ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Efficacy of Research-Based Practices and Therapeutic Interventions in Enhancing Academic Outcomes for Learners with Disabilities

Ms. Priyanka Yadav

Abstract

Background: Students with disabilities often struggle to achieve academic success despite receiving traditional educational services. This study examined the effectiveness of integrated research-based educational practices and therapeutic interventions on academic outcomes for learners with disabilities.

Methods: A mixed-methods study was conducted with 245 students with disabilities aged 8-16 years across three metropolitan school districts over 18 months. Participants included students with specific learning disabilities (42%), autism spectrum disorders (28%), intellectual disabilities (18%), and multiple disabilities (12%). The intervention group (n=127) received integrated research-based educational practices and therapeutic interventions, while the comparison group (n=118) received typical educational services. Academic performance was measured using standardized assessments, curriculum-based measurements, and IEP goal attainment. Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews and focus groups.

Results: Students receiving integrated interventions demonstrated significantly superior academic outcomes across all domains. The intervention group achieved mean academic gains of 13.7 points compared to 3.3 points in the comparison group, with large effect sizes in reading comprehension (d=1.07), mathematical reasoning (d=1.02), and written expression (d=0.95). A dose-response relationship was observed, with high-intensity therapeutic services (≥3 sessions/week) producing the largest gains (d=1.34). Qualitative findings revealed enhanced student engagement, improved self-regulation skills, and effective collaborative professional practices.

Conclusions: Integrated research-based educational practices and therapeutic interventions significantly enhanced academic outcomes for learners with disabilities. The findings support

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

a paradigm shift toward collaborative, comprehensive service delivery models that address the interconnected nature of learning and development in students with disabilities.

Keywords: special education, therapeutic interventions, research-based practices, academic outcomes, integrated services

*Ms. Priyanka Yadav, Assistant Professor, Department of Special Education, Faculty of Education, SGT University, Gurugram, Haryana, India

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Introduction

A. Background of the Study

The educational landscape for learners with disabilities has undergone significant transformation over the past several decades, driven by legislative mandates, evolving pedagogical understanding, and mounting empirical evidence supporting inclusive educational practices. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2023), approximately 14% of all public school students in the United States receive special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), representing over 7 million students with diverse learning needs and challenges. This substantial population encompasses a wide spectrum of disabilities, including specific learning disabilities (33% of all students with disabilities), autism spectrum disorders (11%), intellectual disabilities (7%), emotional disturbances (5%), and multiple disabilities (2%), among others (U.S. Department of Education, 2022).

The diversity within this population extends beyond categorical classifications, encompassing varying degrees of severity, co-occurring conditions, and individualized support requirements. Students with disabilities present unique combinations of strengths and challenges that necessitate differentiated instructional approaches and comprehensive support systems. Research consistently demonstrates that these learners can achieve meaningful academic progress when provided with appropriate evidence-based interventions, accommodations, and therapeutic support services (Browder et al., 2014; Test et al., 2009).

The principle of inclusive education has emerged as a cornerstone of contemporary special education philosophy, emphasizing the fundamental right of all students to receive quality education in the least restrictive environment alongside their typically developing peers. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006) articulates this commitment globally, while national legislation such as IDEA and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act provides the legal framework for ensuring equitable educational opportunities in the United States. Research supporting inclusive practices has demonstrated positive outcomes not only for students with disabilities but also for their non-disabled peers, fostering environments of acceptance, understanding, and mutual support (Ruijs & Peetsma, 2009).

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Central to the success of inclusive education is the implementation of evidence-based interventions that bridge the gap between research and practice. The field of special education has increasingly emphasized the importance of utilizing interventions with demonstrated efficacy through rigorous scientific inquiry. This research-to-practice paradigm ensures that educational decisions are grounded in empirical evidence rather than tradition, intuition, or convenience (Cook & Cook, 2013). Evidence-based practices encompass a broad range of instructional strategies, behavioral interventions, assistive technologies, and therapeutic approaches that have been systematically evaluated and shown to produce positive outcomes for learners with disabilities.

B. Problem Statement

As demonstrated by stagnant NAEP scores, persistent academic achievement gaps between students with and without disabilities continue to be a significant challenge. Systemic problems, such as the uneven implementation of therapeutic interventions and research-based practices in classrooms, are the cause of these disparities (National Centre for Education Statistics, 2022). Due to obstacles like insufficient professional development and scarce resources, there is a notable research-to-practice gap (Boardman et al., 2005). Additionally, student progress is frequently hampered by disjointed service delivery and a lack of coordination between therapeutic and educational interventions (Ruppar et al., 2016). Additionally, students are unable to fully benefit from research-validated approaches due to the inconsistent quality and fidelity of intervention implementation (Durlak & DuPre, 2008).

C. Purpose of the Study

The effectiveness of therapeutic interventions and research-based teaching strategies in improving academic results for students with disabilities is thoroughly evaluated in this study. In order to offer practical suggestions for maximising their delivery in educational settings, it uses a mixed-methods design to examine the statistical efficacy as well as implementation factors of these approaches.

D. Research Questions / Hypotheses

- **RQ1:** What is the impact of research-based educational practices on academic outcomes of learners with disabilities?

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

- **RQ2:** How do therapeutic interventions contribute to academic performance in this population?
- Hypothesis: Learners with disabilities who receive integrated research-based and therapeutic interventions perform significantly better academically than those who do not.

E. Significance of the Study

Because it offers empirical support for successful interventions for students with disabilities, this study is important for researchers, educators, and policymakers. It assists therapists in integrating their services with educational programs and provides educators with useful advice on evidence-based teaching practices. The study advances the theoretical knowledge of implementation science in education and provides policymakers with information for resource allocation and policy development. By ensuring that students with disabilities receive excellent, research-validated support, this work ultimately seeks to improve their academic results and life trajectories.

Literature Review

A. Theoretical Framework

Understanding learning in students with disabilities requires multiple theoretical perspectives. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory emphasizes social interaction and mediated learning, while behaviorist and cognitive theories provide frameworks for systematic instructional interventions (Vygotsky, 1978; Swanson et al., 2014). Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory highlights the importance of coordinated support across home, school, and community settings (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006).

B. Research-Based Educational Practices

Contemporary special education emphasizes evidence-based practices demonstrating measurable student improvements. Differentiated instruction modifies content, process, products, and learning environment based on student readiness, interests, and learning profiles, significantly improving academic achievement when implemented with fidelity (Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2010; Bondie et al., 2019).

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides a comprehensive framework for inclusive learning environments through multiple means of representation, engagement, and action/expression (CAST, 2018). Meta-analytic research revealed moderate to large effect sizes for UDL interventions across disability categories (Ok et al., 2017).

Explicit instruction breaks complex skills into manageable components through clear objectives, modeling, guided practice, and independent application (Hughes et al., 2017). Research consistently demonstrates effectiveness for students with learning disabilities, particularly in reading and mathematics (Stevens et al., 2018).

Assistive technology, from graphic organizers to text-to-speech software, significantly reduces learning barriers when matched to specific student needs with adequate training (Bouck & Flanagan, 2010; Flanagan et al., 2013).

C. Therapeutic Interventions

Speech-language therapy addresses communication disorders through phonological awareness training, vocabulary instruction, and social communication interventions. Intensive services integrated with educational programming significantly improve communication skills and academic outcomes (Justice et al., 2018; Ukrainetz, 2015).

Occupational therapy develops skills necessary for academic participation, targeting fine motor skills, sensory processing, and executive functioning deficits. Services delivered within educational contexts enhance classroom participation and academic performance (Case-Smith & O'Brien, 2015; Cahill & Beisbier, 2020).

Cognitive-behavioral interventions teach self-regulation strategies, problem-solving skills, and coping mechanisms, improving both academic outcomes and emotional well-being (Lenz & Deshler, 2004; Regan et al., 2015).

Social-emotional learning (SEL) programs develop emotion management, goal-setting, empathy, and relationship skills through CASEL's five core competencies framework. Meta-analytic research demonstrates significant academic achievement improvements, particularly for students with disabilities (Durlak et al., 2011; Sklad et al., 2012).

D. Evidence of Efficacy

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Meta-analytic research provides robust evidence for research-based practices and therapeutic interventions effectiveness. Cook et al. (2015) identified evidence-based practices across disability categories, highlighting intensive, individualized interventions delivered with high fidelity. Multi-component interventions produce superior outcomes compared to single-strategy approaches (Gersten et al., 2020), though research limitations include implementation inconsistencies and limited long-term follow-up data (Odom et al., 2005).

Methodology

A. Research Design

In order to give a comprehensive picture of the impact of therapeutic interventions on academic outcomes for students with disabilities, this study combined a qualitative phenomenological investigation with a quantitative pre-post intervention analysis. In order to provide a more thorough understanding of the effectiveness of the intervention, this design captured both the quantifiable academic gains and the complex experiences of teachers, therapists, and students (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Ivankova et al., 2006; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010).

B. Population and Sample

The study population comprised 245 students with disabilities aged 8-16 years enrolled in inclusive educational settings across three metropolitan school districts. Participants represented diverse disability categories including specific learning disabilities (42%), autism spectrum disorders (28%), intellectual disabilities (18%), and multiple disabilities (12%). The sample was recruited from 15 elementary and middle schools serving socioeconomically diverse communities.

A stratified random sampling technique was employed to ensure proportional representation across disability categories and grade levels (Cohen et al., 2018). The intervention group consisted of 127 students, while the comparison group included 118 students matched on key demographic variables including age, disability type, and baseline academic performance. Additionally, 34 special education teachers, 21 related service therapists, and 45 general education teachers participated in the qualitative component through purposive sampling.

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

C. Data Collection Methods

Academic performance data were collected through multiple sources over an 18-month period. Pre- and post-intervention academic metrics included standardized test scores (state achievement assessments), curriculum-based measurements, and individualized education program (IEP) goal attainment rates. Weekly intervention implementation logs documented fidelity and dosage of therapeutic services delivered.

Qualitative data collection involved semi-structured interviews with teachers and therapists at three time points: baseline, mid-intervention (9 months), and post-intervention (18 months). Focus groups with students were conducted to capture their perspectives on intervention experiences and perceived academic benefits. Structured classroom observations using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) were conducted monthly to assess instructional quality and student engagement (Pianta et al., 2012).

D. Instruments and Tools

The study utilized several validated assessment instruments. Academic achievement was measured using the Woodcock-Johnson IV Tests of Achievement and district-administered standardized assessments. The Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function (BRIEF-2) assessed cognitive and behavioral regulation improvements (Gioia et al., 2015). Teacher perceptions were captured through the Teacher Efficacy for Inclusive Practices (TEIP) scale.

Intervention fidelity was monitored using researcher-developed implementation checklists based on evidence-based practice guidelines from the Council for Exceptional Children. Qualitative data collection employed semi-structured interview protocols developed through expert review and pilot testing with similar populations.

E. Data Analysis Procedures

Quantitative analyses were conducted using SPSS version 28.0. Descriptive statistics characterized sample demographics and baseline measures. Repeated measures ANOVA examined pre-post changes in academic outcomes, with effect sizes calculated using Cohen's d. Multiple regression analyses identified predictors of intervention success while controlling for covariates including baseline performance, disability severity, and socioeconomic status (Field, 2018).

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Qualitative data analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis framework. Interview transcripts were coded independently by two researchers, with inter-rater reliability achieving 87% agreement. Codes were organized into themes through iterative analysis and constant comparison methods. Data triangulation involved comparing quantitative outcomes with qualitative themes to identify convergent and divergent findings.

F. Ethical Considerations

The study received approval from the university's Institutional Review Board and participating school districts' research committees prior to implementation. Informed consent was obtained from all adult participants, while parental consent and student assent were secured for minor participants. All data were de-identified and stored on encrypted servers with access limited to authorized research personnel.

Confidentiality protocols ensured that individual student and teacher identities remained protected throughout data collection, analysis, and dissemination. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time without penalty, and data destruction procedures were established for post-study completion.

Results/Findings

This chapter presented the findings from the mixed-methods study examining the efficacy of research-based educational practices and therapeutic interventions on academic outcomes for learners with disabilities. The analysis addressed two primary research questions and tested the hypothesis that integrated interventions yielded superior academic performance. Data were collected over an 18-month period from 245 students with disabilities across three metropolitan school districts, employing both quantitative pre-post intervention analysis and qualitative phenomenological investigation.

A. Participant Demographics and Baseline Characteristics

The study sample comprised 245 students with disabilities aged 8-16 years ($M = 11.8$, $SD = 2.3$), with 127 students in the intervention group and 118 in the comparison group. Table 4.1 presented the demographic distribution across disability categories, grade levels, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Table 4.1: Participant Demographics and Baseline Characteristics

Characteristic	Intervention Group (n=127)	Comparison Group (n=118)	Total Sample (n=245)
Age (Mean ± SD)	11.7 ± 2.4	11.9 ± 2.2	11.8 ± 2.3
Gender			
Male	74 (58.3%)	67 (56.8%)	141 (57.6%)
Female	53 (41.7%)	51 (43.2%)	104 (42.4%)
Disability Category			
Specific Learning Disabilities	54 (42.5%)	49 (41.5%)	103 (42.0%)
Autism Spectrum Disorders	36 (28.3%)	33 (28.0%)	69 (28.2%)

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Intellectual Disabilities	23 (18.1%)	21 (17.8%)	44 (18.0%)
Multiple Disabilities	14 (11.1%)	15 (12.7%)	29 (11.8%)
Grade Level			
Elementary (K-5)	76 (59.8%)	71 (60.2%)	147 (60.0%)
Middle School (6-8)	51 (40.2%)	47 (39.8%)	98 (40.0%)

Baseline academic performance measures indicated no significant differences between groups in reading comprehension ($t = 0.847$, $p = .398$), mathematical reasoning ($t = 1.234$, $p = .219$), or written expression ($t = -0.692$, $p = .490$), confirming successful matching procedures.

B. Research Question 1: Impact of Research-Based Educational Practices

The first research question examined the impact of research-based educational practices on academic outcomes of learners with disabilities. Repeated measures ANOVA revealed statistically significant improvements across all academic domains for students receiving research-based interventions.

Table 4.2: Pre-Post Academic Achievement Scores by Intervention Type

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Academic Domain	Group	Pre-test M(SD)	Post-test M(SD)	Mean Difference	Cohen's d	p-value
Reading Comprehension	Intervention	78.4 (12.6)	91.2 (11.8)	+12.8	1.07	< .001
	Comparison	79.1 (13.2)	82.6 (12.9)	+3.5	0.27	.182
Mathematical Reasoning	Intervention	74.8 (14.3)	88.9 (13.1)	+14.1	1.02	< .001
	Comparison	75.2 (14.8)	78.4 (14.2)	+3.2	0.22	.298
Written Expression	Intervention	72.1 (15.7)	86.3 (14.2)	+14.2	0.95	< .001
	Comparison	71.8 (16.1)	75.1 (15.8)	+3.3	0.21	.341

Figure 4.1: Academic Achievement Gains by Group

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Students in the intervention group demonstrated substantial academic gains with large effect sizes across all domains (Cohen's d > 0.95), while the comparison group showed minimal improvements. The intervention group's reading comprehension scores increased by 12.8 points ($p < .001$), mathematical reasoning by 14.1 points ($p < .001$), and written expression by 14.2 points ($p < .001$).

C. Research Question 2: Contribution of Therapeutic Interventions

The second research question investigated how therapeutic interventions contributed to academic performance. Analysis revealed that students receiving integrated therapeutic services alongside educational interventions achieved significantly higher academic outcomes than those receiving educational interventions alone.

Table 4.3: Academic Performance by Therapeutic Intervention Intensity

Therapeutic Intensity	n	Reading Gains M(SD)	Math Gains M(SD)	Writing Gains M(SD)	Overall Effect Size
High Intensity (≥3 sessions/week)	42	16.2 (8.4)	17.8 (9.1)	18.4 (7.9)	1.34
Moderate Intensity (2 sessions/week)	51	12.4 (7.6)	13.1 (8.2)	12.8 (8.7)	0.98
Low Intensity (1 session/week)	34	8.7 (6.9)	9.3 (7.4)	9.1 (6.8)	0.67

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Educational Only (No Therapy)	118	3.5 (5.2)	3.2 (4.8)	3.3 (5.1)	0.23

Figure 4.2: Academic Progress Over Time by Intervention Type

A dose-response relationship was observed between therapeutic intervention intensity and academic outcomes. Students receiving high-intensity therapeutic services (≥3 sessions/week) demonstrated the largest academic gains (effect size d = 1.34), while those receiving educational interventions alone showed minimal improvement (effect size d = 0.23).

D. Hypothesis Testing

The primary hypothesis stated that learners with disabilities who receive integrated research-based and therapeutic interventions perform significantly better academically than those who do not. This hypothesis was strongly supported by the data.

Table 4.4: Hypothesis Testing Results - Between-Group Comparisons

Comparison	F-statistic	df	p-value	Effect Size (η^2)	Result
Integrated vs. Educational Only	47.82	1,243	< .001	0.164	Supported
Reading Achievement	52.14	1,243	< .001	0.177	Supported

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

Mathematical Reasoning	43.67	1,243	< .001	0.152	Supported
Written Expression	39.28	1,243	< .001	0.139	Supported

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) revealed significant differences between groups (Wilks' $\lambda = 0.721$, $F(3,241) = 31.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.279$). Post-hoc analyses confirmed that students receiving integrated interventions significantly outperformed comparison group students across all academic measures.

E. Qualitative Findings

Thematic analysis of interviews and focus groups identified five major themes regarding intervention effectiveness:

- **Enhanced Student Engagement:** Teachers reported substantial increases in student motivation and classroom participation. One special education teacher noted: *"Students who received both educational and therapeutic support showed remarkable improvements in their willingness to attempt challenging tasks and persist through difficulties."*
- **Improved Self-Regulation Skills:** Occupational and speech therapists observed significant improvements in students' executive functioning and emotional regulation. A participating therapist stated: *"The integration of therapeutic strategies into daily instruction created a more supportive environment where students could practice and generalize their newly acquired skills."*
- **Collaborative Professional Practices:** Educators emphasized the value of interdisciplinary collaboration in intervention planning and implementation. General education teachers reported increased confidence in supporting students with disabilities when therapeutic professionals provided consultation and co-teaching support.

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

F. Implementation Fidelity and Dosage Effects

Analysis of intervention implementation logs revealed high fidelity rates across participating schools (M = 87.6%, SD = 8.9%). Multiple regression analysis identified intervention dosage as the strongest predictor of academic outcomes ($\beta = 0.634$, $p < .001$), followed by implementation fidelity ($\beta = 0.289$, $p < .01$) and baseline academic performance ($\beta = 0.187$, $p < .05$).

FINDINGS AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

A. Summary of Major Findings

This mixed-methods study provided compelling evidence that research-based educational practices and therapeutic interventions significantly enhanced academic outcomes for learners with disabilities. Students receiving integrated interventions demonstrated substantial improvements across all academic domains, with effect sizes exceeding Cohen's benchmarks for large effects ($d > 0.95$). The intervention group achieved mean academic gains of 13.7 points compared to 3.3 points in the comparison group, representing a four-fold advantage that confirmed the superior efficacy of evidence-based approaches.

The investigation revealed a clear dose-response relationship between therapeutic intervention intensity and academic outcomes. Students receiving high-intensity therapeutic services (≥3 sessions per week) achieved the largest academic gains ($d = 1.34$), while those receiving educational interventions alone showed minimal improvement ($d = 0.23$). The primary hypothesis that learners with disabilities receiving integrated interventions would perform significantly better academically was strongly supported (Wilks' $\lambda = 0.721$, $F(3,241) = 31.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.279$).

Qualitative findings revealed three critical mechanisms through which therapeutic interventions contributed to academic success: enhanced executive functioning and self-regulation skills, improved fine and gross motor abilities supporting writing and mathematical manipulations, and strengthened communication and social skills facilitating classroom participation.

ISSN NO: 2583-7842 (Online)
Gateway International Journal of Innovative Research
Volume 4, Issue 4, December, 2025, pp 164-184

B. Educational Implications

- **Classroom Practice:** Teachers should prioritize implementing research-based practices with high fidelity, as implementation quality was a strong predictor of student outcomes ($\beta = 0.289$, $p < .01$). Specific recommendations included utilizing explicit instruction protocols, integrating multi-sensory approaches, implementing systematic progress monitoring, and collaborating closely with therapeutic professionals to ensure coordinated intervention delivery.
- **Related Service Delivery:** The dose-response findings supported more intensive therapeutic service delivery models. Therapeutic professionals should increase service intensity, focus on academic skill transfer, implement collaborative consultation models, and utilize data-driven decision making to optimize student outcomes.
- **Administrative Considerations:** School administrators should invest in professional development for evidence-based practices, restructure service delivery models toward collaborative approaches, allocate resources for comprehensive assessment and intervention materials, and establish systems for monitoring implementation fidelity.
- **IEP Development:** Teams should develop integrated goals reflecting interconnected academic and therapeutic objectives, determine appropriate service intensity based on dose-response evidence, plan for collaborative service delivery, and include multiple outcome measures addressing both academic and therapeutic domains.

C. Policy Implications

The findings supported increased funding for related services, professional development initiatives, and collaborative service delivery models. Policy recommendations included establishing implementation fidelity standards, requiring evidence-based practice implementation, and developing comprehensive outcome measures for accountability systems.

D. Future Research and Limitations

Future research should examine long-term intervention effects, conduct cost-effectiveness analyses, investigate technology-enhanced interventions, and address cultural and linguistic diversity. Study limitations included geographic sample concentration, reliance on

standardized assessments, implementation variations across settings, and ethical constraints preventing true control group comparisons.

E. Conclusion

The study's findings demonstrated that integrated research-based educational practices and therapeutic interventions produced superior academic outcomes for learners with disabilities. The large effect sizes and dose-response relationships provided empirical guidance for evidence-based service delivery decisions. These results supported a paradigm shift from isolated interventions toward collaborative, integrated approaches that addressed the complex, interconnected nature of learning and development in students with disabilities, ultimately maximizing their academic and personal potential.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Boardman, A. G., Arguelles, M. E., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., & Klingner, J. (2005). Special education teachers' views of research-based practices. *Journal of Special Education*, 39(3), 168-180.
- Bondie, R. S., Dahnke, C., & Zusho, A. (2019). How does changing "one-size-fits-all" to differentiated instruction affect teaching? *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1), 336-362.
- Bouck, E. C., & Flanagan, S. M. (2010). Virtual manipulatives: What they are and how teachers can use them. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 45(3), 186-191.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 793-828). John Wiley & Sons.
- Browder, D. M., Wakeman, S. Y., Close, S., & Flowers, C. (2014). Teaching students with significant cognitive disabilities to participate in performance-based assessments. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 39(1), 3-13.
- Cahill, S. M., & Beisbier, S. (2020). Occupational therapy practice guidelines for children and youth with challenges in sensory integration and sensory processing. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 74(1), 1-46.

- Case-Smith, J., & O'Brien, J. C. (2015). *Occupational therapy for children and adolescents* (7th ed.). Elsevier.
- CAST. (2018). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2*. http://udlguidelines.cast.org
- Cook, B. G., & Cook, S. C. (2013). Unraveling evidence-based practices in special education. *Journal of Special Education*, 47(2), 71-82.
- Cook, B. G., Buysse, V., Klingner, J., Landrum, T. J., McWilliam, R. A., Tankersley, M., & Test, D. W. (2015). CEC's standards for classifying the evidence base of practices in special education. *Remedial and Special Education*, 36(4), 220-234.
- Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(3-4), 327-350.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta‐analysis of school‐based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405-432.
- Flanagan, S., Bouck, E. C., & Richardson, J. (2013). Middle school special education teachers' perceptions and use of assistive technology in literacy instruction. *Assistive Technology*, 25(1), 24-30.
- Fletcher, J. M., Lyon, G. R., Fuchs, L. S., & Barnes, M. A. (2019). *Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Newman-Gonchar, R., Dimino, J., & Jayanthi, M. (2020). Meta-analysis of the impact of reading interventions for students in the primary grades. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 13(2), 401-427.
- Hughes, C. A., Morris, J. R., Therrien, W. J., & Benson, S. K. (2017). Explicit instruction: Historical and contemporary contexts. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 32(3), 140-148.
- IDEA. (2004). Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-446, 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.
- Justice, L. M., Logan, J. A., Kaderavek, J. N., Dynia, J. M., Johnson, K. N., & Pelatti, C. Y. (2018). Empirically based profiles of the early literacy skills of children with language impairment in early childhood special education classrooms. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 49(4), 816-833.

- Kauffman, J. M., & Badar, J. (2018). Better thinking about behavior: What we have learned (and not learned) from 25 years of research. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 50(6), 1-16.
- Lenz, B. K., & Deshler, D. D. (2004). Teaching content to all: Evidence-based inclusive practices in middle and secondary schools. Allyn & Bacon.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). *Students with disabilities*. U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2023). *Digest of education statistics 2022*. U.S. Department of Education.
- Odom, S. L., Brantlinger, E., Gersten, R., Horner, R. H., Thompson, B., & Harris, K. R. (2005). Research in special education: Scientific methods and evidence-based practices. *Exceptional Children*, 71(2), 137-148.
- Ok, M. W., Rao, K., Bryant, B. R., & McDougall, D. (2017). Universal Design for Learning in pre-K to grade 12 classrooms: A systematic review of research. *Exceptionality*, 25(2), 116-138.
- Regan, K. S., Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2015). Cognitive strategy instruction for students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 30(1), 8-18.
- Ruijs, N. M., & Peetsma, T. T. (2009). Effects of inclusion on students with and without special educational needs reviewed. *Educational Research Review*, 4(2), 67-79.
- Ruppar, A. L., Neeper, L. S., & Dalsen, J. (2016). Special education teachers' perceptions of preparedness to teach students with severe disabilities. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 41(4), 273-286.
- Schalock, R. L., Luckasson, R., & Tassé, M. J. (2021). *Intellectual disability: Definition, diagnosis, classification, and systems of supports* (12th ed.). American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.
- Sklad, M., Diekstra, R., Ritter, M. D., Ben, J., & Gravesteijn, C. (2012). Effectiveness of school‐based universal social, emotional, and behavioral programs: Do they enhance students' development in the area of skill, behavior, and adjustment? *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(9), 892-909.
- Stevens, E. A., Austin, C., Moore, C., Scammacca, N., Boucher, A. N., & Vaughn, S. (2018). Current state of the evidence: Examining the effects of Orton-Gillingham reading

interventions for students with or at risk for word-level reading disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 84(4), 407-427.

- Swanson, H. L., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of learning disabilities* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Test, D. W., Mazzotti, V. L., Mustian, A. L., Fowler, C. H., Kortering, L., & Kohler, P. (2009). Evidence-based secondary transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes for students with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 32(3), 160-181.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Imbeau, M. B. (2010). *Leading and managing a differentiated classroom*. ASCD.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2022). *43rd annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.
- Ukrainetz, T. A. (2015). *School-age language intervention: Evidence-based practices*. Pro-Ed.
- United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*. UN General Assembly.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press