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Introduction

Baker, Wang and Walberg explain (1994) that “as schools are challenged to effectively serve an increasingly diverse student population, the concern is not whether to provide inclusive education, but how to implement inclusive education in ways that are both feasible and effective in ensuring schooling success for all children, especially those with special needs” (p. 34). Although implementation of inclusive practices will be left to individual teachers in their own classrooms, the responsibility for making inclusion work is ultimately that of the principal (Young, 2010).

My qualitative study is designed to examine the ways that school principals support the implementation of an inclusive model of classroom practice, particularly that of the Three Block Model of Universal Design for Learning (Katz, 2012a). The ways that principals can support inclusive practice may include the way they use systems and structures that fall under their control (Katz, 2012a). In addition, research has indicated that the instructional leadership (Leithwood & Riehl, 2005) of a principal may play a crucial part in implementing inclusive school reform.

Research into the influence principals have on implementing inclusive education points to the understanding that it is their beliefs, values and commitment that are the foundation of inclusive schools (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008). Studies have shown that the principal of an inclusive school must understand inclusion in a broad context, have a bold vision of inclusion in his/her school, and believe in his/her power to make change (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008). Leithwood, Harris and Straus (2010) include “instructional capacity to help at-risk students, learn”, “an unshakable belief in the potential of these students” and the “persistence, patience, and optimism to create productive learning
experiences for children in response to initial failure” as crucial to the role of principal (p. 156).

Although educational literature shows that the school principal is the central figure in implementing change in schools, literature and research that directly links school principals to the enactment of inclusive instructional practices in the classroom is insufficient (Edmunds & Macmillan, 2010) and few articles reference leadership for inclusion of students with disabilities. One reason for this is that inclusion is seen as contentious, and in some areas ill defined (R. B. Macmillan, personal communication, February 28, 2012).

Philip C. Schlechty (2000) explains that crucial steps need to be undertaken in an overall school restructuring process. What is striking is how the attitude and thinking Schlechty cites as crucial for school reform parallel beliefs about inclusion. For example, the belief that all students must be academically engaged, that high standards should be maintained for all students and that teachers are responsible for teaching and assessment of every learner in the classroom are common to both the field of inclusion (Katz, 2012a) and school reform.

Currently there are schools and school divisions in Manitoba looking at ways to improve and increase inclusive practices. Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is coming to be regarded as a way to achieve this. In this paper I will describe how important milestones towards inclusive instructional practices in Manitoba form the purpose of this study. I will outline the origins behind the Three Block Model of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) that will provide the common language and understanding of inclusive instructional practice. I will also explain how the role of principal will be central to ensuring the essential components of UDL become rooted in everyday school practices. I will introduce the role of
the school principal in creating systematic and philosophical change in schools and describe how my research is designed to uncover the practices being used by Manitoba school principals to lead a change towards a fully inclusive instructional program in their schools.

**Research Purpose**

There is a need to understand the practices that will work to achieve increased inclusion in kindergarten to grade 12 schools in Manitoba. The research I am conducting is designed to investigate how principals support implementation of an inclusive instructional program intended to make the school increasingly responsive to the learning needs of all students. To narrow my qualitative study I am specifically investigating how principals support implementation of the Three Block Model of UDL in their schools through a naturalistic inquiry. Changes that a principal may affect related to systems and structures such as allowing for collaborative decision making, providing teachers with dedicated planning time and supporting co-teaching will be investigated. In addition the ways in which instructional leadership practices can facilitate the design of UDL environments will be explored. The study is intended to explore the discourse about inclusion in the school, the supporting systems and structures put in place, and any competing pressures that threaten the implementation of this inclusive model of practice within the school. The purpose is to uncover the process five school principals follow in their efforts to implement the Three Block Model, and discover what they identify as the barriers and facilitators of the process (e.g. attitudes, economics, training, personal experiences, etc).

**Inclusion in Manitoba**

Up to the mid 1960s exclusionary laws that prohibited children with disabilities from attending school prevailed in Manitoba. School was taught by generalist teachers prepared to
teach “normal” students. Anyone at that time who did not fit the system was invited to leave it or was already excluded (Blais & Van Camp, 2005). Since the abolishment of exclusionary laws and the creation of special education Manitoba, like other jurisdictions, has entered into over three decades of discourse about the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms (Sindelar, Shearer, Yendol-Hoppey & Liebert, 2006).

In 1985 an amendment to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms added mental or physical disability to the list of prohibited basis for discrimination which had included race, national or ethnic origin, color, religion, gender, or age. Around the same time that the Salamanca Statement was adopted by the UN World Conference on Special Needs Education, reforms to education in Manitoba were occurring that would profoundly impact the education of students with disabilities. Renewing Education: New Directions outlined the government’s direction for substantial education renewal that would reshape student’s school experiences (Manitoba Education and Training, 1994). Focusing on standardized essential learning for students from kindergarten to grade 12, the direction was for students to all be taught from the same curricula rather than being slotted into challenging or less challenging streams. The government of Manitoba mandated that high expectations and standards for learning (Manitoba Education and Training, 1994) should be maintained for all learners. Only the 1-5% of students with specific cognitive disabilities would be accommodated with modifications to expected learning outcomes.

The direction given was for educators to use their expertise to “enable the vast majority of students to demonstrate the knowledge and skills they are expected to learn” (Manitoba Education and Training, 1995, p. 13). In the wake of the changes, the Manitoba Special Education Review (Proactive Information Services, 1998) described how educators were
comfortable accommodating students in high school with cognitive disabilities who were eligible for the new modified or M course designation. However issues were being raised about the struggling learners who would not qualify for the designation due to their higher cognitive functioning but who were disadvantaged academically due to other issues (Proactive Information Services, 1998). Concerns about training and resources related to teaching a range of struggling learners remained. Although the Manitoba support document *Success for All Learners: A Handbook for Differentiated Instruction* (Manitoba Education and Training, 1996) continues to be used by educators, the recommendation from the Manitoba Special Education Review in 1998 was to find solutions that addressed the educational needs of struggling learners, who did not have cognitive disabilities and for whom modification, and the M course designation, would not be appropriate (Proactive Information Services, 1998).

At the same time, the Manitoba Special Education Review recommended that a philosophy of inclusion be adopted by the province (Proactive Information Services, 1998). Manitoba’s Philosophy of Inclusion was subsequently included in the *Handbook for Student Services* in 2001 and has remained unchanged. It reads:

Inclusion is a way of thinking and acting that allows every individual to feel accepted, valued and safe. An inclusive community consciously evolves to meet the changing needs of its members. Through recognition and support, an inclusive community provides meaningful involvement and equal access to the benefits of citizenship.

In Manitoba, we embrace inclusion as a means of enhancing the well-being of every member of the community. By working together, we strengthen our capacity to provide the foundation for a richer future for all of us. (Manitoba Education, 2001, introduction p. 3)
Rather than identifying one group to which the philosophy applies, Manitoba’s philosophy of inclusion applies equally to every individual, whether students are traditionally labelled regular education or special education.

In 2005 Manitoba amended its Public Schools Act regulations and guiding document, *Appropriate Educational Programming: Standards for Student Services* (2006) to define appropriate educational programming for all students. Standards mandated certain inclusive practices in school divisions and addressed specific areas including: policy; access; early identification; assessment; planning in education, including student-specific planning (IEPs); student discipline, including considerations for students with exceptional learning needs; dispute resolution; coordinated services; professional services. While the regulations in the amended Public School Act support a philosophy of inclusion in the province, the *Standards for Student Services* (2006) do not prohibit segregated settings for students so long as the catchment area school with peers is considered first.

Across Canada the tenet that education systems must not attempt to restrict a child with a disability’s access to public education is well established. Yude Henteleff (2010) however described how questions about the type of education that must be provided were examined by human rights commissions and courts in Canada around cases, such as Eaton v. Brandt Board of Education and Moore v. British Columbia. What has been established is that decisions about access to education must be made in the best interests of the child knowing the child has the right to receive basic supports in order to be accommodated in their school. Henteleff (2010) explains that “provinces must offer gradients of accommodation in order to meet the needs of all disabled children in the province, not just some” (p. 16).
In 1998 Manitoba teachers identified that a lack of support for students with emotional/behavioural issues and struggling learners was an ongoing issue (Proactive Information Services Inc, 1998). In 2010, in light of the Appropriately Educational Programming amendment to the *Public Schools Act*, the Manitoba Teacher’s Society (MTS) found that addressing this same diversity of need in the classroom remained a concern (MTS, 2010). Overworked resource and classroom teachers identified students with special needs and the need for differentiated instruction, adaptations and modifications for students with special needs as a primary contributor to their increasing workload (MTS, 2010, p. 18). Manitoba teachers reported the pressure of planning distinct programming for students with diverse needs and that the task of “trying to meet curriculum outcomes for all students” (MTS, 2010, p. 20) contributed to increased stress, anxiety and preparation time for teachers. Principals in the same report indicated that they often lacked specific knowledge about providing special education and delegated these responsibilities to a resource teacher. The findings of this report revealed that overall Manitoba teachers and principals lack a framework that explains how to instruct students with diverse needs together in inclusive classrooms. So in 2001, 31.1% of Manitoba’s students with disabilities remained in low-inclusion settings such as a regular school with only special education classes and/or where their participation in the extracurricular life of the school was restricted (Timmons & Wagner, 2008, p. 26).

**Educational Research Supports Inclusion**

Despite potential barriers to inclusion (such as teacher workload issues, a shortage of adequate supports, incomplete training for teachers and principals or legal questions) inclusive classrooms have been shown to benefit all students both socially and academically (Canadian Council on Learning, 2009; Cole, Waldron, & Majd, 2004; Crisman, 2008; Katz
& Mirenda, 2002). Global research shows that inclusion is increasingly proving a positive experience for all students (Bru, 2009; Curcic, 2009; Kalambouka, Farrell, Dyson, & Kaplan, 2007). Timmons and Wagner (2008) found that children who are educated in inclusive settings are healthier, do better in school, enjoy going there more, and interact more positively with peers compared to students taught in less inclusive settings.

Inclusive schools provide the opportunity for all students to be part of school communities to learn and grow alongside their peers and should encompass both the academic and the social life of a school. Academic inclusion necessitates that access to learning in the classroom, delivered by the classroom teacher, is maximized. Academic inclusion may include universal design principles that allow for all students, regardless of their learning needs, to participate in the curriculum (Katz, 2012b; Manitoba Education, 2001). Social inclusion recognizes the need for belonging, acceptance and recognition for all people, and requires the opportunity for full and equal participation (Katz, 2012b; Koster, Nakken, Pijl, & van Houten, 2009).

It is in this context that teachers, and school principals as teacher leaders, are in need of an approach to teaching that promises to address not just the range of diversity among learners but creates academic and social learning environments that meet the ideal of being “accessible to all students as a place to learn, grow, and be accepted” (Manitoba Education, 2001, introduction p. 3). To that end, Katz (2012a) has developed the Three Block Model of Universal Design for Learning to help support teachers and principals in their efforts to create inclusive learning environments.

**Universal Design for Learning**

Exclusionary education laws were not the only barrier for people with exceptionalities.
Bingler (1997) explains how for most of the 20th century, with universal design ideas still decades away, the very design and building of schools was exclusionary. Architecture gave no consideration to the input of the community that would be served by the building, including teachers, students and parents. Rather than embracing inclusion and integration the school design process throughout this time favored a “forceful tendency towards disintegration and diffusion” (Bingler, 1997, p. 5). The term universal design (UD) was coined by American architect Ron Mace when he referred to “the process of creating systems, environments, materials and devices that are directly and repeatedly usable by people with the widest range of abilities operating within the largest variety of situations” (cited by Manitoba Education, 2006, p. 4). The essence of universal design in architecture focused on accessibility for all, improving on architecture’s historically exclusionary process for designing buildings by adopting a highly consultative process.

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) follows as a theoretical framework that provides the means for creating accessibility to the social and academic life of the regular classroom for all students (Katz, 2012c). Originally grounded in educational technology, UDL evolved to support the understanding that flexible learning environments intended to accommodate individual learning differences should be developed (CAST, 2011; Rose & Meyer, 2002).

In Manitoba the Department of Education initiated a shift in school practice when UDL was referenced in the 2006 Standards for Student Services. It was explained that, 

Applied to the field of education, the concept of universal design means that school communities, including teachers, develop plans for the full diversity of their student population. In education, universally designed schools, classrooms, curricula and
materials provide all students with access to the resources they require, regardless of their diverse learning needs. (Manitoba Education, 2006, p. 4)

In spite of this description of schools with classrooms and curricula that seamlessly meet the needs of the widest possible range of student diversity, what was still missing was a description of the universal design concept that provides a practical framework for an inclusive instructional program taking place in a classroom of diverse learners.

**The Three Block Model of Universal Design for Learning**

The Three Block Model of Universal Design for Learning (Katz, 2012a) is a framework for classroom teachers to support inclusive education that expands the original, narrow technological focus of universal design for learning to include a broader foundation for inclusive education. The model is a theoretical framework for inclusive education that synthesizes decades of research investigating the most important elements of inclusion and provides accessibility to the curriculum, learning activities, and social life of the classroom for all students (Katz, 2012a). The framework for the model includes three concepts/goals called blocks: developing community / social and emotional well-being; inclusive instructional practice, and; systematic strategies and structures (Katz, 2012a, c).

The Three Block Model draws from various inclusive instructional practices to describe a practical, classroom based structure for creating an instructional program that values diversity, promotes cooperation amongst students and provides multiple means of learning.

The goal of UDL is to bring evidence based instructional practices and service delivery models together in a holistic, practical manner that works in all grades, and a variety of settings (King-Sears, 2009). To reveal students’ true potential as learners, they need to be at the center of the instructional process. Ideally the teaching and learning environment is suited
to their individual needs, interests and aptitudes (Hopkins, 2011). Katz’s Three Block Model of UDL is intended to put this goal into practice. However in order to sustain the changes resulting from the implementation of the Three Block Model of UDL in individual teacher’s classrooms, the systems and structures to support implementation of the model at the school level must be established as outlined in Block 3.

As Leithwood, Harris and Strauss (2010) contend, school divisions must recruit and assign both teachers and principals who have the ability and disposition to further the school’s efforts to improve the instructional program. Research has suggested that to implement inclusive education changes need to be made in the ways in which staff are assigned and utilized (Giangreco, 2010), the roles and qualifications for school principals (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010), the ways schools purchase resources, and in the training that is provided to staff (Loreman, 2010; Philpott, Furey, & Penney, 2010).

**The Role of Principals in Inclusive Schools**

Common core practices of principals in inclusive schools have been identified in the literature (Table 1). Retaining skilled staff, monitoring student progress, shielding teachers from distractions to their work with students, and providing teachers with the material and professional development to succeed at their work contributes greatly to efforts to improve a school’s instructional program. Other factors that must be addressed related to “systems and structures” include the necessary policy, resources, staffing, and delivery systems as outlined in Block 3 of the Three Block Model.
Table 1

Core Practices of Principals Leading Inclusive Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Walton, McLeskey &amp; Reid</th>
<th>Irvine, Lupart, Loreman, &amp; McGhee-Richmond</th>
<th>Leithwood &amp; Riehl</th>
<th>Leithwood</th>
<th>Villa et al.</th>
<th>Scanlan</th>
<th>Ryan</th>
<th>Angelides, Antoniou &amp; Charalambous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and initiate sustained discussion of issues, provide new vision, set direction and motivate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign the organization and/or foster a collaborative school workplace culture</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the delivery of a high quality education with necessary individualized supports</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and encourage parent and caregiver involvement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve and value all students</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare teachers with adequate professional development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified core practices of principals’ leadership in include:

1. The need to redesign the organization and then foster a collaborative workplace culture within it (Angelides, Antoniou, & Charalambous, 2010; Irvine, Lupart, Loreman, & McGhee-Richmond, 2010; Leithwood, 2010; Leithwood, & Riehl, 2005; Ryan, 2010; Scanlan, 2009; Villa et al., 2005; Waldron, McLeskey, & Redd, 2011).

2. Identifying issues and then providing a new vision and direction for the school, along with the need to continually motivate school staff (Irvine, Lupart, Loreman, &
McGhie-Richmond, 2010; Leithwood, 2010; Ryan, 2010; Villa et al., 2005; Waldron, McLeskey, & Redd, 2011).

3. Principals must manage the delivery of a high quality education while providing necessary individual supports to students (Irvine, Lupart, Loreman, & McGhie-Richmond, 2010; Leithwood, 2010; Leithwood, & Riehl, 2005; Ryan, 2010; Waldron, McLeskey, & Redd, 2011).

4. Involving and valuing all students as well as their parents and caregivers (Angelides, Antoniou, & Charalambous, 2010; Irvine, Lupart, Loreman, & McGhie-Richmond, 2010; Leithwood, & Riehl, 2005; Scanlan, 2009). And finally,

5. The need to prepare teachers with adequate professional development (Leithwood, 2010; Scanlan, 2009; Villa et al., 2005).

As Leithwood et al (2010) advocate, these “close-to-the-classroom” leadership practices are essential when principals have the task of improving their school’s instructional program.

**Rationale/Significance of the Study**

The concept of inclusive education represents a belief that all students belong and are valued members of their classroom and school communities (Council of Ministers of Education in Canada [CMEC], 2008; Specht & Young, 2010). Jill Blackmore (2006) explains that today diversity among learners, whether it is linguistic, cultural or disability, is “construed to be a positive force in educational work” (p. 183).

The mid 1990’s saw members of the United Nations, at its World Conference on Special Needs Education adopt a guiding principle that schools should accommodate all children regardless of their diverse physical, intellectual, social, emotional, and linguistic needs (UNESCO, 1994). The resulting Salamanca Statement recognized “the necessity and urgency
of providing education for children, youth and adults with special educational needs within the regular education system” (UNESCO, 1994, p. viii). At this same time educational reforms began taking place in Canada and the United States that were intended to bring regular education and special education together (Edmunds, Macmillan, Specht, Nowicki & Edmunds, 2009) to form inclusive education systems. However in spite of mounting research attesting to the positive effects of inclusion a large percentage of students with exceptionalities continued to be excluded from the regular classroom (Canadian Council on Learning [CCL], 2007). While the move to inclusive education in Canada has improved health and academic outcomes for some students with exceptionalities (CCL, 2007), a large percentage of students with exceptionalities continue to be at risk for exclusion from the regular classroom (CCL, 2007; CMEC, 2008). Models and methods for implementation of inclusive instruction continue to be needed. It is necessary to investigate and understand how a school principal creates the conditions for a profound philosophical and practical change such as a shift towards inclusive systems, structures and instructional practices.

To do this my qualitative study builds on existing research and understanding related to the implementation of the Three Block Model of Universal Design for Learning. This research has been done at the classroom level and has primarily focussed on Blocks 1 and 2 (Katz, 2013; Katz & Porath, 2011). This research into Block 3 - Systems and Structures will seek to understand the role school principals have in implementing this model as an exemplar of inclusive practice being implemented by schools.

**Problem**

Leithwood and Riehl (2005) argue that leadership is especially important in schools serving diverse students and that leadership for diverse populations needs to be practiced
differently. The current problem is that we do not know if principals would indentify that systems and structures are in place to facilitate implementation of the Three Block Model of UDL. There is a need to know which supports are in place for the implementation of this inclusive school reform, and which are not. We have not heard principals identify what barriers they encounter when implementing this specific model of inclusive practice in their schools so that these barriers can be avoided when the model is implemented. Knowing also what principals identify would facilitate the implementation of the Three Block Model can help to ensure that these facilitators are in place in the future.

**Research Questions**

I am conducting semi-structured interviews (initial and follow-up) with Manitoba school principals from school divisions that are implementing the Three Block Model of Universal Design for Learning. These interviews will create data related to the required systems and structures, the instructional leadership practices, and potential facilitators and barriers to the implementation of the inclusive school reform exemplified by the Three Block Model of UDL. My broad research questions include:

- What Systems and Structures identified by Dr. Jennifer Katz (2012a) do principals indicate are in place (or not) to support implementation of inclusive practices as defined by the Three Block Model of Universal Design for Learning?
- What are the instructional leadership practices principals identify as being crucial for the implementation of this inclusive practice and do these align with the need to manage the instructional program as identified by Kenneth Leithwood (2010)?
- What are the facilitators or barriers the principals see in implementation of the model in their school?
It is anticipated that this qualitative study will make a contribution to the field in terms of understanding the role of school principals in implementing a change towards fully inclusive instructional program as exemplified by the Three-Block Model of UDL. Knowing how closely principals’ descriptions of practice align with the literature on instructional leadership and leading schools through change may help future researchers explore the connection between school leadership and implementation of an inclusive instructional program.

**Methodology**

The research method I am using is best described as descriptive interpretivism using naturalistic inquiry as described by Guba and Lincoln (1985). This qualitative method will yield “inevitable conclusions about what is important, dynamic, and pervasive” (Guba & Lincoln, 1985, p. 55) in the field for these principals. As Guba and Lincoln (1985) describe phenomena exist where multiple realities interrelate with one another. The complex work of principals in leading the implementation of an inclusive school reform is one such phenomenon. Naturalistic inquiry respects the complexity of this work and is a good fit for exploring complex problems where the phenomena exists “in the minds of people – what they take to be problems” (p. 59).

John W. Creswell (2007) explains how a qualitative study can expose a void in existing research literature and this void then forms the foundation for the study. One such void is in understanding the complex role of principals in creating a school that embraces practices intended to make schools fully inclusive. Because the social-behavioural nature of a principal’s work is exceedingly complex (Fullan, 2000), it is unlikely that any single independent variable will emerge as an answer to the question about how principals support an inclusive school reform.
It is principals who must provide the vision, set direction and provide the motivation for a school reform to be successful (Irvine et al., 2010; Leithwood, 2010; Ryan, 2003; Villa & Thousand, 2005; Waldron, McLeskey & Redd, 2011). The leadership tasks of principals will likely be intricately interrelated and these connections can be best expanded upon through qualitative methods (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). As Guba and Lincoln (1985) explain, it may be the subtle patterns and differences that are uncovered through the interview process, rather than gross similarities that may be the key to understanding the experiences of these principals.

Rather than pure prediction and generalization the goal of my research is a deep understanding of the findings and development of ideas and knowledge about how five individual principals are striving to support inclusion in their schools. Understanding if participants have had common experiences around inclusion may help me to better understand the context for inclusive school reform being undertaken by a small group of principals (Creswell, 2007). However the goal of the research is not to develop findings that will be readily generalized to a second situation where differences and other complex variables may exist. Rather Wolf and Tymitz (1976-1977, as cited in Guba & Lincoln) sum up the purpose of my naturalistic inquiry well when they describe how a researcher can document “as closely as possible how people feel, what they know, and what their concerns, beliefs, perceptions, and understandings are” (p. 6). The goal is to analyze and understand the school principal’s role in implementing inclusive practice using the Three Block Model of UDL as an exemplar. Recommendations generated by this study may focus on how we should support principals in their complex work rather than creating a “to do” checklist for them.
Summary

I am conducting a naturalistic inquiry with both an initial and follow-up interview to seek to understand the phenomenon of principals supporting the implementation of an inclusive school reform as exemplified by the Three Block Model of Universal Design for Learning described by Katz (2012a). I anticipate learning why and how school principals are moving towards more fully inclusive practices. I also anticipate hearing about the thoughts, feelings and commitment they have towards the reform taking place. These procedural and affective variables can be best understood through qualitative methods.

Although the time boundaries of the inquiry will preclude an examination of the implemented reform over time I may be able to identify areas for future research. My naturalistic inquiry may provide a foundation for future investigations. Specific and quantitative measurement of the outcomes related to Block 3 of the Three-Block Model of Universal Design for Learning and the school principal’s role in supporting implementation could become the focus of future study.
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