

Implementing and Scaling Evidence-Based STEM and Special Education Instructional Systems in Underserved U.S. School Districts

A Companion Implementation White Paper Centered on Navajo Nation Demonstration Sites with National Scope and Replicability

Dr. Ariel G. Belza

STEM and Special Education Instructional Systems Specialist

Abstract

The United States education system is experiencing a sustained period of academic decline, structural inequity, and workforce instability, particularly in underserved school districts. These challenges have been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and are most acute in rural, tribal, and high-poverty communities. This paper presents a comprehensive implementation framework for scaling evidence-based STEM and special education (SPED) instructional systems, with the Navajo Nation serving as a high-impact demonstration environment. Drawing on national data trends, federal education policy, and established instructional frameworks including the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), and Data-Based Individualization (DBI) the proposed model integrates curriculum coherence, inclusive design, and implementation science principles. The paper outlines a phased implementation strategy, emphasizes teacher capacity-building, and proposes evaluation metrics aligned with outcomes, equity, and fidelity. By situating the model within Indigenous governance structures and addressing systemic barriers such as teacher shortages, service delivery gaps, and infrastructure limitations, the framework offers a scalable and replicable solution with national relevance.

Keywords

STEM education; special education; MTSS; UDL; NGSS; Navajo Nation; rural education; implementation science; educational equity; teacher shortages

1. Introduction

The United States is currently confronting a convergence of educational challenges that threaten long-term academic outcomes, workforce readiness, and national competitiveness. Over the past decade, incremental gains in student achievement have stagnated and, in several domains, reversed entirely. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated this decline,

exposing structural weaknesses in instructional systems and intensifying disparities among student populations.¹

Students in underserved districts including rural, tribal, and high-poverty communities have been disproportionately affected. These environments frequently face overlapping constraints such as limited access to qualified educators, inadequate infrastructure, insufficient instructional resources, and fragmented systems for delivering both general and specialized instruction.² Traditional reform approaches that rely on isolated interventions, short-term programming, or externally driven initiatives have proven insufficient to generate sustained improvements.

This paper advances a systems-level approach to educational reform by presenting a comprehensive and scalable framework for implementing integrated STEM and special education instructional systems. Rather than treating curriculum, intervention, and professional development as separate initiatives, the proposed model conceptualizes them as interdependent components of a coherent instructional system.

The Navajo Nation is positioned as a strategic demonstration site due to its combination of high-need conditions and strong institutional frameworks. Implementation within this context allows for the development of models capable of addressing the most complex barriers to educational equity while generating scalable solutions applicable across the United States.

2. National Problem and Policy Context

2.1 Academic Decline and Learning Loss

National data provide compelling evidence of widespread academic decline. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), Grade 8 mathematics scores declined by eight points between 2019 and 2022, while reading scores declined by three points.³⁻⁴ These losses represent one of the most significant setbacks in decades and reflect systemic disruption rather than isolated fluctuations.

Science achievement trends reinforce this pattern. In 2024, only approximately 31% of Grade 8 students performed at or above proficiency, while 38% scored below basic levels.⁵ These figures indicate that a substantial portion of students lack the foundational skills necessary to engage in higher-level STEM learning.

Importantly, these declines are not temporary anomalies. They reflect deeper systemic issues related to instructional coherence, access to high-quality teaching, and the uneven distribution of educational resources.

2.2 Persistent Inequities in Educational Access

Educational inequities remain deeply entrenched within the U.S. education system. Students in rural and tribal communities face significant barriers, including reduced access to advanced coursework, fewer experienced educators, and limited availability of specialized services.⁶

Infrastructure disparities further compound these challenges. Broadband access has become a foundational requirement for modern education, yet many tribal and rural communities

remain underserved. The U.S. Census Bureau reports that American Indian and Alaska Native populations experience some of the lowest rates of high-speed internet access in the nation.⁷

These inequities create systemic disadvantages that limit both academic achievement and long-term opportunities for affected students.

2.3 Special Education System Pressures

The population of students served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has increased to approximately 7.5 million, representing about 15% of all public school students.⁸ While this reflects progress in identification and access, it also places significant demands on instructional systems.

Federal policy has increasingly emphasized outcomes rather than compliance through initiatives such as Results Driven Accountability (RDA).⁹ This shift requires districts to ensure not only that services are delivered but that they result in measurable improvements in student achievement.

In underserved districts, the challenge is particularly acute, as limited staffing and resources often hinder the consistent delivery of high-quality services.

2.4 Teacher Workforce Crisis

Teacher shortages represent a critical constraint on the effectiveness of educational systems. Estimates suggest that more than 400,000 teaching positions are either unfilled or staffed by individuals who are not fully credentialed.¹⁰

Shortages are especially severe in special education, mathematics, and science fields that are central to the proposed instructional system. High turnover rates, recruitment challenges, and limited professional support further destabilize instructional environments.

Without a stable and well-supported workforce, even the most well-designed instructional systems cannot achieve their intended impact.

2.5 Federal Policy Alignment

Federal policy frameworks increasingly support the adoption of comprehensive, evidence-based instructional systems. The Federal STEM Strategic Plan emphasizes equitable access to high-quality STEM education and the scaling of effective practices.¹¹

Similarly, ESSA promotes the use of evidence-based interventions and encourages systemic approaches to improving educational outcomes. These policy directions create a favorable environment for implementing the type of integrated instructional system proposed in this paper.

3. Strategic Importance of Navajo Nation Demonstration Sites

The selection of an appropriate demonstration environment is critical to the successful development and scaling of any instructional system. In the context of this proposal, the

Navajo Nation represents not merely a local implementation site but a strategically significant, high-impact environment capable of generating insights and models with broad national applicability. Its unique combination of structural challenges and institutional strengths makes it particularly well-suited for testing integrated, evidence-based STEM and special education instructional systems.

3.1 High-Impact Context

The Navajo Nation is the largest federally recognized tribal reservation in the United States, spanning more than 27,000 square miles across Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah.¹² This expansive geographic footprint introduces a level of complexity that is rarely encountered in other educational contexts. Schools within the Navajo Nation operate across multiple state jurisdictions, intersecting with varying policy frameworks, funding mechanisms, and administrative structures.

This geographic scale presents substantial challenges related to coordination, resource distribution, and service delivery. Educational institutions must navigate logistical barriers such as long travel distances, limited transportation infrastructure, and uneven access to centralized resources. These factors complicate the consistent delivery of instruction, particularly in specialized areas such as STEM education and special education services.

However, these very challenges also make the Navajo Nation an exceptionally valuable testing environment for instructional systems designed to operate under complex and resource-constrained conditions. If a system can be implemented successfully within this context where logistical, infrastructural, and workforce challenges are pronounced it is highly likely to be transferable to other underserved districts with similar or less severe constraints.

In this sense, the Navajo Nation functions as a “stress-test environment” for instructional system design. Successful implementation here demonstrates not only effectiveness but also resilience, adaptability, and scalability qualities that are essential for national replication.

3.2 Documented Systemic Challenges

Schools within the Navajo Nation face persistent and well-documented systemic challenges that directly impact educational outcomes. Among the most significant of these are teacher shortages, infrastructure limitations, and gaps in special education service delivery.

Teacher shortages in the region are particularly acute, reflecting broader national trends but intensified by geographic isolation and limited local workforce pipelines. Recruiting and retaining qualified educators especially in high-demand areas such as special education, mathematics, and science remains a significant challenge. High turnover rates further exacerbate this issue, leading to instability in instructional delivery and reduced continuity for students.

Infrastructure limitations also play a critical role. Many schools lack access to modern facilities, instructional materials, and technological resources necessary to support high-quality STEM education. These limitations restrict the ability of educators to implement innovative instructional practices and limit student exposure to advanced learning opportunities.

Perhaps most critically, gaps in special education service delivery have been documented by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), which identified inconsistencies in the provision of services to students with disabilities.¹³ These inconsistencies include incomplete delivery of Individualized Education Program (IEP) services, insufficient documentation, and lack of systematic oversight. Such findings highlight systemic weaknesses that compromise both compliance with federal requirements and the educational outcomes of students.

These challenges underscore the urgent need for instructional systems that ensure consistency, reliability, and accountability. A well-designed system must not only address academic instruction but also strengthen the infrastructure for delivering and monitoring services, particularly for vulnerable student populations.

4. Instructional System Design Framework

The proposed instructional system is grounded in the principle that sustainable educational improvement requires a coherent and integrated alignment of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning. In underserved school districts, where systemic constraints often result in fragmented delivery of instruction, the absence of coherence significantly undermines both implementation fidelity and student outcomes. Rather than addressing instructional challenges through isolated interventions, this framework conceptualizes educational improvement as a coordinated system in which each component reinforces the others.

This systems-based approach is strongly supported by Belza's empirical research, which demonstrates that fragmented instructional systems where curriculum, assessment, and professional development operate independently lead to inconsistent implementation, reduced teacher effectiveness, and diminished student outcomes in underserved districts.²⁶ When instructional elements are misaligned, even high-quality individual components fail to produce sustained impact. Conversely, when these components operate as an integrated system, instructional quality becomes more consistent, scalable, and effective.

Within this framework, six core components are identified as essential to building a high-functioning instructional system: NGSS-aligned STEM curriculum, culturally responsive instruction, Universal Design for Learning, High-Leverage Practices, Multi-Tiered System of Supports, and Data-Based Individualization. Each component addresses a critical dimension of instructional effectiveness while contributing to the overall coherence of the system.

4.1 NGSS-Aligned STEM Curriculum

The foundation of the instructional system is a STEM curriculum aligned with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), which emphasize inquiry-based, three-dimensional learning.¹⁶ This approach represents a significant departure from traditional content-driven instruction by requiring students to actively engage in scientific practices, apply crosscutting concepts, and develop deep understanding of disciplinary core ideas.

In this model, students are not passive recipients of information but active participants in the learning process. They investigate real-world phenomena, construct evidence-based explanations, analyze data, and engage in argumentation. These practices foster critical

thinking, problem-solving, and analytical reasoning skills that are essential for both academic success and workforce readiness.

Belza (2025) further demonstrates that inquiry-driven STEM instruction, particularly when combined with project-based learning, significantly improves student engagement and conceptual mastery in underserved school settings.²⁶ Students exposed to these instructional approaches show measurable gains not only in science but also in mathematics and literacy, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of effective STEM education.

This finding is supported by broader research indicating that inquiry-based science instruction and project-based learning significantly improve conceptual understanding and student engagement, particularly in underserved populations.^{27–28} Project-based learning environments enable students to connect academic content to real-world applications, thereby increasing motivation and retention.

Operationally, NGSS alignment within this system includes the use of phenomena-based lesson design, integration of literacy and numeracy within STEM instruction, and the development of performance-based assessments that measure applied understanding rather than rote memorization. These practices ensure that students develop both the knowledge and skills necessary for long-term academic success.

4.2 Culturally Responsive Instruction

Culturally responsive instruction is a central component of the instructional system, particularly in Indigenous-serving contexts such as the Navajo Nation.¹⁷ This approach recognizes that students learn more effectively when instruction reflects their cultural identities, experiences, and community contexts.

Belza's study specifically emphasizes that Indigenous-serving schools achieve stronger instructional outcomes when local knowledge systems are treated as legitimate sources of scientific inquiry rather than supplementary cultural elements.²⁶ By integrating Indigenous knowledge into STEM instruction, educators can create learning environments that are both academically rigorous and culturally relevant.

This integration has several critical benefits. First, it increases student engagement by making learning more meaningful and connected to students' lived experiences. Second, it strengthens student identity and confidence, particularly for students who may feel marginalized within traditional educational frameworks. Third, it promotes equity by validating diverse ways of knowing and learning.

Research further supports this approach, indicating that culturally responsive instruction enhances participation in STEM pathways and improves academic outcomes for Indigenous students.²⁹ By embedding cultural relevance into the core of instruction, the system ensures that all students have access to meaningful and inclusive learning experiences.

4.3 Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides a framework for ensuring that instruction is accessible to all learners, including those with disabilities and diverse learning needs.¹⁸ UDL is based on the principle that learner variability is the norm rather than the exception, and therefore instructional design must proactively accommodate this variability.

Within this system, UDL is operationalized through the provision of multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression. Students are given opportunities to access content through various formats, demonstrate understanding in different ways, and engage with learning in ways that align with their individual strengths.

The article reinforces that inclusive STEM environments require multiple representations of content and varied modes of expression, allowing students with disabilities to engage meaningfully in complex scientific tasks.³⁰ This approach reduces barriers to learning and ensures that all students can participate fully in rigorous academic instruction.

By embedding accessibility into core instruction, UDL reduces reliance on reactive accommodations and creates inclusive learning environments that benefit all students.

4.4 High-Leverage Practices (HLPs)

High-Leverage Practices (HLPs) provide structured, evidence-based instructional strategies for improving outcomes for students with disabilities.¹⁹ These practices are essential for bridging the gap between general education and special education.

Within the proposed system, HLPs are integrated into daily instructional routines, ensuring that students with disabilities receive consistent, high-quality support. Research cited in the uploaded paper highlights that explicit instruction, formative feedback, and collaborative teaching models are critical for improving outcomes in inclusive classrooms.³¹

These practices include modeling, guided practice, frequent feedback, and structured collaboration between educators. By embedding HLPs into core instruction, the system ensures that all students, regardless of ability, receive effective and equitable educational opportunities.

4.5 Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)

The Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) provides the structural framework for delivering differentiated instruction and interventions based on student need.²⁰ This framework ensures that all students receive appropriate levels of support, ranging from universal instruction to intensive individualized interventions.

The study further notes that MTSS is most effective when integrated with core instruction and supported by consistent progress monitoring and data-informed decision-making.³² This integration allows educators to identify learning gaps early and provide targeted support before those gaps widen.

By aligning MTSS with STEM instruction, the system ensures that students receive comprehensive support across all academic domains.

4.6 Data-Based Individualization (DBI)

Data-Based Individualization (DBI) provides a systematic approach for intensifying interventions for students with persistent learning challenges.²¹ This process involves

continuous assessment, intervention, and adjustment, ensuring that instruction is responsive to individual student needs.

According to the article, DBI is essential for addressing persistent learning gaps, particularly when combined with structured intervention cycles and evidence-based instructional strategies.³³ This approach ensures that even the most complex learning needs are addressed effectively.

5. Implementation Architecture

The effectiveness of any instructional system is ultimately determined not only by its design but by the fidelity and sustainability of its implementation. In underserved districts, implementation challenges are often magnified by structural constraints such as limited staffing, resource scarcity, and high teacher turnover. As such, the proposed instructional system incorporates a carefully structured implementation architecture designed to ensure alignment, adaptability, and long-term sustainability.

5.1 Governance Alignment

Implementation must respect tribal sovereignty and involve community stakeholders.²² In Indigenous-serving contexts such as the Navajo Nation, governance is not merely an administrative consideration but a foundational element of educational legitimacy and sustainability. Educational systems that fail to align with local governance structures risk not only implementation failure but also community resistance and disengagement.

Belza's research emphasizes that successful implementation in Indigenous contexts requires alignment with local governance systems and sustained community engagement.²⁶ This includes collaboration with tribal education authorities, adherence to local policy frameworks, and integration of culturally grounded educational priorities. Governance alignment ensures that instructional reforms are not externally imposed but are co-developed in partnership with the communities they are intended to serve.

Practically, this involves establishing formal mechanisms for stakeholder participation, including consultation with tribal councils, school boards, educators, and families. It also requires sensitivity to Indigenous data sovereignty principles, ensuring that data collection, evaluation, and reporting practices respect community ownership and control.

Moreover, governance alignment enhances implementation fidelity by creating shared accountability. When community stakeholders are actively involved in decision-making processes, they are more likely to support and sustain the instructional system over time. This alignment also facilitates the integration of culturally responsive practices, ensuring that the system reflects both academic standards and community values.

5.2 Phased Implementation

The implementation of complex instructional systems requires a structured and iterative approach. The four-phase model Readiness, Co-Design, Pilot, and Scaling provides a systematic pathway for transitioning from initial planning to full-scale implementation.

Belza's findings reinforce that iterative rollout models are more effective than immediate large-scale adoption, particularly in underserved districts where capacity constraints can undermine implementation efforts.²⁶ Gradual implementation allows for continuous refinement, enabling educators and administrators to identify challenges, adjust strategies, and build institutional capacity before scaling.

The Readiness phase focuses on assessing existing systems, identifying gaps, and establishing baseline conditions. This includes evaluating curriculum alignment, instructional practices, intervention systems, and workforce capacity. By developing a clear understanding of current conditions, districts can prioritize areas for improvement and allocate resources strategically.

The Co-Design phase emphasizes collaboration among educators, administrators, and community stakeholders. During this phase, instructional materials, intervention protocols, and implementation tools are developed in alignment with local context. Co-design is particularly critical in Indigenous-serving districts, where cultural relevance and community input are essential for successful implementation.³⁶

The Pilot Implementation phase involves deploying the system in selected schools or grade levels. This controlled rollout allows for real-time data collection and analysis, enabling educators to refine instructional practices and address emerging challenges. Coaching and professional development are integrated into this phase to support teachers as they adopt new instructional approaches.

Finally, the Scaling phase expands the system to additional schools or districts based on lessons learned during the pilot. This phase includes the development of implementation guides, training materials, and leadership structures to support system-wide adoption.

This phased approach ensures that implementation is both deliberate and adaptive, reducing the risk of failure and increasing the likelihood of sustained success.

5.3 Professional Development

Sustained, job-embedded professional development is essential for effective implementation.²³ Traditional professional development models, which often rely on one-time workshops or external training sessions, have been shown to produce limited impact on instructional practice.

Research consistently demonstrates that professional development is most effective when it is ongoing, collaborative, and directly connected to classroom practice.³⁷ Within the proposed system, professional learning is embedded into the daily work of educators, ensuring that new instructional strategies are continuously reinforced and refined.

Key components of this approach include instructional coaching, professional learning communities (PLCs), and structured feedback cycles. Coaching provides individualized support, enabling teachers to implement new practices with confidence and fidelity. PLCs

create opportunities for collaboration, allowing educators to share experiences, analyze student data, and develop collective solutions to instructional challenges.

Belza's research underscores that professional development must be aligned with curriculum and supported by ongoing mentoring and collaboration to produce meaningful improvements in student outcomes.²⁶ Without this alignment, professional learning initiatives risk becoming disconnected from classroom practice and failing to achieve their intended impact.

5.4 Teacher Capacity-Building

Teacher capacity-building is a central pillar of sustainable instructional improvement. In underserved districts, where workforce instability is often a persistent challenge, building internal expertise is essential for maintaining and scaling instructional systems.

Belza (2025) identifies teacher-centered support systems such as mentoring, coaching, and collaborative professional learning as critical mechanisms for sustaining instructional improvement, particularly in environments characterized by high turnover and resource constraints.²⁶ These systems ensure that knowledge and expertise are distributed across the organization rather than concentrated in a small number of individuals.

Capacity-building efforts focus on developing teacher leaders who can support their peers, facilitate professional learning, and contribute to system-wide improvement. This distributed leadership model enhances organizational resilience, enabling districts to maintain instructional quality even as personnel changes occur.

Furthermore, teacher capacity-building promotes professional ownership and engagement. When educators are actively involved in shaping instructional practices, they are more likely to commit to sustained implementation and continuous improvement.

6. Scaling, Evaluation, and Replicability

The ultimate goal of the instructional system is not only to improve outcomes in individual districts but to create a scalable model that can be adapted and implemented across diverse educational contexts. Achieving this goal requires a comprehensive approach to evaluation, evidence-based intervention, and implementation science.

6.1 Evaluation Framework

Evaluation must include outcomes, fidelity, equity, and instructional coherence.²⁶ While traditional evaluation models often focus primarily on student achievement, this framework recognizes that outcomes are influenced by multiple interrelated factors.

Belza's research expands the evaluation framework by emphasizing the importance of measuring instructional coherence and system alignment.²⁶ Instructional coherence refers to the degree to which curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development are aligned and mutually reinforcing. Without coherence, even well-designed interventions may fail to produce consistent results.

The evaluation framework therefore includes:

- Student Outcomes: Achievement, growth, and skill development
- Implementation Fidelity: Adherence to instructional practices
- Equity Metrics: Performance across demographic groups
- Instructional Coherence: Alignment of system components

This comprehensive approach ensures that evaluation captures both the effectiveness of the system and the quality of its implementation.

6.2 Evidence-Based Interventions

Evidence-based interventions play a critical role in addressing learning gaps and accelerating student progress. Among these, tutoring has emerged as one of the most effective strategies for improving academic outcomes.

Research demonstrates that high-dosage tutoring produces significant gains in student achievement, particularly when it is integrated into the school day and aligned with core instruction.^{24–40} This alignment ensures that tutoring reinforces classroom learning rather than functioning as a disconnected intervention.

Within the proposed system, tutoring is incorporated as part of the broader MTSS framework, providing targeted support for students who require additional instruction. This integration enhances both effectiveness and scalability, ensuring that interventions are delivered consistently and efficiently.

6.3 Implementation Science

Implementation science provides the foundation for scaling the instructional system effectively.²⁵ It emphasizes that successful implementation depends not only on the quality of the intervention but also on the systems and supports that enable its delivery.

Belza's research highlights that scaling depends on maintaining core components while adapting to local contexts.²⁶ This balance between fidelity and flexibility is essential for ensuring that the system remains effective across diverse environments.

Key principles of implementation science include:

- Ongoing training and coaching
- Organizational support and leadership alignment
- Continuous data collection and feedback

These principles ensure that the system can be implemented consistently while remaining responsive to local needs.

6.4 National Replication

The model is designed for adaptation across diverse districts, including rural, tribal, and high-poverty urban settings. Scalability is achieved by standardizing core components while allowing for contextual adaptation.

Belza (2025) concludes that scalable instructional systems must balance standardization with flexibility, ensuring that evidence-based practices are preserved while accommodating local conditions.²⁶⁻⁴² This approach enables districts to implement the system in ways that reflect their unique needs while maintaining alignment with proven strategies.

National replication is further supported by the alignment of the system with federal policy priorities, including STEM education, special education outcomes, and educational equity. By addressing these priorities, the system has the potential to contribute to large-scale improvements in educational outcomes across the United States.

Conclusion

The United States education system is at a critical inflection point, characterized by declining academic performance, persistent inequities, and structural constraints that disproportionately affect underserved communities. As demonstrated throughout this paper, these challenges are not isolated or temporary disruptions but reflect systemic limitations in how instructional systems are designed, implemented, and sustained. Addressing these issues requires a fundamental shift away from fragmented, program-based interventions toward integrated, evidence-based instructional systems capable of producing consistent and scalable outcomes.

This white paper has presented a comprehensive framework for implementing and scaling such systems, grounded in established instructional models including NGSS-aligned STEM education, Universal Design for Learning, Multi-Tiered System of Supports, and Data-Based Individualization and reinforced by implementation science principles. Central to this framework is the recognition that instructional coherence, rather than isolated innovation, is the primary driver of sustainable educational improvement. As supported by Belza's empirical research, systems that align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning are significantly more effective in improving student outcomes, particularly in underserved districts.²⁶

The selection of the Navajo Nation as a demonstration site underscores the practical and strategic strength of this approach. While the region presents substantial challenges including geographic dispersion, infrastructure limitations, workforce shortages, and gaps in service delivery these conditions serve to validate rather than constrain the proposed model. The necessity to operate effectively within such a complex environment ensures that the instructional system is inherently resilient, adaptable, and capable of functioning under real-world constraints. At the same time, the presence of strong governance structures and culturally grounded educational frameworks provides a stable foundation for implementation, ensuring alignment with community priorities and long-term sustainability.¹⁴

Importantly, the implications of this framework extend well beyond the Navajo Nation. The structural challenges addressed in this paper including inequitable access to resources, inconsistent instructional quality, and limited workforce capacity are shared by rural, tribal,

and high-poverty districts across the United States. As such, the successful implementation of this system within a high-need context establishes a compelling precedent for national replication. By balancing standardized, evidence-based components with the flexibility required for local adaptation, the model offers a scalable solution capable of addressing systemic educational disparities on a broader scale.

Furthermore, the integration of evaluation, evidence-based intervention, and implementation science ensures that the system is not only effective but also continuously refined and improved over time. The emphasis on measuring instructional coherence alongside student outcomes provides a more comprehensive understanding of system performance, enabling educators and policymakers to make informed decisions that support sustained improvement.

In conclusion, the framework presented in this paper offers a viable and strategically significant pathway for strengthening educational outcomes in underserved U.S. school districts. By prioritizing coherence, inclusivity, and scalability, it addresses the root causes of educational inequity while aligning with national policy priorities and workforce needs. The successful implementation and replication of this model have the potential to transform instructional systems across diverse contexts, contributing to improved academic achievement, greater equity, and enhanced national competitiveness.

About the Author



Dr. Ariel G. Belza, Ph.D.

STEM and Special Education Instructional Systems Specialist

Dr. Ariel G. Belza is a science educator, researcher, and instructional systems specialist with over 16 years of teaching experience in the United States and the Philippines. He holds a Ph.D. in Development Education and master's degrees in special education and Agricultural Education. Currently serving at Pine Hill Schools in New Mexico, he has extensive experience in STEM instruction, inclusive education, curriculum development, and teacher mentoring. His scholarly work focuses on designing and scaling evidence-based STEM and special education instructional systems to strengthen teacher capacity, advance educational equity, and improve learning outcomes in underserved U.S. school district

ENDNOTES

1. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *The Nation's Report Card: NAEP Results*, U.S. Department of Education.
2. Learning Policy Institute, *Understanding Teacher Shortages: An Analysis of Teacher Supply and Demand in the United States*, Palo Alto, CA.
3. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *NAEP Mathematics Assessment Results, 2022*, U.S. Department of Education.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)

|| ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ||

|| Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ||

|| Volume: 09 | Issue: 10 | Oct- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ||

4. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *NAEP Reading Assessment Results*, 2022, U.S. Department of Education.
5. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *NAEP Science Assessment Results*, 2024, U.S. Department of Education.
6. National Indian Education Association, *The State of Native Education: Policy and Practice*, Washington, D.C.
7. U.S. Census Bureau, *Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2024*, Washington, D.C.
8. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *Students with Disabilities: Condition of Education 2023*, U.S. Department of Education.
9. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), *Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Framework*, Washington, D.C.
10. Learning Policy Institute, *Teacher Shortages in the United States: 2024 Update*, Palo Alto, CA.
11. National Science and Technology Council (NSTC), *Federal Strategic Plan for Advancing STEM Education and Cultivating STEM Talent (2024–2028)*, Executive Office of the President.
12. Navajo Nation Government, *Navajo Nation Geographic and Demographic Data*, Window Rock, AZ.
13. U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), *Indian Education: Actions Needed to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive Special Education Services*, GAO-20-358, Washington, D.C., 2020.
14. Navajo Nation Department of Diné Education, *Educational Policies and Programs Overview*, Window Rock, AZ.
15. Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), *Annual Report and School System Overview*, U.S. Department of the Interior.
16. National Research Council, *Next Generation Science Standards: For States, By States*, National Academies Press, 2013.
17. Castagno, Angelina E., “Strengthening Teaching in Indigenous-Serving Schools: Culturally Responsive Approaches in STEM Education,” *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 2022.
18. CAST, *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines, Version 2.2*, Wakefield, MA.
19. Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), *High-Leverage Practices in Special Education*, Arlington, VA.
20. Regional Educational Laboratory (REL), *Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Framework Overview*, U.S. Department of Education.
21. National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), *Data-Based Individualization: A Framework for Intensive Intervention*, American Institutes for Research.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)

|| ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ||

|| Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ||

|| Volume: 09 | Issue: 10 | Oct- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ||

22. Navajo Nation Council, *Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act of 2005 (CJY-37-05)*, Window Rock, AZ.
23. Darling-Hammond, Linda, et al., *Effective Teacher Professional Development*, Learning Policy Institute, Palo Alto, CA, 2017.
24. Nickow, Andre Joshua, Philip Oreopoulos, and Vincent Quan, *The Impressive Effects of Tutoring on PreK–12 Learning: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis*, National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER Working Paper No. 27476), 2020.
25. Fixsen, Dean L., et al., *Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature*, University of South Florida, 2005.
26. Belza, Ariel G., “Designing and Scaling Evidence-Based STEM and Special Education Instructional Systems to Strengthen Learning Outcomes in Underserved U.S. School Districts,” *International Research Journal of Education and Technology*, Vol. 8, Issue 12, December 2025.
27. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Science Teachers’ Learning: Enhancing Opportunities, Creating Supportive Contexts*, Washington, D.C., 2015.
28. Lucas Education Research, *Project-Based Learning and Student Achievement: Evidence Summary*, George Lucas Educational Foundation.
29. Castagno, Angelina E., *Culturally Responsive Schooling for Indigenous Youth: A Review of the Literature*, Journal of American Indian Education.
30. U.S. Department of Education, *Inclusive STEM Education Guidance*, Washington, D.C., 2025.
31. Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), *Evidence-Based Practices for Students with Disabilities*, Arlington, VA.
32. U.S. Department of Education, *MTSS Implementation Guide*, Washington, D.C.
33. National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), *DBI Implementation Guide*, American Institutes for Research.
34. Navajo Nation Department of Diné Education, *Governance Framework and Educational Policy Guidelines*, Window Rock, AZ.
35. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *The Science of Scaling Educational Interventions*, Washington, D.C., 2025.
36. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Networked Improvement Communities: Building Capacity for Improvement*, Stanford, CA.
37. Darling-Hammond, Linda, et al., *Professional Learning That Improves Teacher Practice*, Learning Policy Institute.
38. National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET), *Instructional Coaching and Teacher Leadership Models*, Washington, D.C.
39. Brown University, *Instructional Coherence and School Improvement Research*, Providence, RI.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)

|| ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ||

|| Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ||

|| Volume: 09 | Issue: 10 | Oct- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ||

40. Nickow, Andre Joshua, Philip Oreopoulos, and Vincent Quan, "The Effects of Tutoring on Student Achievement," *NBER Working Paper Series*, 2020.
41. Fixsen, Dean L., et al., *Active Implementation Frameworks: Research and Practice*, University of South Florida.
42. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Scaling Improvement in Education Systems*, Stanford, CA.