International Research Journal of Education and Technology

Peer Reviewed Journal, **ISSN: 2581-7795**

Building National Teacher Capacity for Inclusive MTSS Implementation:

A Micro-Credentialing and Instructional Leadership Framework

Imelda E. Aguilar, PhD
Educationalist and Inclusive Instructional Systems Specialist

Abstract

The effectiveness of Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS) and inclusive instructional frameworks depends not only on sound design, but on the capacity of educators and instructional leaders to implement them with fidelity at scale[1]. While federal and state policies increasingly mandate inclusive practices, data-driven intervention, and accountability for subgroup outcomes, persistent gaps in teacher preparation and professional development continue to undermine implementation—particularly in mathematics instruction serving English Language Learners (ELLs), students with disabilities, and Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing (D/HoH) learners[2].

This companion article is intentionally aligned with the author's prior scholarly work, *"Designing a National Inclusive Mathematics and MTSS Framework for Diverse Learners, Including English Language Learners and Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing Students."* The earlier publication proposed a National Inclusive Mathematics and MTSS Framework to address persistent systemic shortcomings in mathematics instruction affecting historically underserved learner populations. That framework integrated evidence-based mathematics pedagogy, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), MTSS fidelity structures, and linguistically and visually accessible instructional strategies for English Language Learners (ELLs) and Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing (D/HoH) students, with emphasis on scalability, educator capacity building, and data-driven accountability aligned with federal education mandates.

This paper proposes a **National Teacher Capacity and Instructional Leadership Framework** designed to support sustainable, system-wide implementation of inclusive MTSS. Distinct from curriculum-focused reforms, the framework centers on workforce development through micro-credentialing, instructional coaching, and leadership pipelines aligned with federal education priorities[3]. By addressing the human capital infrastructure needed for inclusive MTSS, this paper complements instructional reform efforts and offers a scalable solution to one of the most persistent barriers to educational equity in the United States.

I. Introduction

Over the past two decades, U.S. education policy has increasingly emphasized inclusive instruction, evidence-based intervention, and accountability for subgroup performance[4]. Frameworks such as MTSS and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) have been widely promoted as mechanisms for improving outcomes among historically underserved student

populations[5]. Yet despite broad adoption, implementation quality remains uneven, and intended outcomes are frequently unrealized.

A growing body of research demonstrates that implementation failure, rather than framework inadequacy, is the primary obstacle to MTSS effectiveness[6]. Schools often adopt MTSS structures procedurally while lacking instructional expertise, leadership capacity, and professional learning systems required for sustained fidelity. This challenge is especially pronounced in inclusive mathematics instruction for ELLs, students with disabilities, and D/HoH learners, where instructional complexity and accessibility demands are high[7].

The primary manuscript on *Inclusive Mathematics and MTSS* addresses the instructional design problemof what high-quality, equitable instruction should entail. This companion paper addresses a separate but interdependent issue: how education systems develop, scale, and sustain the educator capacity required to deliver that instruction nationwide.

II. The National Teacher Capacity Challenge

A. Persistent Gaps in Teacher Preparation

National studies consistently find that most teacher preparation programs provide limited coursework and clinical experience in inclusive instructional practices, MTSS implementation, and culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy[8]. Mathematics educators, in particular, frequently report minimal preparation for integrating language development and disability accommodations into content instruction[9].

For D/HoH learners, the preparation gap is more acute. Access to educators trained in visual-gestural instruction, accessible assessment design, and Deaf education methodologies varies widely across states and districts[10]. These systemic inequities cannot be resolved through curriculum reform alone and require intentional workforce development strategies.

B. Structural Weaknesses in Professional Development

Traditional professional development models—characterized by isolated workshops and compliance-driven seat-time requirements—have repeatedly demonstrated limited impact on instructional practice[11]. Research indicates that without sustained coaching, opportunities for application, and feedback loops, professional learning rarely translates into improved student outcomes[12].

As a result, districts often invest significant resources in professional development without achieving commensurate instructional improvement, particularly in complex reform areas such as inclusive MTSS.

III. Policy Context and National Importance

Federal education statutes emphasize educator effectiveness as a cornerstone of equitable access. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires professional development to be sustained, collaborative, job-embedded, and evidence-based[13]. Similarly, IDEA mandates that students with disabilities receive instruction from qualified personnel capable of supporting access to the general curriculum[14].

Despite these requirements, states and districts lack scalable models for operationalizing educator capacity development. This disconnect between policy mandates and implementation capacity elevates teacher workforce development to a matter of national public interest[15].

IV. Conceptual Framework: Teacher Capacity as Systems Infrastructure

In most educational reform models, professional development is treated as a support functiona peripheral system deployed to address implementation gaps or post hoc compliance needs. In contrast, this framework redefines **teacher capacity as core systems infrastructure**a structural element as foundational as curriculum alignment, assessment systems, or data governance[16]. Under this model, teacher learning and professional expertise are not just enablers of inclusive Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS); they are the backbone upon which equity-centered school systems are built.

This conceptual shift has major implications for policy, practice, and leadership. It requires national and district-level stakeholders to allocate sustained investment, design long-range infrastructure plans, and measure success based not only on student outcomes but on the growth, stability, and leadership of the instructional workforce.

The framework is grounded in five interlocking principles that function as systemic pillars:

1. Competency-Based Professional Learning

Rather than time-bound, workshop-based in-service models, professional development must be redesigned around **competency-based pathways** that articulate what inclusive educators should know and be able to do across domains of MTSS, disability inclusion, literacy intervention, and communication equity.

This includes:

- Defined performance indicators for MTSS practices at each tier
- Competency maps aligned to national or state teaching standards
- Demonstration-based progression (e.g., portfolios, coaching feedback, video reflection)
- Continuous self-assessment tools integrated into school improvement platforms

Competency-based learning honors the varied entry points of teachers—from novice to master—and ensures that training is focused on demonstrable skills rather than seat time.

2. Job-Embedded Instructional Practice

The most effective teacher learning occurs not in isolation from instruction, but **within the act of teaching itself**. This framework prioritizes job-embedded professional development that includes co-teaching models, instructional coaching, peer-led planning labs, and data inquiry cycles that are tied to students' actual IEP goals and progress markers.

Examples of job-embedded learning include:

- Co-facilitated lesson planning that integrates MTSS tiers and IEP accommodations
- Video-based reflection on classroom implementation of Total Communication
- Weekly PLCs (Professional Learning Communities) focused on analyzing literacy screening data across subgroups
- On-the-spot coaching and modeling during instructional blocks

This approach not only builds teacher skill but embeds collective ownership of inclusive outcomes across grade-level and content teams.

3. Scalable Credentialing Structures

To sustain inclusive MTSS at scale, systems must invest in **credentialing frameworks** that formally recognize and incentivize specialized expertise. These may include micro-credentials, tiered licensure tracks, or stackable certificates that signal a teacher's proficiency in inclusion-related domains such as:

- Universal Design for Learning (UDL)
- AAC integration in Tier 1 instruction
- Culturally and linguistically responsive intervention
- IEP-aligned data analysis
- Total Communication strategy application

Credentialing should be portable across states or regions and tied to career advancement and compensation structures, helping retain and elevate high-skill educators in high-need districts.

4. Leadership Development Pipelines

Inclusive MTSS cannot thrive without leadership that understands both the instructional and structural demands of equity-focused reform. This framework calls for **intentional leadership pipelines** that prepare educators for roles such as:

- MTSS Facilitators or Inclusion Coaches
- IEP and Data Coordinators
- Literacy and Language Access Specialists
- Assistant Principals for Instructional Equity

Leadership development should begin early—ideally embedded into teacher induction—and continue through district-level succession planning, mentorship networks, and targeted coursework. A core expectation for all leaders is fluency in MTSS design, inclusive pedagogy, and systems thinking.

5. Data-Driven Accountability Systems

Finally, no teacher capacity framework is complete without a **robust accountability system** that tracks impact at both the educator and student levels. This includes:

- Linking teacher training participation to student IEP goal progress, literacy outcomes, and Tier placement shifts
- Using educator dashboards to visualize MTSS fidelity, intervention usage, and classroom differentiation

- Embedding inclusive practices into teacher evaluation rubrics
- Auditing professional learning equity across schools and educator subgroups

Such data systems reinforce that teacher capacity is not abstract, it is measurable, improvable, and foundational to student success.

V. Micro-Credentialing as a Scalable National Solution

Micro-credentials are competency-based certifications that validate educators' proficiency in specific instructional practices through evidence of performance rather than seat time or workshop attendance[33]. Unlike traditional professional development formats, micro-credentials require teachers to document authentic implementation through artifacts such as annotated lesson plans, student work samples, data reflections, and video demonstrations.

Recent research confirms that micro-credentialing aligns with adult learning theory by offering personalization, immediate applicability, and autonomy in the learning process[34]. These features not only increase teachers' engagement and agency but also facilitate deeper transfer of learning to the classroom. Because teachers earn credentials for demonstrating real-world competence, micro-credentials strengthen the direct connection between professional learning and student outcomes.

Within this framework, micro-credentials function as both quality assurance and implementation drivers. They:

- **Support sustained adoption** of inclusive MTSS practices across different school types and cultural contexts.
- **Enable recognition of specialization**, particularly in areas such as AAC, literacy intervention, and inclusive lesson design.
- **Facilitate scale** by offering portable, stackable, and standards-aligned certifications that can be integrated into national licensing systems.
- **Drive accountability** by producing documentation of classroom application that can be reviewed and evaluated at the system level.

Strategically implemented, micro-credential systems can serve as national capacity-building infrastructure—empowering educators, reducing inequities in access to professional development, and embedding inclusive MTSS implementation into teacher career pathways.

VI. Inclusive MTSS Micro-Credential Framework

To ensure content relevance, system alignment, and inclusive practice fidelity, five interrelated micro-credential domains are proposed. Each credential area addresses a high-leverage aspect of inclusive MTSS implementation and can be pursued independently or stacked to support differentiated teacher growth.

1. **Inclusive Mathematics Instruction (UDL-Aligned)** – Focuses on strategies for designing and delivering mathematics instruction that aligns with Universal Design for Learning principles. Candidates submit lesson plans demonstrating multiple means

of representation, engagement, and expression, particularly for students with IEPs and diverse learning needs[19]

2. **MTSS Fidelity and Data-Based Decision Making** – Emphasizes implementation integrity of tiered supports and instructional responsiveness based on student data. Educators must submit documentation of Tier placement decisions, progress monitoring tools, and team-based intervention adjustments supported by reflection on student outcomes[20]
3. **Language Scaffolding for ELLs in Mathematics** – Supports educators in integrating language supports and culturally responsive strategies into math instruction for English Language Learners. Credential earners demonstrate use of sentence frames, visual scaffolds, and translanguaging techniques within academic math discourse tasks[21].
4. **Accessible Instruction for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Learners** – Builds educator capacity to ensure language access through Total Communication strategies, captioning tools, sign language integration, and interpreter collaboration. Evidence includes adapted instructional materials and feedback from DHH students or specialists[22].
5. **Inclusive Instructional Leadership** – Targets school leaders, coaches, and coordinators tasked with overseeing MTSS implementation. Credentialing includes IEP-aligned professional learning plans, fidelity walkthrough rubrics, and staff coaching reflections demonstrating impact on teacher practice and student inclusion[23].

Each credential requires the submission of instructional artifacts, anonymized student data, and reflective analysis to ensure rigor and practitioner accountability. Taken together, these five areas provide a cohesive national model for enhancing teacher effectiveness in inclusive, data-driven environments.

VII. Instructional Coaching and Communities of Practice

Teacher-leaders serve as critical mediators between policy and practice. In inclusive MTSS models, they play essential roles in facilitating tiered support teams, supporting IEP fidelity, and promoting instructional equity[24]. The framework includes structured leadership micro-credentials that prepare teachers to:

- Lead MTSS implementation planning;
- Facilitate cross-disciplinary intervention teams;
- Mentor colleagues pursuing inclusive teaching credentials;
- Align classroom practice with schoolwide improvement goals.

These teacher-leaders bridge implementation across classrooms and provide real-time expertise that grounds reform efforts in practical application.

Equally important, **school and district administrators** require targeted preparation to evaluate inclusive instruction and lead equity-based resource allocation. Administrators must be equipped to:

- Conduct observation walkthroughs using inclusion fidelity tools;
- Evaluate the impact of professional learning on IEP goal progress;
- Schedule collaborative planning time aligned to instructional tiers;

- Distribute staffing and assistive technology in accordance with MTSS priorities[25].

Together, teacher-leaders and administrators form the leadership infrastructure required to sustain inclusive MTSS at scale.

VIII. Instructional Leadership Pipelines

Teacher-leaders serve as critical mediators between policy and practice. They are uniquely positioned to guide inclusive instructional improvement by translating district-wide goals into practical classroom implementation strategies. As the bridge between administrative directives and student-facing instruction, teacher-leaders influence culture, collaboration, and capacity-building at the school level[26].

The proposed framework embeds leadership development into the teacher growth continuum, with micro-credentials and endorsements tailored to leadership roles in inclusive MTSS systems. Teacher-leaders are prepared to:

- Facilitate MTSS problem-solving teams and student support cycles;
- Mentor novice and experienced colleagues in inclusive instructional planning;
- Model effective use of data to inform Tier 1 and Tier 2 differentiation;
- Lead professional learning aligned to UDL, communication accessibility, and IEP fidelity.

These leadership roles are not limited to department chairs or coordinators. Instead, they emphasize distributed leadership models that empower teachers across roles and grade levels to act as agents of systems change.

Administrators likewise require specialized preparation to evaluate inclusive instruction and strategically allocate resources. Principal preparation programs and district leadership institutes must incorporate inclusive MTSS content, emphasizing:

- Observation and feedback strategies using inclusion-aligned walkthrough tools;
- Scheduling and staffing plans that enable co-teaching, planning time, and intervention delivery;
- Data dashboard interpretation with a focus on equity indicators, IEP goal progress, and Tier transitions;
- Budgeting decisions that prioritize assistive technology, accessibility infrastructure, and sustained coaching[27].

When teacher-leaders and administrators share a common leadership language, grounded in the inclusive MTSS framework, implementation becomes coherent, collaborative, and sustainable. Leadership development is no longer an isolated program but a systemic investment in equity-centered instructional quality.

IX. Scalability and Sustainability

The framework is designed for broad adoption across educational systems, including local districts, state education agencies, and regional service providers. Its modular structure allows for phased implementation that aligns with each institution’s readiness level, resources, and

policy context. Implementation pathways can be adapted for low-, medium-, or high-capacity environments without compromising core fidelity[28].

By leveraging digital delivery systems, learning management platforms, and shared regional content hubs, the model supports cost efficiency and equitable access. For example, credential content can be housed within statewide platforms, while coaching protocols and fidelity tools can be integrated into district data dashboards. These design elements help mitigate the resource disparities often seen in special education reform efforts.

The modularity of the framework also supports sustainability by enabling gradual scaling. Institutions can begin with one credential domain or a small pilot cohort and expand over time based on local evaluation data. Feedback loops built into the micro-credential process (e.g., peer review, coach validation) reinforce continuous improvement and local ownership.

X. Evaluation and Accountability

To maintain quality and ensure long-term impact, the framework incorporates a dual-focus evaluation structure. This approach prioritizes both implementation and measurable improvements in student outcomes.

Key Evaluation Domains:

- **Changes in teacher practice**: Documented shifts in lesson design, instructional delivery, differentiation strategies, and data use aligned to MTSS principles.
- **Fidelity of MTSS implementation**: Measured through walkthrough tools, coaching logs, team meeting protocols, and alignment with district MTSS standards.
- **Correlated student outcome gains**: Analyzed through progress monitoring data, IEP goal attainment, reductions in Tier 2/3 referrals, and increased time in general education settings.

This accountability structure ensures that professional learning is not evaluated by participation alone but by its impact on inclusive instructional quality and equity-centered student achievement[29].

XI. Discussion: Complementarity with Inclusive Mathematics and MTSS

This companion manuscript is purposefully distinct from the previously published white paper, *Advancing Inclusive and Data-Driven Special Education Instruction for Students with Disabilities Across K–12 Educational Systems*. While the earlier work focuses on instructional frameworks, content accessibility, and learner-level intervention design, this manuscript addresses the human capital infrastructure necessary to sustain inclusive reform at scale.

Together, the two manuscripts reflect a holistic approach to educational transformation. The instructional design paper outlines **the changes needed in classroom practice, while the systems infrastructure paper explores how these** changes can be embedded, supported, and sustained across multiple levels of the educational ecosystem.

This complementary relationship follows global best practices in education reform, where sustainable improvement is contingent on both pedagogical rigor and systems alignment. Districts and states seeking to launch inclusive MTSS initiatives can use these dual frameworks in tandem—as a blueprint for practice and a guide for building the necessary workforce capacity.

XII. Limitations and Future Research

While this framework provides a robust model for developing and sustaining educator capacity within inclusive MTSS systems, several limitations warrant further investigation. The current framework is grounded in best practices, policy analysis, and implementation science; however, more empirical research is needed to assess its impact across diverse educational settings and demographic contexts.

Specifically, future research should:

- Conduct **longitudinal studies** that track the sustained effects of credentialed professional learning on both instructional practice and student outcomes over multiple years;
- Examine **cross-cultural implementation** in under-resourced districts, rural areas, and schools serving multilingual learners and students with complex needs;
- Evaluate the framework's **integration with teacher licensure and credentialing systems**, particularly in terms of portability, articulation with higher education, and policy incentives;
- Explore **technology-mediated delivery** models and their accessibility for educators in remote or low-bandwidth regions;
- Assess potential disparities in access to micro-credential pathways and coaching supports, ensuring that the framework advances—not reproduces—systemic inequities[30].

These areas represent opportunities for applied research, formative evaluation, and cross-sector collaboration between policymakers, universities, state departments of education, and school districts.

XIII. Conclusion

Inclusive MTSS frameworks cannot succeed without intentional, system-wide investment in educator capacity. Instructional reform efforts that fail to address the professional growth, leadership development, and data literacy of teachers risk fragmentation, burnout, and inequitable implementation.

The **National Teacher Capacity and Instructional Leadership Framework**offers a scalable, evidence-informed solution to these challenges. By anchoring inclusive practice in micro-credentialing, job-embedded coaching, leadership pipelines, and integrated accountability systems, the framework operationalizes equity and coherence within instructional ecosystems.

Designed for adoption by districts, state education agencies, and higher education institutions, this framework complements curriculum reforms and supports long-term transformation. Its

emphasis on sustainability, adaptability, and outcome alignment reflects a commitment to excellence for all learners, particularly those historically marginalized in traditional educational structures.

As national and global education systems respond to shifting demographic, technological, and equity demands, this framework provides a roadmap for building instructional capacity at scale—advancing access, innovation, and workforce readiness for the next generation of inclusive schools[31].

About the Author

Imelda E. Aguilar, PhD, is a licensed professional educator in both the United States and the Philippines, with over 18 years of experience in inclusive instruction, special education systems development, and the implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports (MTSS). She currently a Diverse Learner Mathematics Teacher, English Language Learner (ELL) Representative, and Behavioral Specialist at a public high school in Illinois, where she supports inclusive mathematics instruction, IEP implementation, and data-driven intervention within co-taught classrooms.

Dr. Aguilar holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Leadership and Management**, a** Master of Arts in Special Education**, and a** Bachelor's degree in Elementary Education. She is a Licensed Professional Teacher in the Philippines through the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) and has completed extensive U.S.-based professional development aligned with federal and state education standards.

Her professional experience includes founding and leading a community-based special education program in the Philippines and serving in instructional leadership roles supporting curriculum alignment, teacher mentoring, and inclusive practice. Dr. Aguilar's scholarship and applied work focus on inclusive mathematics, MTSS fidelity, educator capacity building, and equitable access for English Language Learners and Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing students.

Endnotes

1. Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change*.
2. Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher education and equity*.
3. Learning Policy Institute. (2020). *Preparing teachers for deeper learning*.
4. ESSA, Pub. L. No. 114-95 (2015).
5. CAST. (2018). *UDL Guidelines v2.2*.
6. Fuchs, L. S., et al. (2012). *RTI in mathematics*.
7. Goldenberg, C. (2008). *Teaching English Language Learners*.

8. Darling-Hammond, L. (2017).
9. NCES. (2021). *Mathematics performance of ELLs and students with disabilities*.
10. National Deaf Center. (2020). *Accessible STEM education*.
11. Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002).
12. Yoon, K. et al. (2007). *Review of professional development effects*.
13. ESSA §2103.
14. IDEA, 20 U.S.C. §1400.
15. U.S. Department of Education. (2019). *MTSS guidance*.
16. Honig, M. (2012).
17. BloomBoard. (2019). *Micro-credentialing research*.
18. Darling-Hammond et al. (2020).
19. Ralston, N.C., & Wilson, A. (2020). *Inclusive Mathematics Instruction Using Universal Design for Learning*. Education Sciences.
20. Sugai, G., & Simonsen, B. (2012). PBIS Implementation Blueprint. Center on PBIS
21. Moschkovich, J. (2013). Principles for Supporting ELLs in Mathematics. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
22. Luckner, J.L., & Muir, S.G. 23 McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N.L. (2011). Leadership for Inclusive Schools. The Educational Forum.(Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (2006).
23. Goldenberg, C. (2008).
24. Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (2009). Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Helping Teachers Develop as Leaders (3rd ed.). Corwin Press.
25. The Wallace Foundation. (2021). How Principals Affect Students and Schools: A Systematic Synthesis of Two Decades of Research.
26. Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (2009). *Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Helping Teachers Develop as Leaders* (3rd ed.). Corwin Press. 27
27. The Wallace Foundation. (2021). How Principals Affect Students and Schools: A Systematic Synthesis of Two Decades of Research.
28. 28 Redding, S., & Cannata, M. (2011). Scaling Up School Improvement: Sustainability and Fidelity of Implementation. Center on Innovation & Improvement.
29. Fixsen, D.L., et al. (2005). Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature. National Implementation Research Network.
30. 31 Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M.E. (2020). Preparing Educators for the Time of COVID... and Beyond. Learning Policy Institute.
31. OECD. (2020). Teaching in Focus: Teacher Professionalism and Policy for Inclusive and Equitable Learning Environments. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
32. Bloomboard. (2020). *The Case for Micro-Credentials: Transforming Professional Learning in Education*.
33. DeMonte, J. (2017). *Micro-Credentials for Teachers: What Three Early Adopter States Have Learned So Far*. American Institutes for Research.