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A school-university partnership, which was formed in 2003 to update the Beamish (1992) practice listing for students with severe disabilities, was extended in 2004 to refine and edit the revised listing. A related activity was the generation of a catalogue of practice to accompany the listing. In this second phase of this participatory action research project, the school community took the lead and moved from the status of co-researchers to that of research leaders (Turnbull, Friesen, & Ramirez, 1998). First, they designed a procedure for making discriminative judgements in order to reduce the 86 practices items in the 2003 list to a more manageable set of essential practices. Second, two editing processes were undertaken in order to increase context relevance and measurability of practice statements. Initially, a key teacher edited practice statements in consultation with school staff in the four suites that coordinated curriculum for Years 1–3, 4–6, 7–9, and postschool transition options, respectively. Later, another key teacher consulted with university staff and returned to school to lead a final editing of the practice statements. Third, teachers pooled practice exemplars within and across classrooms in order to create a catalogue of school-wide practice. Video clips of these catalogued practices were assembled on a DVD in order to construct a tool for ongoing practice review. The university partners also signalled their intention to use this catalogue as a tool to research teacher understanding of essential practices when working with students with more significant disabilities in specialised and regular settings. This second cycle of researching practice opened up various issues about the nature of school-university partnerships.

Background

Researching practice at Caboolture Special School began in 2003 and proceeded through a rich cycle of participatory action research to generate a practice listing for the school. Participatory action research (PAR) involves "joint ownership of the research, collaborative conduct of the research, and immersion of the subjects being studied in every stage of the research, from design to outcome" (Beamish & Bryer, 1999, p. 459). It is an approach that requires researchers to conduct research with those being studied on a fully participatory basis. Increasingly, PAR is being adopted as the preferred methodology in educational and disability-related research, despite the demanding nature of the commitment from all participants (McNicoll, 1999; McTaggart, 1999; Singer & DiVenere, 1997).
The school principal initiated a working partnership with university researchers in order to adapt an existing 35-item list (Beamish, 1992). The revised and expanded list of 86 practices was aimed to evaluate school effectiveness in educating students with significant disabilities. It was anticipated that the development of practice standards for the school would guide program improvement. The partnership was aimed to design a school research plan, conduct a practice identification process within the school, and disseminate the list to the wider educational community (Hartshorne, Murray, Beamish, & Bryer, 2003). In this initial cycle of research, school and university staff functioned as coresearchers in a strong Level 5 partnership (see Table 1).

### Table 1
Continuum of constituent participation in research (Turnbull, Friesen, & Ramirez, 1998, p. 182)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>RESEARCHER-CONSTITUENT RELATIONS</th>
<th>METHODOLOGICAL STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Constituents as Research Participants</td>
<td>Not PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Constituents as Advisory Board Members</td>
<td>Not PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Constituents as Occasional Reviewers &amp; Consultants</td>
<td>Not PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Researchers as Leaders and Constituents as Ongoing Advisers</td>
<td>PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Researchers and Constituents as Coresearchers</td>
<td>PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Constituents as Research Leaders and Researchers as Ongoing Advisers</td>
<td>PAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New developments
A series of meetings between the partners was held in 2004 (March, June, September, and October). The March, June, and October meetings took place at the university, and the September meeting took place at the school. Meetings were focused on research processes and products related to the school's emergent practice listing. This list needed more editing for item understanding and measurability and more dissemination through the school community for wider discussion about practice among all staff.

### January
The school initiated a second cycle of researching practice in 2004. This initiative marked the beginning of a new phase of the study, because the principal made an independent decision to continue the research and to further refine the school's list. The principal used the first pupil-free day in January to distribute a copy of the list to all teachers, who had generated the 2003 list, and to teacher aides, who received an individual copy for the first time. The principal set a school-wide goal linked to the school's annual operational plan to ensure the relevance of each existing item to school practice. Moreover, the principal and deputy principal held individual meetings with each teacher in Term 1, week 3. The purpose of this meeting was to establish the expectation that each teacher needed to review each practice item.

The principal suggested three questions to guide this review: "Is the practice (a) good practice seen in the school (scored as 3); (b) good practice but not seen in the school..."
(scored as 2), or (c) impractical practice, probably not desirable or applicable (scored as 1).” Furthermore, the principal asked the four suite leaders to hold a group meeting with their respective teams (viz., Years 1–3, 4–6, 7–9, and transition) and to collectively review each of the listed practices. For this activity, the principal provided an electronic version of the list to each suite leader. However, he did not articulate any set process to reach agreement about each of the 86 practices.

March

The principal then contacted the university researchers and requested a continuation of the partnership into a second cycle of participatory action research (see Table 1). A review of the school’s recent initiatives at a meeting at the university in March suggested that the school community had progressed from the status of coresearchers to research leaders (Level 6, in Turnbull et al., 1998). Because the school had proceeded independently to begin a second research cycle, the university staff and principal discussed the emergence of the school as the leading partner in the second cycle and the willingness of the university staff to take an advisory role.

Closer examination of Term 1 research products from three of the four school suites, however, revealed inconsistencies in the implementation of the process that the principal had arranged with suite leaders to review, rate, and comment on the practice items. Each suite had reviewed the list in February and had provided collective comments about the implementation of the practices in the suite (see Table 2). The fourth suite, focused on transition to postschool options, did not document their review.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUITE</th>
<th>PRACTICE RATING METHOD</th>
<th>COMMENTS FROM COLLECTIVE SUITE REVIEW OF PRACTICE ITEM 1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years 1–3</td>
<td>Anecdotal evaluation of this practice rather than numeric rating</td>
<td>“Needs practice” comment on implementation of this practice within this suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 4–6</td>
<td>Coded numeric response to this practice according to specified 1–3 rating</td>
<td>Use of visual timetables, blank cards for relief staff to use, social stories where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 7–9</td>
<td>Single summative statement, globally applied to all practices rather than to this practice</td>
<td>Talk about weekly routine at start of week; talk about daily program each day; refer to visual timetable to reinforce activity changes; frequently remind students about any change in activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all, only one suite used the specified criteria to question each practice. This Years 4–6 suite not only used the coding scheme systematically across all practices but also provided extensive detail on each practice. Another suite provided a report to the principal, in which teachers made a summative assessment that each practice was being implemented in Years 7–9, with some being implemented more fully than others. This suite focused their review comments on examples of implementation strategies currently
used within their suite. A key suite leader with experience across the two suites covering the middle years supported both suites as they gathered specific examples of practice within their respective suites. However, the Years 7–9 suite did not provide itemspecific 1–3 ratings. A third suite (Years 1–3) used a system of typed comments recorded alongside each practice that replaced the specific rating scheme (e.g., practice "needs improvement" or "yes within suites…but not across suites"). This rich material generated within the suites did not provide a basis for collation of practice data, comparison across suite, and directions to make changes to practice statements.

After this review of the suite ratings, the principal and the university advisers mapped three tasks for Term 2. The first task was to redo practice ratings across all suites in the consistent procedure previously agreed. The second task was to appoint a key teacher to lead the editing process and to make amendments approved by all suites in the school. Specifically, clarity of each practice was to be the target of this refining process. Earlier research has emphasised that the need for practice standards to be articulated clearly and concisely so that they can be observed, measured, and shared among a teaching community (Jaeger, 1978).

Moreover, feasibility was an issue in deleting practices from the list. For this editing task, the advisers recommended reduction of the total number of practice items to 50 or less. Three listings of this approximate size have been generated by Australian researchers (Beamish, 1992; Chalmers, Carter, Clayton, & Hook, 1998; Dule, Korner, Williams, & Carter, 1999). Workability is the critical advantage of a smaller list: Too large a list may deter busy practitioners from using it.

A third task, to develop a catalogue of practice for the listing, was also proposed. The university researchers, in their advisory role to the school, suggested this task as a support for the second task: Cataloguing practice was viewed as a motivational tool to maintain staff interest in continued refinement of the listing. At a basic level, cataloguing practice requires concretisation of a practice in action with students in teaching situations. The text of a practice statement can be brought to life in a "story" about how a teacher makes effective use of a practice. At a more interpretative level, cataloguing involves analysis and reflection about the practice statement. A catalogue of the list was a means to promote broader views of effective practice across the school community. The construction of a catalogue of examples of specific practices, therefore, was seen as an organised way to share recommended practice stories.

The notion of a catalogue of practice was conceived as an extension of the Activities Catalog developed by Wilcox and Bellamy (1987). This catalogue was focused on activity-based learning across leisure, personal management, and work domains for adolescent students with significant disabilities (viz., a similar population to the older students in the present school). It comprised a wide range of examples of everyday activities in each curriculum domain. Teachers could then send the paper catalogue of activities to the parents to obtain input about the young person's current interests and needs. Thus, the catalogue was designed to facilitate review and decision making about the student's Individual Education Plan (IEP) and to select learning priorities. The pictured examples and accompanying task analysis of each activity provided explicit visual content that could be shared among teachers, parents, students, and other
stakeholders. This Activities Catalog was a major breakthrough in individualisation because the simple, clear combination of graphic representation of the activity and deconstructed steps in the activity brought to life specific elements of the curriculum.

The proposed practice catalogue was focused on key aspects of teaching across the school curriculum. This catalogue was intended to promote a broader view of each listed practice among teachers from different suites. Accumulation of written examples of each practice statement would provide explicit stimulus material around which to examine and reflect upon practice standards identified by teaching staff for their school.

**June**

A change of principals at Caboolture Special School resulted in attendance of both the departing principal and the acting principal at the university-based meeting. In the event, none of the three tasks proposed at the March meeting had taken place. The transitions between administrators created a research vacuum. In order to inform the incoming principal about the project and to encourage him to continue the project, the outgoing principal and the two university advisers shared the history of list development and reviewed the planned tasks for list refinement. Each of the three tasks set at the March meeting was revisited. This retelling resulted in further elaboration of the research design and further enhancement of the prospective use of the research products.

There were three important outcomes of this meeting. First, it was agreed that the practice statements needed to be reviewed in a systematic way across all suites. Moreover, the rating method was further refined at this point. Specifically, a 4-point scale was codesigned and recommended for use by suites to rate the importance and feasibility of each practice (i.e., 4 = essential practice seen 80% of the time; 3 = essential practice but not seen or only partially implemented; 2 = not an essential practice; 1 = has some elements of an essential practice and needs to be integrated with another practice).

Second, it was agreed that there was an urgent need to finalise list editing, so that it could be disseminated as a functional list and as a credible research product. The incoming principal agreed with the allocation of staff time to complete this edit. The edit would entail reduction of the number of practices in the list.

Third, it was agreed that the notion of the catalogue of practices should be pursued. The incoming principal suggested that videoclips of examples of practices would enrich text-based practice stories. Everyone strongly agreed with the idea of using visualisation in constructing the catalogue. It is recognised that video would add extra meaning to examples of practice and would provide a depth of contextualisation not available in written text (i.e., a practice story) alone. It was also decided that the catalogue would take the form of a DVD.

**September**

At this school-based meeting, both principals and both university advisers attended. Moreover, two other key members in the research team over the two cycles of the project also attended. Both staff (deputy principal and suite leader) had lead list generation groups in 2003. Both continued to make substantial contributions to the project in 2004. The deputy principal assisted the departing principal to conduct individual meeting with all teachers about the practice list at the beginning of the year. The suite leader for Years 4–6 managed the most thorough review of the list (see Table 2).
The agenda of this meeting was focused on the progress of the three tasks planned at the previous meeting. It was concluded that progress was made on one task, practice editing, but not on the other two tasks, practice rating and practice cataloguing. School staff directed their efforts in researching their practice to list editing, and they succeeded in reducing the list from 86 practices (October 2003) to 38 statements (September 2004).

The process of editing the list engaged the whole school in a multistep procedure. Teachers and teacher aides across all suites took part in collective suite discussion, gave personalised feedback, and provided a final individual reflection. One designated teacher, selected by the ongoing principal for this task because she was an experienced English high school teacher, coordinated the process and designed the procedure. The coordinating teacher first provided each suite with another copy of the practice list and asked suite staff to comment. Specifically, she asked them to identify any overlapping practices within and across headings (under which clusters of practice items were previously sorted). She also asked them to reflect on unclear wording and structure of the practices. The coordinating teacher then collated responses and circulated a draft for individual reflection before the staff meeting. Teacher aides were consulted via teachers, and feedback was relayed at the staff meeting. Any additional changes from individual feedback were made, and a final copy was made available for staff to peruse. All staff were asked to reflect on and respond affirmatively to the question, "Are you happy to implement these practices in your classroom?"

The final step in editing the September 2004 list was to send it immediately to the university partners for review. The two advisers examined the list in terms of established guidelines for recommended practices (Beamish, 2004). In particular, they considered the clarity, measurability, and feasibility of each practice statement. Two interesting findings from this review emerged. The school’s editing process was highly effective in reducing many practices to fewer and more measurable statements (see Table 3), but it was ineffective in which some practices were combined into fewer but less measurable statements (see Table 4).

Table 3 presents several instances of combining practice statements in an effective manner. Reworking of practice statements enabled elements of one single practice to be integrated into a richer practice statement. For example, different elements of a discrete practice (viz., Item 9.1 and 9.8 in the October 2003 list) were combined into one practice dealing with self-improvement. The new practice (Item 9.1 in the September 2004 list) also retained its measurability.

Table 4 shows examples where two discrete practices were combined into a single practice. However, when unrelated practices were blended in this way, then they did not produce a measurable practice statement. For example, Item 1.1 in the September 2004 list blends a general practice of positive language used to express valuing of students with a more specific communicative practice, which is embedded in the general practice. The practice becomes unmeasurable, because performance could signal either or both kinds of action. This difficulty arose in eight practice statements in the revised list (September 2004).
Table 3
Comparison of Practice Items related to Collegial Support and Professional Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Staff use the Caboolture Best Practice list to evaluate and improve practice (self, peer, suite, school).</td>
<td>9.1 Staff members use the Caboolture Best Practice list to self-reflect, evaluate, and improve practice (self, peer, suite, and school).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Staff engage in ongoing professional development and training relevant to current student population.</td>
<td>9.2 All staff members engage in ongoing, targeted professional development and training, relevant to current student population, for the purpose of increasing staff competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Mentoring and coaching is used to disseminate newly acquired professional practice among staff.</td>
<td>9.3 Mentoring and coaching are used to disseminate newly acquired professional practice, as well as established school practices, among staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 Established school practices are shared among staff through mentoring and coaching. (See 9.3.)</td>
<td>9.4 Teachers and teacher aides collaborate to meet their respective responsibilities with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 Staff competence is increased through targeted professional development. (See 9.2.)</td>
<td>9.5 Particular school roles accommodate individual staff strengths and relevant prior experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6 Teachers and teacher aides collaborate to meet their respective responsibilities with students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7 Particular school activities accommodate individual staff strengths and relevant prior experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8 Staff use self-reflection to compare current personal performance to recommended practice. (See 9.1.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Examples of Discrete Versus Combined Practice Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 All staff communicate with and about students in a positive and respectful manner.</td>
<td>1.1 All staff members speak about and with students in a positive and respectful manner, communicating any activity changes prior to implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 All staff communicate changes to activities to students prior to implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 New and novel experiences in the community are used to provide added stimulus and enriched life-long learning.</td>
<td>5.3 Daily routines and structured activities provide the functional context for the teaching of skills, augmented by new and novel experiences that add stimulus and enriched life learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Daily routines and structured activities are used to provide the functional context for the teaching of skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, a further meeting between the university advisers and the key suite leader about the September 2004 meeting occurred early in October 2004 to resolve issues about the ineffective practice combinations. The final listing (See Appendix) was, therefore, able to be presented to the school staff at their October 2004 pupil-free day, exactly one year after they had generated the draft list.
Cataloguing the list of practices was the other topic discussed at the September 2004 meeting. Three issues formed the basis of the plan to catalogue practices in the final term of the school year. First, criteria for the selection of practice examples were set. In particular, examples of practice needed to represent variations in student age and ability, teacher style and curriculum adaptations, conditions of practice delivery, and particular methods used to achieve practice integration. Second, ethical issues of consent from families and staff were acknowledged, and the need to obtain ethical clearance from government and university was noted. Third, the potential uses of the video catalogue for school improvement and research were shared and compared.

The final decision of this meeting was that the school would generate a suitable procedure to (a) identify and (b) agree upon the specific practice examples to be included in the school’s catalogue of recommended practice. Overnight, the key suite leader at the meeting developed a "probable" procedure for discussion among stakeholders and circulated the procedure. For the first identification phase of the procedure, teachers within suites were asked to revisit the revised practice list and identify an example of each practice for consideration in the catalogue. They were given three guidelines to select examples. First, the practice example needed to be observable and measurable. Second, the example needed to be a reflection of current classroom practice. Third, the examples needed to be brief, so that it could be captured for inspection and approval. An electronic proforma for the each proposed practice example was provided to each suite (see Table 5).

For the second inspection phase, the examples were collated and checked against the relevant practice item in the school’s list. Then a panel of staff selected the most suitable items, provided feedback to a routine staff meeting, and sought staff confirmation of these choices. Finally, a schedule for the videoing of practice examples concluded the procedure.

Table 5
Procedure for Entering Practice Examples for Consideration in Catalogue of Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRACTICE AREA</th>
<th>PRACTICE ITEM NUMBER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Class:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite:</td>
<td>Day:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., Shopping skills are implemented in a variety of settings, with a variety of people, at different times and with different notes and coins.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return electronically to Lyndal at [email supplied] by October 15th 2004.
Conclusion

The continuing relationship in 2004 generated products with some hiccups and generated a new understanding of PAR partnerships. The products comprised a viable practice list and an accompanying practice catalogue. The brevity and clarity of the list makes it a manageable tool for school improvement, which falls within the resource capability of today’s schools. The vivid visual stories of the practice catalogue make it an innovative and reflective tool to supplement practice improvement activities.

From a school improvement perspective, this PAR process enabled staff to advance their collective practice within the school. At the pupil free day in July, staff discussion about their suite work on the list provided a basis for critical analysis of the curriculum designed for all students of all ages and abilities in the state and suggested a way forward in the design of more meaningful curriculum for students with significant disabilities. Given the probable paths for the students in this school (i.e., active citizenship, vocational education, and New Basics), teachers were able to work backwards from likely postschool options for specific students to plan for more curriculum continuity across suite programs.

Specifically, they incorporated the practices they were in the process of examining instead of the general, mainstream-oriented model for teacher practices proposed in Education Queensland’s Productive Pedagogies. The curriculum will continue to employ the rich tasks and assessment that drives the New Basics curriculum. However, teachers in this setting have customised it to provide more meaningful preparation for the postschool needs of individual students.

The ongoing research partnership between school and university changed from Level 5 to Level 6, and back again. Although school staff and university staff continued to be willing participants in the research process, communication about agreed procedures clashed with an intraschool leadership transition. This progression to the highest level of school participation in action research featured a lower frequency of exchanges between the school and university partners and a change in school leadership. These factors contributed substantially to weaker PAR relations, decreased research activity, and reduced rigour of the research process. In contrast, return to a strong Level 5 "coresearching" partnership boosted PAR relations, increased procedurally driven research activity, and generated functional research products.

From a participatory perspective, this second cycle of researching practice made it clear that each level of PAR implementation raises a set of particular issues and produces a corresponding set of checks and balances. In particular, a change of level necessitates a contractual agreement to new roles and responsibilities and to a new schedule of communication. Such an agreement preempts unclear expectations and enables the partners to "look forward with enthusiasm to the next phase of inquiry in establishing efficacy and best practices" (Turnbull et al., 1998, p. 187).
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Appendix

1.0 Valuing Students
1.1 All staff members speak about and with students in a positive and respectful manner.
1.2 All staff members maintain the privacy of students and their family circumstances in all formal and informal communications, in order to assure confidentiality and dignity.
1.3 All staff members offer age appropriate, meaningful activities that most closely resemble those experienced by nondisabled peers.
1.4 All staff members communicate changes in activities prior to implementation.
1.5 All staff members share current and relevant information about each student in a confidential manner.

2.0 Program Quality
2.1 Programs are functional, activity based, chronologically age appropriate, and matched to individual learning style and ability.
2.2 Programs focus on improving communication and social skills.
2.3 Programs match alternative strategies (e.g., intellikeys) to perform learning tasks to individual learning style and ability.
2.4 Programs specify individualised instructional strategies (e.g., prompting, error correction, and reinforcement) relevant to the learning task.
2.5 Programs engage and motivate students through enjoyable and rewarding activities.
2.6 Programs are prepared in an organised way and presented in a structured but dynamic manner, to maximise student engagement and learning outcomes.
2.7 Programs employ alternative measures and strategies to assess student achievement and progress.

3.0 Productive Partnerships
3.1 The school uses cooperative planning to coordinate student progression through curriculum suites.
3.2 Teachers lead transdisciplinary teams of relevant staff and carers in cooperative planning, delivery, and evaluation of programs.
3.3 Teachers monitor students’ developmental growth on standardised assessment items (e.g., Adaptive Behaviour Scale, Yr 2 continuum net, Carolina Inventory, Functional Skills Analysis) in consultation with specialist staff.
3.4 Teachers adopt the school vision statement with its shared philosophy and expectations to achieve team cohesion.
3.5 All staff members try to establish productive partnerships across the school and wider community.
3.6 All staff members contribute to a supportive school environment through positive guidance, conflict negotiation, and accountability for practice.

4.0 Instruction
4.1 Instructions to students are clear, concise, and appropriate to individual learning style and needs.
4.2 Opportunities for students to make choices and express preferences and feelings are embedded in all teaching episodes.
4.3 Material resources are used innovatively and changed regularly to enhance student learning.
4.4 Activity-based learning is consistently used to engage and motivate students.
4.5 Programs are written to provide explicit instructions that allow reliable implementation by any staff in the absence of the teacher.

5.0 Teaching in Natural Contexts
5.1 Community based programs provide life experiences to acquire and extend functional living skills.
5.2 Programs are generalised across a variety of contexts (people, places, and times) in order to promote student independence and interdependence in society.
5.3 Daily routines and structured activities provide the functional context for the teaching of skills.
5.4 New and novel experiences in the community add stimulation and enrich life learning.
6.0 Technology for Learning
6.1 Individual students use relevant adaptive technology to access the curriculum and increase independence (e.g., self-care and mobility).
6.2 Teachers integrate technology across the curriculum.
6.3 A school support committee monitors the provision of ICT practices and equipment.

7.0 Individual Education Plans
7.1 Teachers work collaboratively with all relevant stakeholders to identify authentic and appropriate IEP goals.
7.2 IEP goals build on existing skills and progressively build towards a quality lifestyle in postschool years.
7.3 Parents and other carers (acknowledged as the students' primary/life-long teachers) are actively involved in implementing IEP goals.

8.0 Positive Behavioural Support
8.1 All staff members use information about the function of an individual student's problem behaviour when interacting with that student.
8.2 All staff use nonaversive strategies to manage problem behaviour.
8.3 All staff members teach communication and social skills that replace problem behaviours.
8.4 All staff members manage and monitor problem behaviours in a consistent and proactive manner.

9.0 Collegial Support and Professional Activities
9.1 All staff members use the Caboolture Best Practice list to self-reflect, evaluate, and improve practice (self, peer, suite, and school).
9.2 All staff members engage in ongoing, targeted professional development and training, relevant to current student population, for the purpose of increasing staff competence.
9.3 Mentoring and coaching are used to disseminate newly acquired professional practice to all staff and to disseminate established school practices to new staff.
9.4 Teachers and teacher aides collaborate to meet their respective responsibilities with students.
9.5 Particular school roles accommodate individual staff strengths and relevant prior experiences.