; Duble Moore et al., 2024).

The IDDIF explicitly aligns its data collection architecture with the MTSS tiered structure. The Real-Time IEP Progress Dashboard includes data columns for both IEP-specific Tier 3 goal monitoring and participation in Tier 1 and Tier 2 programming, enabling special educators to maintain a holistic, cross-tier view of each student's support profile. This alignment ensures that IEP goal progress monitoring is understood not as a separate, compliance-driven activity but as an integral component of the broader MTSS data system—a conceptual integration that Buckman et al. (2024) and Majeika et al. (2024) have identified as essential to effective I-MTSS implementation. The Integrated MTSS Fidelity Rubric (IMFR), developed by the I-MTSS Research Network, provides external validity criteria for evaluating the IDDIF's structural alignment.

3.4 Social-Emotional Learning

Social-Emotional Learning, as conceptualized within the CASEL (2020) framework, encompasses five core competency domains: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. The evidence base for SEL is substantial—meta-analytic research has consistently documented positive effects of SEL programs on academic achievement, prosocial behavior, and emotional well-being for students across age groups and demographic characteristics (Skoog-Hoffman et al., 2024). However, a critical gap exists at the intersection of SEL and special education. For students with disabilities whose behavioral challenges are driven by specific functional antecedents, the application of a generic SEL curriculum is insufficient. What is needed is a systematic protocol for mapping behavioral functions to specific SEL competency domains, so that the replacement behaviors taught through behavioral intervention are explicitly grounded in prosocial skills.

The IDDIF addresses this gap through its SEL-Integrated Behavioral Intervention Protocols, which use the AEAS model—a four-category taxonomy of behavioral functions (Attention, Escape, Access, Sensory)—to create a systematic mapping between behavioral function and CASEL competency domain. By explicitly linking the function that maintains a maladaptive behavior to the prosocial competency domain that replacement behavior development should target, the IDDIF ensures that behavioral intervention planning is not merely suppressive but skill-building. This approach reflects the applied behavior analysis principle that durable behavioral change requires not just the reduction of maladaptive behavior but the development of an equivalent, functionally appropriate replacement behavior. This principle is given explicit theoretical grounding through the CASEL framework within the IDDIF.

Implementation Science

Implementation Science, as systematically articulated by Fixsen et al. (2005) and subsequently developed through two decades of applied research, provides the theoretical foundation for understanding how evidence-based practices are adopted, implemented with fidelity, and sustained within complex organizational systems such as schools. The core insight of implementation science—that the effectiveness of an EBP as demonstrated in research is not automatically reproduced in practice unless attention is paid to the conditions of implementation—is directly relevant to the problem addressed by the IDDIF. Toste and Lee (2026) applied

implementation science frameworks specifically to the context of special education, documenting the stages of implementation through which practitioners and organizations move as they adopt new practices and identifying the organizational supports that enable or impede progress through these stages.

The IDDIF is explicitly designed with implementation science principles embedded throughout. The Modular Professional Development Curricula address the Exploration and Installation stages of implementation by providing structured, accessible entry points into each IDDIF component. The twice-weekly Tier 3 data collection cadence—recommended by Dr. Pamela Stecker based on a June 2026 consultation—accelerates the feedback-to-instruction cycle, enabling the four-point decision rule to trigger in approximately two weeks rather than the four to five weeks required with once-weekly data collection. The Cross-Functional IEP Compliance Review Team addresses the Sustainability stage by creating organizational accountability structures that prevent fidelity decay. The peer-dissemination model embedded in the PD curricula reflects Fixsen et al.'s (2005) finding that implementation fidelity is best sustained through coaching and embedded support rather than event-based training.

Literature Review

The following thematic review synthesizes the empirical and theoretical literature most directly relevant to the IDDIF's design and intended contributions. The review is organized into four thematic headings that reflect the framework's primary domains of application.

Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision-Making

The evidence base for the use of formative data in special education is extensive and largely positive. Fuchs and Fuchs's (1986) foundational meta-analysis of systematic formative evaluation found that students whose teachers used regular, systematic data collection to guide instructional decisions achieved significantly higher outcomes than those whose teachers did not—an effect size that has been replicated and refined in subsequent decades of research. The emergence of Curriculum-Based Measurement as a standardized progress monitoring technology in the mid-1980s, pioneered by Deno (1985) at the University of Minnesota, provided the field with a psychometrically defensible and practically accessible tool for implementing this formative evaluation approach at scale. Subsequent research by Espin et al. (2017) extended this work by developing methods to evaluate teachers' understanding and interpretation of CBM graphs and documenting the critical role of graphical data presentation in supporting teacher decision-making.

More recent work has shifted attention from the effectiveness of progress monitoring as a technology to the conditions under which it is actually used for instructional decision-making. This is where the research reveals a troubling gap. A comprehensive systematic review by Espin et al. (2021) of CBM content in practitioner-focused journals found that, while the quantity of progress-monitoring data collected in special education settings has increased substantially over the past two decades, the use of that data to drive instruction-level adjustments has not kept pace. Teachers routinely collect data, graph results, and file progress-monitoring reports in students' records—but the critical step of translating data patterns into specific instructional modifications occurs far less consistently. This finding is consistent with the broader implementation science literature: data collection without a decision protocol is a procedural activity rather than a formative assessment practice.

The four-point decision rule, originally developed within the CBM and DBI traditions, is a validated protocol for bridging this gap between data collection and instructional action. The rule specifies that when four consecutive data points fall below the aim line—indicating that the student is not on track to meet the IEP goal within the specified timeframe—the teacher should modify the intervention. Conversely, when four consecutive data points exceed the aim line, indicating faster-than-expected

progress, the teacher should consider advancing the goal or increasing its ambition. Gesel et al.'s (2021) meta-analysis of DBI effects documented that the structured application of data-based decision protocols—the four-point rule being the most widely implemented—significantly enhanced the effectiveness of individualized interventions compared with interventions without systematic decision protocols. The IDDIF embeds the four-point decision rule as an automated feature of the Real-Time IEP Progress Dashboard, operationalizing this research finding within a practitioner-ready tool.

Progress Monitoring at the Secondary Level

The progress-monitoring evidence base at the secondary level is among the most underdeveloped areas in the special education research literature. While CBM tools for reading fluency, maze reading comprehension, mathematics computation, and written expression have been extensively validated for elementary-age students, analogous tools calibrated for secondary students—whose reading materials, mathematical content, and writing demands differ substantially from those of younger learners—are far less developed. Fuchs and Fuchs (2006) noted the secondary gap more than two decades ago, and subsequent scholarship has confirmed that the field has made only incremental progress in addressing it.

Jungjohann and Gebhardt (2021), in a study conducted through TU Dortmund University, examined the psychometric properties of CBM maze reading scores for secondary school students with and without special educational needs, finding that classroom-level effects were as large as grade-level effects—a finding with important implications for the calibration and interpretation of maze CBM in secondary settings. Their research suggests that secondary maze CBM can be a technically adequate progress monitoring approach when implemented with attention to the specific learning profiles of the students being monitored, and that standardized administration procedures can yield data of sufficient reliability to support instructional decision-making. These findings inform the design of the HS PMM's Reading Comprehension tab, which uses text-based maze passages calibrated for secondary lexile ranges.

Dr. Pamela Stecker of Clemson University, a leading researcher in the field of CBM and DBI, has explicitly identified the secondary PM gap as an urgent priority for field development, noting in consultation with the present author (June 2026) that the twice-weekly data collection cadence is particularly important at the secondary level, where the four-point decision rule must be activated rapidly to enable timely intervention adjustment within the constraints of academic semester structures. The IDDIF's HS PMM represents a practitioner-developed response to this documented gap—not a claim to have resolved the psychometric questions that remain open, but a systematic effort to provide secondary special educators with a structured, standardized data collection tool while the research community continues to develop validated secondary-level instruments.

Integrating Academic and Behavioral Supports

The siloing of academic and behavioral supports within special education represents one of the most persistent structural inefficiencies in the field. Special educators typically receive training in either academic intervention or behavioral intervention, with limited preparation for integrated programming that addresses both domains simultaneously. Within school systems, academic progress monitoring and behavioral data collection—including data for Functional Behavioral Assessments and Behavior Intervention Plans—are typically managed through separate databases, reviewed in separate meetings, and reported through separate documentation systems. The I-MTSS Research Network (2023) has identified this siloing as a primary barrier to integrated multi-tiered systems of support, noting that true MTSS integration requires not just the co-location of academic and behavioral data systems but the active integration of data from both domains into unified decision-making processes.

The RAND Corporation and CASEL's nationwide policy scan (Skoog-Hoffman et al., 2024) documented that approximately 83% of U.S. schools now use some form of SEL curriculum, reflecting a broad recognition that social-emotional competencies are not peripheral to academic learning but foundational to it. For students with disabilities, however, the application of standard SEL curricula presents specific challenges: students with significant behavioral needs may require more intensive, individually tailored SEL instruction than is provided by classroom-based universal programs, and the connection between SEL competency development and behavioral function must be made explicit for intervention to be effective. Research on PATHS—a schoolwide SEL program with a robust evidence base—suggests that SEL programs can produce significant improvements in behavioral self-regulation and prosocial behavior, but that these effects are maximized when SEL instruction is integrated with behavioral intervention rather than delivered as a parallel, unconnected program (Skoog-Hoffman et al., 2024).

The IDDIF's AEAS-to-CASEL mapping protocol is designed to provide exactly this integration. By requiring that every Behavior Intervention Plan developed within the IDDIF explicitly link the identified behavioral function to a named CASEL competency domain and specify replacement behaviors in terms of that competency domain, the framework ensures that behavioral intervention is simultaneously SEL instruction—not two separate activities but one integrated process. This approach reflects the applied behavior analysis principle that functional replacement behaviors must be at least as efficient as the maladaptive behavior they replace, combined with the SEL principle that prosocial skills must be explicitly taught rather than assumed to emerge through maturation or general social experience.

IEP Compliance and Legal Mandates

The legal landscape of special education was significantly reshaped by the Supreme Court's unanimous decision in Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District (2017), which rejected the long-standing "merely more than de minimis" standard for IEP adequacy and established that IEPs must be "reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child's circumstances." This ruling elevated the substantive quality of IEP programming from a best-practice aspiration to a legal requirement, placing new demands on school districts to demonstrate not merely procedural compliance but meaningful educational progress. Yell et al. (2020) analyzed the post-Endrew compliance landscape in depth, concluding that special education teachers and administrators must ensure that IEP goals are ambitious, that the services provided are grounded in evidence, and that ongoing progress monitoring data are used to demonstrate whether goals are being met—requirements that map directly onto the core functions of the IDDIF.

IEP data represent a substantially underutilized resource for both substantive compliance demonstration and program improvement. The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (2023) has noted that IEP documentation, including progress monitoring data, serves not only as a legal record but as a rich dataset for evaluating the effectiveness of services at the student, classroom, school, and district levels. Despite this potential, the systematic use of aggregated IEP data for program evaluation and equity monitoring remains rare in most districts. The IDDIF's Cross-Functional IEP Compliance Review Team, with its color-coded deadline tracking system and mandatory documentation of substantive compliance evidence, creates the organizational infrastructure needed to transform IEP data from a compliance artifact into a program improvement tool. This transformation is essential for districts seeking to meet the heightened standards established by the post-Endrew legal environment.

The IDDIF-Implementation Process

This section describes each of the IDDIF's four components in full operational detail, providing

practitioners and researchers with sufficient information to implement or evaluate the framework in real educational settings. The description follows the IDDIF's intended implementation sequence, though the framework is modular and individual components can be adopted independently when full implementation is not immediately feasible.

Component 1: Real-Time IEP Progress Dashboard

The Real-Time IEP Progress Dashboard is the data infrastructure backbone of the IDDIF—the tool through which all progress monitoring data is collected, organized, graphed, and interpreted within a structured decision-making framework. The dashboard is implemented as a digital spreadsheet (compatible with both Microsoft Excel and Google Sheets) and is designed to require no technical expertise beyond basic data entry. Its standardized data fields are mapped directly to IDEA mandates, ensuring that the information required for legal compliance and data-driven decision-making is captured in a single document rather than across multiple disconnected systems. Standard fields include student name and identification information, IEP goal area, baseline performance data and date, goal date, current performance data by administration date, rate-of-growth calculation (slope), graphed trend line, and decision rule status.

The dashboard's most functionally significant feature is the embedded four-point decision rule, operationalized through color-coded conditional formatting that automatically identifies decision-rule triggers as data are entered. When four consecutive data points fall below the student's aim line, the dashboard flags a "Modify Intervention" alert; when four consecutive data points exceed the aim line, it flags an "Advance Goal" alert. These automated alerts transform the decision rule from a protocol that teachers must remember to apply into a structural feature of the data system itself—a design choice informed by implementation science research documenting that cognitive load reduction is a key predictor of sustained implementation fidelity (Fixsen et al., 2005; Michael, 2024).

A critical operational decision within the IDDIF concerns the frequency of data collection. Based on a consultation with Dr. Pamela Stecker of Clemson University in June 2026, the framework specifies a twice-weekly (2×/week) data-collection cadence for Tier 3 IEP goal monitoring. This frequency is significant for a specific mathematical reason: the four-point decision rule requires four consecutive data points above or below the aim line to trigger a decision. With once-weekly data collection, four consecutive data points require four weeks to accumulate. During this time, a student may spend a full month receiving an intervention that is not working. With twice-weekly data collection, four consecutive data points can accumulate in approximately two weeks, cutting the feedback-to-instruction cycle in half and enabling far more rapid instructional adjustment. For students with the most significant learning needs, this two-week cycle represents a meaningful acceleration of the intervention response system.

The dashboard also incorporates the Assessment Purpose Decision Framework (APDF), developed in consultation with Dr. Stecker and embedded in its data-entry protocol. The APDF requires that every data collection event be classified by assessment purpose—Diagnostic (D), Eligibility Evaluation (E), or Progress Monitoring (PM)—prior to data entry. This classification system ensures that practitioners select assessment tools appropriate to the purpose of each assessment, rather than using progress monitoring measures for diagnostic or eligibility purposes for which they are not psychometrically validated. The APDF reflects the fundamental assessment principle, documented extensively in the special education measurement literature that the interpretive validity of any assessment instrument is conditional on its being used for the purpose for which it was validated. Finally, the dashboard includes columns for Tier 1 and Tier 2 programming participation alongside the Tier 3

IEP-specific data, supporting alignment across the MTSS tiers and providing a holistic view of each student's support profile.

Component 2: Cross-Functional IEP Compliance Review Team

The Cross-Functional IEP Compliance Review Team represents the IDDIF's organizational infrastructure component—the team structure and accountability system that ensures both procedural and substantive IEP compliance across the school year. The team is multidisciplinary by design, including, at minimum, the special education teacher, the general education teacher of record, the school psychologist, a building administrator, and a family member. The inclusion of family members as core team members—rather than as guests—reflects the IDEA's explicit requirement for family participation in IEP development and the evidence that family engagement is a significant predictor of IEP implementation quality (Yell et al., 2020).

The team's work is organized around a color-coded deadline tracking system that monitors all IDEA-mandated timelines for each student on the special education caseload. Green status indicates that a student's IEP processes are on track within established timelines; Yellow indicates that a deadline is approaching within a specified warning window; Red indicates an overdue or at-risk compliance item requiring immediate attention. The team meets at least quarterly to review the status of all students' IEP timelines, data trends from the progress dashboard, and the adequacy of current programming in light of student performance data. Red items do not wait for quarterly review—they trigger an emergency team convening within 48 hours of identification, ensuring that compliance failures are addressed before they become legal liabilities.

The team's documentation practices are designed specifically to address the post-Endrew legal standard. Where traditional IEP compliance monitoring focuses primarily on procedural timelines—whether meetings were held, whether forms were completed—the Cross-Functional Review Team produces documented evidence of substantive compliance through its quarterly review records, which capture not only timeline status but data-driven program modifications, parent engagement activities, and the relationship between current student performance and IEP goal trajectories. This documentation creates a defensible evidentiary record of the school's commitment to meaningful educational progress—precisely the evidence that Endrew requires and that most current IEP documentation systems fail to produce.

Component 3: SEL-Integrated Behavioral Intervention Protocols

The IDDIF's SEL-Integrated Behavioral Intervention Protocols represent the framework's most theoretically novel contribution—a structured, four-step process for developing Behavior Intervention Plans that are simultaneously grounded in behavioral function analysis and explicitly linked to CASEL social-emotional competency development. The protocol begins with a rigorous Functional Behavioral Assessment using the AEAS taxonomy, which categorizes behavioral functions across four domains: Attention (the behavior produces social attention from adults or peers), Escape (the behavior allows the student to avoid or terminate aversive tasks or stimuli), Access (the behavior produces access to preferred objects, activities, or environments), and Sensory (the behavior produces automatic sensory reinforcement independent of social consequences).

In the protocol's second step, the identified behavioral function is systematically mapped to the CASEL competency domain most directly associated with the prosocial skills that would enable the student to meet their needs in socially appropriate ways. Attention-seeking behavior, whose function is interpersonal and social, maps to the Relationship Skills and Social Awareness competency domains; developing these competencies equips the student with the social tools needed to obtain attention through appropriate means. Escape-motivated behavior,

which reflects difficulties with task persistence, frustration tolerance, and self-regulation under stress, maps to the Self-Management and Responsible Decision-Making domains. Access-motivated behavior, which reflects difficulty regulating desire for preferred items or activities, maps to Self-Awareness and Responsible Decision-Making. Sensory-motivated behavior, which reflects challenges with sensory regulation and self-monitoring, maps to Self-Management and Self-Awareness.

In the third step, the Behavior Intervention Plan is written to specify replacement behaviors explicitly defined as expressions of the named CASEL competency—ensuring that the BIP is not merely a behavior management document but a skill-instruction plan. In the fourth step, behavioral data are monitored using CBM-aligned rating scales administered at the same twice-weekly frequency as academic progress monitoring data, enabling integrated review of behavioral and academic trends within the unified dashboard system. Pilot outcome data from the author's implementation suggest that this integrated approach produced a 41% reduction in office discipline referrals and a 34% improvement in teacher-rated self-regulation scores over approximately 18 months. However, caution is warranted in interpreting these outcomes given the single-practitioner, no-control-group pilot design.

Component 4: Modular Professional Development Curricula

The Modular Professional Development Curricula represent the IDDIF's implementation science component—the structured professional learning system designed to enable other practitioners to adopt and sustain the framework's practices with fidelity. The curricula comprise five standalone modules, each approximately 60 to 90 minutes long, designed for peer-to-peer dissemination: teachers who complete a module are equipped to facilitate it for colleagues, creating a cascading professional learning model that does not require ongoing external expert involvement. The five modules address, in sequence: (1) Introduction to DBI and CBM, including the theoretical foundations and evidence base; (2) Dashboard Setup and Data Entry, including hands-on practice with the Real-Time IEP Progress Dashboard tool; (3) The Four-Point Decision Rule and Instructional Adjustment, including case-based practice with data interpretation and intervention modification; (4) The SEL-BIP Protocol, including the AEAS taxonomy, CASEL mapping, and BIP writing practice; and (5) The APDF and High School Progress Monitoring Measure, including calibration of secondary-level CBM tools and the HS PMM workbook.

Each module includes practitioner guides with step-by-step implementation instructions, sample dashboard data for hands-on practice, decision trees for navigating the four-point rule and AEAS-to-CASEL mapping, annotated case studies drawn from the author's pilot implementation, and a coaching checkpoint—a structured self-monitoring activity to be completed within two weeks of module completion. The coaching checkpoints are the most direct response to the implementation science fidelity decay problem. By embedding a structured accountability activity within each module, the curricula create an ongoing support structure that addresses the predictable decline in implementation fidelity that occurs in the absence of such structures within 10 to 14 days of initial training (Michael, 2024). The peer-dissemination model further reinforces fidelity by creating within-school coaching relationships that provide ongoing, contextually relevant support for implementation.

The High School Progress Monitoring Measure

The High School Progress Monitoring Measure (HS PMM) is a 10-tab Microsoft Excel workbook that provides secondary special educators with a structured, standardized system for monitoring student progress across five academic domains: Reading Comprehension, Written Expression, Mathematics, Text-Based Science, and Content Area subjects. Each domain is represented by two dedicated tabs: a data entry and graphing tab for recording and

visualizing student performance data across the school year, and a decision-rule summary tab that automatically applies the four-point decision rule to the accumulated data and generates color-coded alerts for Modify or Advance decisions.

The Reading Comprehension tab uses text-based maze passages calibrated for secondary lexile ranges, with standardized administration procedures derived from the CBM maze research literature. The Written Expression tab uses CBM written expression probes, scored for correct word sequences (CWS) and correct punctuation sequences (CPS)—metrics that capture the fluency and mechanical accuracy of student writing. The Mathematics tab uses two standalone tools: MC-CBM (Maze Computation, scored as Digits Correct Per Minute) and M-CAP (Math Concepts and Applications, scored as Percent Correct). It is important to note that MEAISP (a mathematics evaluation tool currently under development) is not included in the HS PMM, as it has not yet achieved the validation status required for high-stakes progress monitoring. This decision reflects the APDF's emphasis on selecting tools appropriate to the assessment purpose and the instrument's validation status.

The HS PMM's built-in aim line generator requires entry of the student's baseline and goal performance levels. It automatically calculates and graphs the expected weekly growth rate needed to reach the goal by the IEP goal date. The twice-weekly data entry cadence results in automatic rate-of-growth calculation using the slope of the student's actual performance data, enabling direct comparison of the actual growth trajectory with the expected aim line. The color-coded decision rule alert system eliminates the need for teachers to evaluate data patterns manually, reducing cognitive load and increasing the likelihood that decision rule triggers will be consistently identified and acted upon.

Practical Applications for Educators

One of the IDDIF's defining design principles is accessibility: the framework is explicitly designed to be implementable by any special education teacher using widely available, frequently free tools, without requiring additional district budget allocations or specialized technology purchases. The Real-Time IEP Progress Dashboard and HS PMM are both implemented in Microsoft Excel or Google Sheets, which are available to virtually all public school teachers through district technology licenses or free Google Workspace accounts. The Cross-Functional IEP Compliance Review Team requires no new organizational structures—only a reorientation of existing team meeting functions. The SEL-BIP Protocol requires no commercially licensed assessment tools, as FBA processes are standard practice under IDEA, and the AEAS-to-CASEL mapping framework is a practitioner-developed decision tool. The PD Modules require only the time of committed practitioners and can be facilitated without external trainers or consultants.

For individual special education teachers seeking to begin IDDIF implementation, the recommended implementation sequence proceeds from the most immediately actionable component to the most complex. The practitioner should begin by establishing the Real-Time IEP Progress Dashboard for their current caseload—entering baseline data, establishing aim lines, and initiating twice-weekly data collection for Tier 3 goals. Once the dashboard is operational, the teacher should propose forming a Cross-Functional IEP Compliance Review Team to their building administrator, presenting the color-coded tracking system and its compliance-risk management benefits. With the team structure in place, the SEL-BIP Protocol can be integrated into the next BIP development cycle for any student with an identified behavioral need, using the AEAS taxonomy for FBA documentation and the CASEL mapping framework for specifying replacement behaviors. Participation in the PD Module sequence—either as a learner or as a facilitator for colleagues—supports sustained implementation by providing both skill development and coaching accountability.

To illustrate the IDDIF's implementation flow concretely, consider the following worked case example involving a secondary student (referred to as Student A) with a learning disability in reading and an escape-motivated behavioral profile. Student A, a 10th-grade student, presents with a reading comprehension IEP goal targeting maze CBM performance at the secondary level. At the beginning of the implementation period, Student A's baseline maze CBM score is established at 15 correct replacements per minute (CRPM), with an IEP goal of 28 CRPM by the end of the school year. Twice-weekly maze CBM probes are administered and entered into the HS PMM Reading Comprehension tab, with the aim line automatically generated based on the baseline and goal data. After six data points (three weeks), the dashboard's four-point decision rule triggers a Modify Intervention alert, as four consecutive data points fall below the aim line. The teacher uses this alert to schedule an immediate IEP team consultation, resulting in a modification to the reading intervention that increases the text-to-meaning scaffolding ratio.

Simultaneously, Student A's behavioral profile—frequent task refusal and disruption during demanding reading tasks—is addressed through the SEL-BIP Protocol. The FBA identifies escape as the primary behavioral function, which maps to the CASEL domains of Self-Management and Responsible Decision-Making. The resulting BIP specifies that Student A will learn to use the "request a break" procedure—a concrete, explicit replacement behavior tied to the Self-Management competency of identifying and expressing emotional states—rather than engaging in task refusal. Behavioral rating scale data are entered into the dashboard at the same twice-weekly cadence as reading data, enabling integrated review of behavioral and academic trends. Three months into the implementation, the behavioral data show a consistent upward trend in appropriate self-management behavior, corresponding with a reduction in task refusal incidents. The reading data, following the intervention modification triggered by the four-point rule, also show a resumption of positive growth trending toward the aim line. The PD Module coaching checkpoint, completed two weeks after the teacher's Module 3 training, confirms that the four-point decision rule is being applied correctly and that the teacher can articulate the rationale for the recent modification to the intervention.

For special education coordinators and administrators seeking to scale the IDDIF across a school or district, several strategic considerations apply. First, the PD Module's peer-dissemination design means that scaling does not require proportional increases in external training resources—a small cadre of trained practitioners can facilitate modules for their colleagues within each building. Second, the Cross-Functional IEP Compliance Review Team model can be standardized across buildings using the color-coded tracking template, enabling district-level oversight of IEP compliance patterns without requiring additional administrative personnel. Third, aggregated dashboard data for a building's special education caseload can provide building leadership with a real-time picture of IEP goal mastery rates, progress-monitoring frequency, and compliance status—information currently unavailable in most districts because it is not systematically captured in any existing data system.

Practitioners and administrators implementing the IDDIF should also be aware of its limitations and the cautions that govern its appropriate use. The IDDIF is not a replacement for a comprehensive psychoeducational evaluation, and its progress-monitoring tools are explicitly designed for that purpose only. The APDF, as embedded in the dashboard, is designed to prevent the misuse of progress monitoring measures for diagnostic or eligibility determination purposes—uses for which these instruments are not psychometrically validated. Additionally, the pilot outcome data presented in the following section are derived from a single-practitioner implementation and should be interpreted with appropriate caution. Replication studies with larger samples, control groups, and independent evaluators are essential before the IDDIF's

effectiveness can be claimed as an empirically supported practice.

Pilot Outcomes and Implications

The pilot implementation of the IDDIF has been conducted in a high-need urban public school district—Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS)—by the author, a special education teacher with direct responsibility for a secondary-level caseload of students with learning disabilities, emotional and behavioral disorders, and multiple co-occurring disabilities. The framework was conceived during the 2023–2024 school year while the author served as a Grade 5 classroom teacher, was theoretically refined during 2024–2025 while serving as an Economics teacher, and was formally implemented beginning in August 2025 upon the author's transition to a dedicated special education role. The pilot implementation thus spans approximately one academic year (2025–2026). A single practitioner has carried out the implementation without a formal comparison group or randomized assignment, which limits the causal conclusions that can be drawn from the outcome data. These limitations are acknowledged explicitly and addressed in the research agenda articulated below.

Despite these methodological constraints, the pilot outcome data are sufficiently promising to warrant detailed presentation and discussion as a basis for hypothesis generation and replication research. Across the implementation period, four primary outcome domains have been tracked: IEP goal mastery rate, IDEA timeline compliance, office discipline referrals, and student self-regulation scores. Table 1 summarizes these outcomes.

Table 1: Summary of Pilot Outcome Data: IDDIF Implementation in Milwaukee Public Schools (October 2023–July 2026)

Outcome Domain	Pre-Implementation (Baseline)	Post-Implementation	Change
IEP Goal Mastery Rate	58%	79%	+21 percentage points
IDEA Timeline Compliance	Not systematically tracked	100% maintained throughout	Sustained compliance achieved
Office Discipline Referrals	Baseline cohort rate	41% reduction	−41%
Self-Regulation Scores (teacher-rated)	Baseline rating scale scores	34% improvement	+34%

Note. IEP goal mastery rate was calculated as the percentage of annual IEP goals rated as mastered or substantially mastered at the time of annual review. IDEA timeline compliance reflects adherence to all federally mandated timelines throughout the implementation period. Office discipline referrals reflect changes in ODR rates among the author's caseload students. Self-regulation scores were derived from teacher-completed behavior rating scales administered at baseline and at approximately 18-month follow-up—single-practitioner implementation; no control group. Results should not be interpreted as confirmatory evidence of IDDIF effectiveness.

The 21-percentage-point increase in the IEP goal mastery rate—from 58% at baseline to 79% post-implementation—is the most direct measure of the IDDIF's intended purpose. The baseline mastery rate of 58% is consistent with national estimates of IEP goal mastery in special education, suggesting that the author's pre-implementation practice was typical rather than

systematically below average—a finding that strengthens the case that the observed improvement reflects IDDIF implementation effects rather than correction of outlier practice. The maintained 100% IDEA timeline compliance throughout the implementation period reflects the effectiveness of the Cross-Functional IEP Compliance Review Team's color-coded tracking system, which enabled proactive deadline management rather than reactive compliance crisis response.

The 41% reduction in office discipline referrals and 34% improvement in teacher-rated self-regulation scores reflect the impact of the SEL-Integrated Behavioral Intervention Protocols. The concurrent improvement in both behavioral suppression (ODR reduction) and prosocial skill development (self-regulation improvement) is consistent with the theoretical prediction that AEAS-to-CASEL mapping should produce durable behavioral change rather than temporary compliance through punishment or behavioral suppression alone. The maintenance of self-regulation improvements over an 18-month monitoring period suggests that replacement behaviors taught through the SEL-BIP protocol were internalized rather than situationally specific—though without a control group and with teacher-completed rating scales as the measurement instrument, these findings must be interpreted with substantial caution.

The methodological limitations of the pilot are significant and must be stated plainly. This is a single-practitioner implementation with no comparison group, no randomization, and no independent outcome evaluator. The outcome measures are primarily practitioner-collected, raising concerns about demand characteristics and measurement bias. The student population is specific to one urban school district with a particular demographic and programmatic profile, limiting generalizability. The implementation period, while approximately 30 months in duration, is relatively brief by the standards of implementation science, which suggests that two to four years of sustained implementation are required to reach the Full Implementation stage (Fixsen et al., 2005). These limitations are not presented defensively but as a transparent accounting of the evidentiary status of the pilot data—promising indicators that justify investment in rigorous evaluation research, not confirmatory evidence of a proven intervention.

The call for replication and evaluation research is therefore the most important methodological conclusion of this section. What is needed are multi-site randomized or quasi-experimental studies comparing IDDIF-implementing classrooms with matched comparison classrooms using standard IEP practices, with outcome measures collected by independent evaluators using validated instruments. Longitudinal tracking of student outcomes—following cohorts of IDDIF-served students across multiple grade levels to examine the durability of gains in goal mastery and behavioral improvements—is particularly important. Research examining the differential effectiveness of individual IDDIF components would enable the field to identify which elements of the framework drive improvements in outcomes and which might be modified or simplified without loss of effectiveness. Additionally, replication across demographic and geographic contexts—including suburban and rural districts, elementary and secondary settings, and populations with different disability-category compositions—is essential for establishing the framework's external validity.

From a policy perspective, the IDDIF's outcomes have direct implications for how districts and states conceptualize the quality of IEP implementation. The framework's components align with existing federal requirements under IDEA, the substantive compliance standard established by Endrew F., and the evidence-based practice requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Implementation does not require legislative change, additional funding streams, or specialized technology infrastructure. It requires a reorientation of existing resources—team meeting time, teacher collaboration periods, and district data systems instead—toward the

integrated, data-driven practices that the IDDIF operationalizes. This makes the IDDIF a potentially high-leverage, low-cost policy instrument for districts seeking to improve the quality of IEP implementation and student outcomes without significant additional investment.

Conclusion

The research-to-practice gap in special education is not a new problem, and this article does not claim to have solved it. What the IDDIF represents is a practitioner-developed attempt to address the structural dimension of that gap—the absence of an integrated, operationalizable framework that enables special educators to systematically organize, deploy, and sustain the evidence-based practices validated by the research community over the past four decades. The preceding sections have described both the problem and the response in detail: the compounding structural gaps in current special education practice, the five theoretical pillars on which the IDDIF is built, the thematic empirical literature that supports its design, the operational implementation of its four components, and the pilot outcome data that suggest its promise.

The IDDIF's most significant contributions to the field can be summarized as four distinct but interrelated innovations. First, to the author's knowledge, it is the first practitioner-developed framework to explicitly integrate the AEAS behavioral function taxonomy with the CASEL social-emotional competency framework into a structured behavioral intervention planning protocol. This mapping transforms BIP development from a behavior-management activity into a prosocial skill-instruction process. Second, it extends CBM progress monitoring to the secondary level through the High School Progress Monitoring Measure. This 10-domain standardized data-collection tool addresses one of the most underdeveloped areas in the special education assessment literature. Third, it embeds the Assessment Purpose Decision Framework as a structural component of the data collection system, ensuring that assessment tool selection is always aligned with the assessment purpose. This fundamental psychometric principle is frequently violated in practice when progress monitoring tools are applied to diagnostic or eligibility purposes for which they are not validated. Fourth, it provides modular professional development curricula designed for peer-to-peer dissemination, enabling the framework's practices to spread within schools without ongoing dependence on external expert trainers. This sustainability design directly addresses the implementation fidelity decay problem documented by implementation science.

Looking forward, the IDDIF is best understood not as a finished product but as a practitioner's contribution to an ongoing conversation between researchers and practitioners about how evidence-based practices can be systematically organized and operationalized within the complex, resource-constrained environment of real schools. The most productive next chapter in that conversation would be collaborative partnerships between practitioners and university researchers—partnerships in which practitioners' real-world implementation knowledge and researchers' methodological rigor are brought together to design studies that are both ecologically valid and scientifically rigorous. The field of special education has produced a remarkable body of research on individual practices and isolated components. What it needs now are integration frameworks—and practitioners willing to build them.

The IDDIF is offered as one such framework: imperfect, iteratively developed, and in need of rigorous empirical validation, but grounded in five decades of research, designed for real practitioners in real schools, and responsive to the genuine urgency of the problem it addresses. The 7.5 million students currently receiving special education services under IDEA deserve nothing less than the full, integrated, and faithfully implemented application of what the research community knows. Bridging the research-to-practice gap is not merely an academic aspiration—it is a moral imperative.

References

Buckman, M. M., Brock, M. E., Duble Moore, T., Majeika, C. E., Melton, T., O'Donnell, C., & Oakes, W. P. (2024). Professional development to support effective implementation within I-MTSS. Intervention in School and Clinic. Advance online publication.

CASEL. (2020). CASEL's SEL framework: What are the core competence areas, and where are they promoted? Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/what-is-the-casel-framework/

Deno, S. L. (1985). Curriculum-based Measurement: The emerging alternative. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 219–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440298505200303

Duble Moore, T., Brock, M. E., Buckman, M. M., Majeika, C. E., Melton, T., O'Donnell, C., & Oakes, W. P. (2024). Integrating evidence-based practices in Tier 3 within I-MTSS. Intervention in School and Clinic. Advance online publication.

Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District, 580 U.S. 386 (2017).

Espin, C. A., & Tindal, G. (2023). Progress monitoring for secondary students with disabilities: Current status and future directions—remedial and Special Education. Advance online publication.

Espin, C. A., Wayman, M. M., Deno, S. L., McMaster, K. L., & de Ayala, R. (2017). Data-based decision-making: Developing a method for capturing teachers' understanding of CBM graphs. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 32(1), 8–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12122

Espin, C. A., Wallace, T., Lembke, E. S., & Tichá, R. (2021). A systematic review of CBM content in practitioner-focused journals. Remedial and Special Education. https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325211009843

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature. University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication No. 231).

Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (1986). Effects of systematic formative evaluation: A meta-analysis. Exceptional Children, 53(3), 199–208. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440298605300301

Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2006). Introduction to response to intervention: What, why, and how valid is it? Reading Research Quarterly, 41(1), 93–99. https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.41.1.4

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Malone, A. S. (2017). The taxonomy of intervention intensity. TEACHING Exceptional Children, 50(1), 35–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059917703962

Gesel, S. A., LeJeune, L. M., Chow, J. C., Sinclair, A. C., & Lemons, C. J. (2021). A meta-analysis of the effects of data-based Individualization on student outcomes. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 54(4), 269–286. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219421994556

I-MTSS Research Network. (2023). Integrated multi-tiered systems of support: Definition and key lessons. Institute of Education Sciences. https://ies.ed.gov/ncer/projects/program.asp?ProgID=62

I-MTSS Research Network. (2024). Implementing practices within an integrated multi-tiered system of support [Special series]—intervention in School and Clinic.

Jung, P. G., McMaster, K. L., Kunkel, A. K., Shin, J., & Stecker, P. M. (2018). Effects of data-based Individualization for students with intensive learning needs: A meta-analysis. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 33(3), 144–155. https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12172

Jungjohann, J., & Gebhardt, M. (2021). Classroom effects are as large as grade-level effects on curriculum-based measurement maze reading scores of secondary school students with and without special educational needs. Frontiers in Education. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.657956

Majeika, C. E., Brock, M. E., Buckman, M. M., Duble Moore, T., Melton, T., O'Donnell, C., & Oakes, W. P. (2024). Integrated multi-tiered systems of support in elementary schools: Practical applications. Intervention in School and Clinic. Advance online publication.

Melton, T., Brock, M. E., Buckman, M. M., Duble Moore, T., Majeika, C. E., O'Donnell, C., & Oakes, W. P. (2024). Integrating evidence-based practices in Tier 1 within I-MTSS. Intervention in School and Clinic. Advance online publication.

Michael, K. (2024). An examination of methods for increasing teachers' treatment fidelity for special education students (Doctoral dissertation, Howard University). ProQuest LLC.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). Students with disabilities. Condition of Education. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgg

National Center on Intensive Intervention. (2022). Data-based Individualization: A framework for intensive intervention. American Institutes for Research. https://intensiveintervention.org/resource/data-based-individualization-framework-intensive-intervention

O'Donnell, C., Brock, M. E., Buckman, M. M., Duble Moore, T., Majeika, C. E., Melton, T., & Oakes, W. P. (2024). Integrating evidence-based practices in Tier 2 within I-MTSS. Intervention in School and Clinic. Advance online publication.

Okwarajiaku, P. (2026). Integrated Data-Driven IEP Intervention Framework (IDDIF): Methodology description, theoretical foundations, and implementation protocols. Milwaukee Public Schools. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/404820332

Skoog-Hoffman, A., Miller, A. A., Plate, R. C., Meyers, D. C., Tucker, A. S., Meyers, G., Diliberti, M. K., Schwartz, H. L., Kuhfeld, M., Jagers, R. J., Steele, L., & Schlund, J. (2024). Social and emotional learning in U.S. schools: Findings from CASEL's nationwide policy scan and the American Teacher Panel and American School Leader Panel surveys (RR-A195-213). RAND Corporation. https://doi.org/10.7249/RRA195-213

Toste, J. R., & Lee, J. D. (2026). Implementation science in special education: Foundations, methods, and directions for research and practice. Focus on Exceptional Children, 50(1). https://doi.org/10.17161/foec.v50i1.25334

Yell, M. L., Katsiyannis, A., & Losinski, M. (2020). Ensuring FAPE in the least restrictive environment under IDEA. TEACHING Exceptional Children, 52(5), 268–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059920914259