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Purpose of this guide:
This presenter’s guide is intended to support the PowerPoint slides by offering
- Suggested background readings;
- Talking points relative to each slide;
- Suggested activities to enhance learning opportunities for participants;
- Tips to facilitate the professional growth experience; and
- Suggested readings for extension of learning.

About the format:
There are three distinct sections of this document, “Preparation”, “Presentation/Process”, and “Supplementary Materials”.

The preparation section begins on the following page and includes:
- Participant objectives;
- Three suggested agenda/timeframes to help you meet the needs of the audience and/or available time allotment;
- Support/background materials the presenter may wish to access prior to preparation for presentation;
- Materials and supplies needed for the presentation; and
- Equipment needed for the presentation.

The presentation/process section follows preparation suggestions and includes:
- Suggested minutes for information sharing and/or suggested activities for each of the key concepts of the presentation, within each section minutes are enclosed in boxes and intended to be highlighted ahead of time dependent on the overall timeframe selected for the presentation;
- Slides in miniature, in sequential order, with talking points,
  - Usually in bulleted format, not intended to be read verbatim, and
  - Presenter is encouraged to interject his/her own style;
- Participant activities to enhance learning opportunities, indicated by a vertical line to the left of each activity,
  - May be carried out as suggested, or
  - Adjusted to audience and time allotment;
- Presenter notes to suggest background information or extension readings, noted in bold italic font;
- Presenter tips to suggest facilitation techniques, noted in bold italic font; and
- Suggested segue comments to bridge between ideas and/or activities, also noted in bold italic font.

The supplementary materials section contains handouts that may be copied and used to support or enhance the presentation.
Common Core State Standards and Students with Disabilities

Objectives:

Participants will increase knowledge relative to
- Common Core State Standards and application to students with disabilities
- Assessment development aligned to Common Core
  - Embedded accommodations for the general assessments
  - Similarities and differences of the alternate assessments
- Where to find more formation

Participants will explore implications for
- Instructional design
- Service delivery
- Assessments

Agenda/Timing:

280 minutes - Total time including all information, all optional activities, and Q&A
(Expanded presentation timeframe) – breaks not included
180 minutes - Total time for information sharing and selected optional activities
(Mid-level presentation timeframe) – breaks not included
90 minutes - Total time for sharing of key information and Q&A
(Brief information presentation timeframe)
60 minutes - Total time for sharing of key information only
(Key information presentation timeframe)

280 minutes - Expanded presentation timeframe (all slides)
Suggested time allotments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>Common Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application to Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 min</td>
<td>High Quality Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>IEP Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 min</td>
<td>Assessment Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Further information and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Question and Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>Discussion/application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
180 minutes - Mid-level presentation timeframe (all slides; selected activities)
Suggested time allotments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>Common Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>High Quality Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>IEP Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>Assessment Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Further information and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Question and Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90 minutes – Brief information presentation timeframe (slides 1-3, 7, 12-13, 16-17, 33-37, 39, 44-45, 49-50 and/or 51-52 [based on assessment(s) being used by participants], 53, 55-59)
Suggested time allotments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Common Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 min</td>
<td>High Quality Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>IEP Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Assessment Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Further information and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Question and Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60 minutes – Key information presentation timeframe (slides 1-3, 7, 12-13, 16-17, 33-35, 37, 39, 44-45, 49-50 and/or 51-52 [based on assessment(s) being used by participants], 53, 55-56)
Suggested time allotments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Common Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>High Quality Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>IEP Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Assessment Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Further information and resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support Materials:

http://www.k12center.org/rsc/pdf/Coming_Together_April_2012_Final.PDF

Common Core State Standards Initiative
www.corestandards.org

Co-Teaching: General and Special Educators Working Together
http://nichcy.org/schoolage/effective-practices/coteaching

Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System Consortium
www.dynamiclearningmaps.org

National Center and State Collaborative Partnership
www.ncscpartners.org

Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers
www.parcconline.org

Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium
www.SmarterBalanced.org

Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports
www.pbis.org

The IDEA Partnership Website; Common Core Collection
www.ideapartnership.org

Universal Design for Learning
www.udlcenter.org

Materials and Supplies:

- PowerPoint slides - or -
- Overheads prepared from the PowerPoint slides
- Handout Masters – to be copied in appropriate numbers
- Chart paper and markers
- Paper and pencils for Participants

Equipment:

- Computer and projector -or-
- Overhead projector
- Projection screen
Introduction

**Presenter Tip:** The introduction should be very brief and garner interest immediately. The following is a starting point; adapt for the particular audience.

Ideas to share with participants:

- An issue garnering much attention in the field of education today
- Beginning in the spring of 2009, Governors and state commissioners of education from 48 states, 2 territories and the District of Columbia committed to developing a common core of state K-12 English-language arts (ELA) and mathematics standards.
- ELA and mathematics standards have now been adopted by many states and some territories
- We will spend the next few minutes exploring what this means for students with identified disabilities
**Presenter Note:** A collaborative effort of many members of the IDEA Partnership, the information contained in this presentation is current as of the date of printing. It is advisable to visit the listed websites prior to conducting the presentation.

This presentation was created through collaborative efforts of many individuals working within the IDEA Partnership. Participants represented a wide-range of roles within the field of education. [noted on slide] Time on this slide is very brief; however, it is important to recognize the work of those who contributed to make this presentation accessible to the field and the public.

The original collection of bridging tools relative to the Common Core State Standards was initially created by a full range of education stakeholders in a 2011 general Partnership meeting. Each document was then edited and produced by a small group of persons including those representing teachers, general education and special education administrators, specialized instructional support personnel, families, higher education personnel, technical assistance providers, and policymakers. Subsequent revisions have been made through the small group process ensuring representation of a wide range of stakeholder roles.
Presenter Tip: The agenda slide is presented as an adult learner organizer tool and should not be omitted. Very little time needs to be spent here for the brief presentation. For the expanded presentation, the presenter may wish to configure the bullets to come in one at a time and give the participants a sentence or two about each as a preview of what is to come.

Ideas for sharing with participants:

- **Common Core State Standards (CCSS)**
  - Will look briefly at why the standards were developed; the rationale
  - Expectation for students with disabilities to engage with, and demonstrate mastery in the standards

- **Application to students with disabilities**
  - High quality instruction - elements of both instructional planning and service delivery
  - IEP development – components and approach

- **Resources**
  - Web addresses for further exploration and keeping up to date
Presenter Tip: For the longer versions, the presenter may choose to configure the bullets to enter one at a time as the notes for each are shared with the participants.

Presenter Note: Handout #1 (bottom) To address... is available for use at this time. It is intended as an adult note-taking organizer.

Ideas for sharing with participants:

- Disparate standards across states
  - Strong evidence of significant differences in academic standards across states
  - Common Core provides a foundation to work collaboratively across states and districts
  - Pooling resources and expertise, to create curricular tools, professional development, common assessments and other materials

- Student mobility
  - Mobility increases problem of disparate standards across states
  - Expectations are consistent for all
  - Not dependent on a student’s zip code

- Skills needed for today’s jobs/careers and jobs/careers of tomorrow
  - Societal changes; job changes; expected skill sets have changed over the years
  - Standards are college- and career-ready
  - Will help prepare students with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in education and training after high school

- Global competition
  - Increased global competition for existing jobs
  - Internationally benchmarked
  - Help ensure our students are globally competitive
• CLICK to bring in overlay box
  o Common core standards are fundamentally different from those standards that existed in many states prior to this initiative; many states are in process of implementation; timelines for implementation vary from state to state
  o Standards set expectations for all students
  o Assessments must be fundamentally different
  o Must assess all learners with validity and reliability

• CLICK to bring in overlay box
  o ALL students, including students with disabilities

Ideas for sharing with participants:
• Grounded in our evolving sense of reasonable benefit; Education prepares students for work and life
• Informed by our growing knowledge of instruction; We are expected to use what we have learned about what works
• Guided by provisions in recent reauthorizations; NCLB and IDEA define highly qualified in terms of subject area
• Competence
• Consistent with education reform; Cradle to College and Career is the overarching framework
• Aligned with disability policy direction across the lifespan; Integrate employment, post-secondary access, independent living
Ideas for sharing with participants:

- There is a gap between high school expectations for students and what students are expected to do in college/career.
- Among high school graduates, only half are academically prepared for postsecondary education (Greene & Winters, 2005). Significant discrepancies are seen for students with identified disabilities.
- Labor force statistics December 2010
  - 28% of working-age adults with disabilities are employed, compared with 70% of people without disabilities.
  - Workers with disabilities have experienced significantly higher levels of job loss and hardship during the recession of the late 2000s.
- Career-readiness and college-readiness levels are very similar; and have similar expectations for high school graduates.
- K-12 standards were back-mapped from college and career expectations.
Segue: What do the Common Core documents say about students with disabilities?

Source: Common Core State Standards Initiative 2-page document on Application to Students with Disabilities

Ideas for sharing with participants:

- Common Core State Standards introduction to English Language Arts Standards states:

  The Standards should also be read as allowing for the widest possible range of students to participate fully from the outset and as permitting appropriate accommodations to ensure maximum participation of students with special education needs. For example, for students with disabilities reading should allow for the use of Braille, screen-reader technology, or other assistive devices, while writing should include the use of a scribe, computer, or speech-to-text technology. In a similar vein, speaking and listening should be interpreted broadly to include sign language.

Segue: We will look briefly at the changes in these Common Core State Standards in comparison to most previous state standards for student learning.
Presenter Tip: For the longer version, the presenter may choose to configure the bullets to enter one at a time as the notes for each are shared with the participants.

Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- Progression based on evidence and anchored in the college and career readiness (CCR) standards
  - CCR standards define broad competencies and reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language
  - K-12 standards lend further specificity by defining a developmentally appropriate progression of skills and understandings

- Reading
  - Increasing complexity of skills as advance grade levels in what students must be able to read so that all students are ready for the demands of college- and career-level reading no later than the end of high school; also require progressive development of reading comprehension so that students advancing through the grades are able to gain more from whatever they read
  - Diverse array of classic and contemporary literature as well as challenging informational texts in a range of subjects; recognizing that teachers, school districts and states need to decide on appropriate curriculum, CCSS has no reading list

- Writing
  - Ability to write logical arguments based on substantive claims, sound reasoning, and relevant evidence is a cornerstone of the writing standards, with opinion writing extending down into the earliest grades
  - Research—both short, focused projects (such as those commonly required in the workplace) and longer term in depth research—is emphasized
• Speaking and Listening
  o Students gain, evaluate, and present increasingly complex information, ideas, and evidence through listening and speaking as well as through media
  o Focus of speaking and listening standards is academic discussion in one-on-one, small-group, and whole-class settings

• Language
  o Vocabularies develop through a mix of conversations, direct instruction, and reading
  o Use formal English in writing and speaking
  o Make informed, skillful choices among the many ways to express themselves through language
  o Conventions (and vocabulary) extends across reading, writing, speaking, and listening

• Media and Technology
  o Integrated throughout standards
  o Both critical analysis and production of media
Ideas for sharing with participants:

- Independence with text complexity
  - Research indicates that those students who are able to respond to complex text are better equipped for college and/or career
  - Emphasis on higher-order/critical thinking is insufficient without complex text
  - Qualitative dimensions – aspects of reading best measured by an attentive human reader
    - Purpose
    - Structure
    - Language conventionality and clarity
    - Knowledge demands
  - Quantitative dimensions – aspects of reading typically measured in mathematical terms
    - Word length
    - Sentence length
    - Frequency
    - Text cohesion
    - Complex and lengthy sentences hide important information and can make fundamental concepts in content areas difficult to understand or locate
  - Reader and task considerations
    - Variables specific to a reader – motivation, knowledge, experiences
    - Variables specific to a task- purpose, complexity of task assigned or question posed
- Evidence-based argument
  - Emphasis on sound arguments on substantive topics and issues
  - Focused conversation
  - Foundations of good decision-making
- Value evidence – beyond main idea and supporting details; application to science concepts, social studies concepts, etc.
- Changes in standards indicate changes needed in teaching and student engagement for all learners
• Emphasis on increasing text complexity - problems for some students with disabilities; level of independent reading based on complexity of text
  SWD: Text complexity is based partly on reader’s skills.
• Balancing the increased proficiency standards with need for individualized instruction – real issue is not text difficulty but instruction in how to access text
• Revises role of Educators … must understand why text is hard and teach our students how to read it (Fisher, Frey & Lapp, 2012, p. 45)
Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- **Focus** – 2 to 4 concepts developed deeply in each grade level
  - **K-5**
    - Six domains (groups of related standards)
      - Counting and cardinality
      - Operations and algebraic thinking
      - Number and operations in base ten
      - Number and operations – fractions
      - Measurement and data
      - Geometry
    - Solid foundation in whole numbers, addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, fractions and decimals
    - Kindergarteners work on the number core: how numbers correspond to quantities, how to put numbers together and take them apart
    - Continuous progression from grade to grade
    - Stress both procedural skill and conceptual understanding
  - **Middle school**
    - Six domains (groups of related standards)
      - Ratios and proportional relationships
      - The number system
      - Expressions and equations
      - Functions
      - Geometry
      - Statistics and probability
    - With a strong foundation K-5, students can do hands on learning in geometry, algebra and probability and statistics
    - Students who have mastered the content and skills through the 7th grade will be well-prepared for algebra in grade 8

---

**Presenter Tip:** For the longer version, the presenter may choose to configure the bullets to enter one at a time as the notes for each are shared with the participants.
High school

- Six conceptual categories (crossing a number of traditional course boundaries)
  - Number and Quantity
  - Algebra
  - Functions
  - Modeling
  - Geometry
  - Statistics and Probability
- Practice applying mathematical ways of thinking to real world issues and challenges; prepare students to think and reason mathematically
- Emphasis on mathematical modeling; use of mathematics and statistics to analyze empirical situations, understand them better, and improve decisions
- Coherence – concepts logically connected
  - from one grade level to the next
  - to other major topics within the grade level
- Rigor
  - Fluency with math facts
  - Application of knowledge to real world situations
  - Deep understanding of mathematical concepts
Ideas for sharing with participants:

- Construct viable arguments and critique reasoning of others – mathematically proficient students…
  - Understand and use stated assumptions and definitions
  - Make conjectures and build logical progression of statements to explore truth of their conjectures
  - Analyze situations
  - Recognize and use counterexamples
  - Justify conclusions and communicate them to others
  - Respond to arguments of others
  - Reason inductively
  - Compare
  - Generalize

- Use appropriate tools strategically; including technology - mathematically proficient students…
  - Familiar with tools appropriate for grade level (paper, pencil, ruler, protractor, calculator, etc.)
  - Consider what is asked and the tools available
  - Choose appropriate tool to solve

- Indicate change in teaching and student engagement for all learners

- Additional challenges for some students with disabilities
  - Demonstrating math fact fluency
  - Address the language of mathematics in relation to language development of the student
  - Demonstrating mathematical understanding
  - Procedural skill proficiency
  - Complexity of math concepts as you move through the grade levels
  - Ensuring appropriate sequence of skill instruction
  - Complexity of Secondary Mathematics Standards

- Revises role of Educators … to understand the material they teach in context (John Ewing President, Math for America)
Ideas for sharing with participants:

- Intentional design limitations
- The standards do NOT define:
  - How teachers should teach. – provides flexibility to meet needs of all students
  - All that can or should be taught.
  - The nature of advanced work beyond the core
  - The interventions needed for students well below grade level
  - The full range of support for English learners and students with special needs
  - Everything needed for students to be college- and career-ready

Segue: it is important to recognize that students with identified disabilities are different one from another, and will need differing supports to facilitate optimum interaction with and demonstration of learning in the Common core.
Application to Students with Disabilities
High Quality Instruction

80 minutes
60 minutes
25 minutes
20 minutes

Presenter Note: This slide is used as an introduction to addressing instructional practices. Do not read the content to the participants; simply paraphrase and move on to the next slide.

Source: Application to Students with Disabilities, CCSS Standards Documents
Optional Activity for longer presentations: Reflecting on where we are

Whole Group Discussion Activity
[depending on time available; 10-20 minutes]

Lead in statement and questions:
Now that we have spent time in an overview of the Common Core State Standards; and, we think about students with identified disabilities…

- What issues are coming to the forefront for you?
- What questions are uppermost in your mind?

Format of activity:
- Open the floor for discussion
- Paraphrase and repeat whenever clarity is needed
- Answer questions that are answerable
- Record
  - Questions for which there are no answers at this time
  - Issues to explore
  - Suggestions for moving forward
- Facilitate so that all may share in the discussion. Should one or two persons seem to be dominating the discussion, ask for a response from a specific table or from a specific person.

Trainer Tip: Capture key ideas on chart paper. Visual recording for all to see indicates that there will be something done after the discussion and that this is not an exercise in futility.

Presenter paraphrases and summarizes the discussion.
Ideas for sharing with participants:

- Do not recreate the ‘retrofit’ that we had with the first standards movement
- CLICK to bring in “do not” overlay; positive statements will appear automatically after the symbol appears
- Build on what we know about standards-based IEPs
- Consider students with disabilities in all aspects of instruction; planning, accessible materials, supplies, strategies, use of technology, differentiated student deliverables, etc.
- Consider students with disabilities in the general and alternate assessment; in which will he/she participate?; how will she/he access?
Optional Slide for longer presentations:

All students are general education students first.

Ideas for sharing with participants:
- Over time the focus on free appropriate public education for students with disabilities has changed
  - Early on
    - Physical access
    - Procedural safeguards
    - Due process
  - Evolving from access to the school building, to the classroom, to the general education curriculum
  - More recently
    - Appropriate transitions
    - Assessment; accountability under ESEA
  - Highly qualified personnel; subject area competencies
- Most students with disabilities are in the general education curriculum for major parts of the day…many up to 80%
- Opportunities exist in ‘the shifts’ … and will demand greater collaboration among all education professionals to meet the needs of all students
Presenter Note: Throughout the slides there may be abbreviations or acronyms used in order to save space on the slide so that the font is large enough to be read by participants. In such cases, be sure to state the full term when referring to the slide. SwD = students with disabilities

For SwD to meet standards and demonstrate learning...
- High-quality, evidence-based instruction
- Accessible instructional materials
- Embedded supports
  - Universal Design for Learning
  - Appropriate accommodations
  - Assistive technology

Source: CCSS Initiative document “Application to Students with Disabilities”

Ideas for sharing with participants:
- High-quality, evidence-based instruction – what we know from research that works, both for all students and strategies for students who present with a specific skill gap, learning ability/disability
- Accessible instructional materials – to address physical disabilities; reading levels; learning modalities; communication issues, etc.
- Embedded supports
  - Universal Design for Learning – frontloading planning for instruction to meet the needs of a variety of learners
  - Appropriate accommodations – to ensure access and opportunities to demonstrate learning
  - Assistive technology – to ensure access and opportunities to demonstrate learning
Ideas for sharing with participants:

- For **all** students in the general education curriculum, including the majority of students with disabilities; whether the setting be the general education classroom or a more restrictive environment.

- **Instructional strategies**
  - Universally designed units/lessons – UDL – designing lessons and units of study from the beginning to ensure:
    - More ways to access
    - More ways to participate
    - More ways to demonstrate learning
    - Potentially more progress and demonstration of mastery of the standards
  - Individualized accommodations - Change in instructional strategies that enable children to access materials; to demonstrate their abilities in the classroom; to access assessment/s; designed to provide equity, not advantage, for children with disabilities
  - Positive behavior supports - broad range of proactive systemic and individualized strategies for achieving important social and learning outcomes while preventing problem behavior; problem behavior that has potential to interfere with academic learning

- **Service delivery options**
  - Co-teaching approaches – six approaches as per work of Marilyn Friend:
    - Teaching and assisting
    - Teaching and observing
    - Alternate teaching
    - Parallel teaching
    - Station teaching
    - Teaming
  - Paraeducator supports – supporting academic and behavioral needs of students; under the direction of a certificated teacher.

**Presenter Note:** Throughout the slides there may be abbreviations or acronyms used in order to save space on the slide so that the font is large enough to be read by participants. In such cases, be sure to state the full term when referring to the slide. SwD = students with disabilities
Presenter Note: This slide is used as an introduction to addressing Universal Design for Learning. Do not read the content to the participants; simply paraphrase and move on to the next slide.

Ideas for sharing with participants:
- Foundational statement for UDL
- Planning classrooms that address variability among students, including students with disabilities, has potential to increase learning outcomes
Segue: UDL concepts are founded in research about how the brain interacts with concepts and skills.

**3 Networks = 3 UDL Principles**

- **Recognition Networks** - the what of learning = Multiple Means of Representation
- **Strategic Networks** - the how of learning = Multiple Means of Action & Expression
- **Affective Networks** - the why of learning = Multiple Means of Engagement

Ideas for sharing with participants:
- The 3 UDL Principles address the 3 brain networks used for learning:
  - Recognition Networks – the what of learning = Multiple Means of Representation
  - Strategic Networks – the how of learning = Multiple Means of Action & Expression
  - Affective Networks – the why of learning = Multiple Means of Engagement
Presenter Note: Handout #2: UDL Guidelines is available for distribution at this time.

Ideas for sharing with participants:

- UDL Guidelines available on the National Center on UDL website
- Presenter may wish to give some examples of options (strategies) that fall within a cell, e.g.,
  - 1. Options for perception; alternatives for visual information
     - Use of technology and media
     - Text
     - Graphic organizers
     - Photographs
     - Illustrations
  - 5. Options for expressive skills; media for communication
     - Paper and pencil
     - Text to speech
     - Communication boards
     - Sign language
     - Pointing
     - Graphic arts
     - Oral presentation
     - Personal checklists
     - Rubrics for academics
     - Rubrics for behavior
     - Attend to brain research about wait time and time for the brain to process information
     - Student think-pair-share
     - Collaborative learning; reflection on working together
Optional Activity for longer presentations: Application of UDL Guidelines

Triad or table think-pair-share

[depending on time available; 10-20 minutes]

Lead in statement and questions:
Think of a student/child/youth that you know. Characterize how he/she takes in information, expresses learning, and engages with information.

Format of activity:
• In a triad or as a whole table
  o Describe a student with respect to preferred processes/modes
  o Identify the cell under each of the three principles that best fits the child
  o Discuss what needs to be addressed in lesson-planning in order for this student to have the greatest opportunity to achieve his/her potential
• Ask for two or three groups to share out their brainstorming

Presenter paraphrases and summarizes the discussion.
Presenter Note: This slide is used as an introduction to accommodations and ensuring that they are appropriate for the student to access and progress in the expectations set forth in the standards. Do not read the content to the participants; simply paraphrase and move on to the next slide.

Ideas for sharing with participants:

- **What is needed beyond UDL?**
  - Assuming implementation of principles of UDL
  - Designing instructional units to meet needs of diverse learners
  - Most accommodations will be embedded

- **Has student been taught**
  - To use accommodation appropriately
  - To provide an appropriate accommodation does not necessarily mean it will be successful used unless the student has been taught and practiced appropriate use

- **Is the accommodation**
  - Used – if not, reconsider if it is appropriate; if not needed and get same result, then reconsider
  - Beneficial – provides access
  - Barrier – if it gets in the way, reconsider
  - Enabling – the point is to eliminate barriers so that students can become more independent learners

- **Important to note:** daily instructional and assessment accommodations used routinely by the student are considered for standardized assessments
**Presenter Note:** This slide is used as an introduction to addressing instructional practices relative to teaching developmentally appropriate behaviors. Do not read the content to the participants; simply paraphrase and move on to the next slide.

**Ideas for sharing with participants:**
- Teach what to do; much more effective than telling children what not to do
- Practice – create opportunities for children/youth to practice; ensure across environments
- Reinforce for maximum internalization
- Individual performs expected behavior

Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- Most dropouts follow identifiable pathways through the education pipeline
- More likely to drop out due to either low academic performance or low engagement, or both; i.e.,
  - Low academic performance
  - Struggling in the classroom; often low reading skills, frustration with low ability to understand text; low grades; low test scores
  - Letter grades of F in English and math indicator of dropping out
  - Falling behind in number of course credits needed each year to be on the trajectory for graduation
  - Retained one or more times linked to lower chances for graduation

- Low educational engagement; More likely to develop disciplinary problems and dropout, as seen in
  - High rates of absenteeism or truancy
  - Poor classroom behavior; acting out or withdrawal
  - Decreased participation in extracurricular activities
  - Bad relationships with teachers and peers

- It is clear that student decisions to drop out of school are not always and only academic-related

- Sometimes the decision to dropout is due to lack of engagement
  - Which is the social/behavioral side of learning
  - Indicating a need to address and deal with the “whole child”

- Those with good attendance records and who are actively engaged in classroom activities are more likely to graduate and be successful adults

- Students who are absent and or disengaged from school often develop disciplinary problems and are more likely to drop out

- Social/emotional aspects can create barriers to accessing and demonstrating learning
Segue: Many schools and districts are implementing a Response to Intervention or multi-tiered system of support framework to address both academic and behavioral growth for all students.

Presenter’s Tip: As RTI begins with quality instruction for all students, it is preferred that explanation of the graphic begin with Tier 1 and move upward.

Ideas for sharing with participants:
- Tier 1-UNIVERSAL: High Quality instructional, behavioral, and social-emotional supports for ALL students in general education. Also called universal interventions or core instruction. The expectation is that 80% of students will become proficient.
  - Incorporation of the principles of Universal Design for Learning
  - Ensuring appropriate accommodations for all students who need them
  - Scheduling adult time and energy to best serve students (co-teaching, paraeducator supports)
- Tier 2-TARGETED: Targeted intensive prevention or remediation for some students whose performance and rate of progress lag behind the norm for their grade and educational setting. The expectation is that an additional 15% of students will become proficient by engaging in the core curriculum and additional supplementary focused instruction. This is not the same strategies used for longer periods of time; it is the use of different strategies with more intensity (frequency and duration).
- Tier 3: INTENSIVE Comprehensive evaluation by multi-disciplinary team to determine eligibility. Intensive 1:1 interventions for students w/ insufficient response to Tier 1 & 2. Typically, approximately 5% of all students have needs addressed at this tier.
Co-teaching
A service delivery model in inclusive schools whereby two or more teachers are delivering substantive instruction to a diverse and blended group of students in a single classroom.

Co-teaching approaches...
1. Teaching and Assisting
2. Alternative Teaching
3. Parallel Teaching
4. Station Teaching
5. Teaming
6. Teaching and Observing

Adapted from Friend and Cook

Presenter Note: This slide is used as an introduction to addressing co-teaching and to help the participants to change thought processes from instructional practices to service delivery systems. Do not read the content to the participants; simply paraphrase and move on to the next slide.

Ideas for sharing with participants:
- Teaching and Assisting – teachers interchange roles; it is not the special education teacher in the roll of classroom assistant or pareducator
- Alternative Teaching – one is responsible for most of students while other works with flexible small group to pre-teach, reteach, extend
- Parallel Teaching – both teaching same lesson plan with half the class in heterogeneous groupings
- Station Teaching – content is divided into sections; all students participate in all stations
- Teaming – seamlessly working together to facilitate student learning
- Teaching and Observing – one teacher actively collects agreed upon classroom data that both will analyze for action planning
**Presenter Note:** This slide is used as an introduction to addressing supports provided by paraeducators and to help the participants to change thought processes from instructional practices to service delivery systems. Do not read the content to the participants; simply paraphrase and move on to the next slide.

**Presenter Note:** Throughout the slides there may be abbreviations or acronyms used in order to save space on the slide so that the font is large enough to be read by participants. In such cases, be sure to state the full term when referring to the slide. IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan (birth to 3); IEP = Individualized Education Program (ages 3-21 or high school graduation); ITP = Individualized Transition Plan

Ideas for sharing with participants:
- Slides are self-explanatory
- Presenter may wish to share a specific example or two as they relate to a bullet on either slide
Segue: To this point, we have been exploring implementation of the Common Core State Standards as it applies to students participating in the general education curriculum, including most students with disabilities. What about that one to two percent of students whose education is based on alternate achievement standards?

**Presenting Note:** Given the segue statement, this slide is self-explanatory.
Segue: Considering the Common Core requires a deep task-analysis (looking at the precursor skills to achieve a particular skill) of the grade level standard.

Ideas for sharing with participants:
- Looking at a CCSS, identify the precursor skills
- Consider communication skills

Presenter Background Information: From NCSC Validity Evaluation Learner Characteristics Inventory Project Report - Across all NCSC partner states, teachers reported that the majority of students (69%) participating in the AA-AAS used symbolic language to communicate; 18% of students used intentional communication, but not at a symbolic level (emerging symbolic); and 10% communicated primarily through cries, facial expressions, change in muscle tone, etc., but showed no clear use of objects/textures, regularized gestures, pictures, signs, etc., in communicating (pre-symbolic).

- Consider attending skills

Presenter Background Information: From NCSC Validity Evaluation Learner Characteristics Inventory Project Report - The majority of students who participated in the AA-AAS across all NCSC partner states initiated and sustained social interactions (54%; see Exhibit 20 and Exhibit 21) or responded with social interaction, but did not initiate or sustain social interactions (32%).

- Identify the level of mastery this student is expected to achieve; typically determined annually
Ideas for sharing with participants:

- Beginning a task analysis of precursor skills
- Standards are broad in scope; this could be analyzed relative to precursor skills for
  - Main idea
  - Key details
  - Explain connection between main idea and key details
  - Summarizing
- Here we are analyzing steps of mastery to determining the main idea on the slide; arranged on slide from higher to lower skills
- Lowest precursor skill is identifying the main idea in a stand-alone sentence

Overlay animation is on series of CLICKs; each CLICK brings in the next overlay
- Must consider finding the main idea when explicit in the text before implicit
- Consider the student ability to determine main ideas through listening, following along with text, then independently in text
- Consider student skills and level of text complexity

**Presenter Background Information:** from NCSC Validity Evaluation Learner Characteristics Inventory Project Report

The LCI delineates five reading categories for students who participate in the AA-AAS. Across all NCSC partner states, approximately 65% of students could read written text or Braille: 39% of students read basic sight words, simple sentences, directions, bullets, and/or lists in print or Braille; 22% of students could read fluently with basic, literal understanding; and 4% of students across all NCSC partner states could read fluently with critical understanding in print or Braille.
Ideas for sharing with participants:
- Beginning a task analysis of precursor skills
- Standards are broad in scope; this could be analyzed relative to precursor skills for each type of system of units
- Here we are analyzing steps of mastery of linear measurement relativity; arranged on slide from higher to lower skills
- Overlay animation is on series of CLICKs; each CLICK brings in the next overlay
  - Concrete experiences first
  - Representational paper and pencil work next
  - Then move to abstract or mental modeling

**Presenter Background Information:** from NCSC Validity Evaluation Learner Characteristics Inventory Project Report

Conversely, 16% of students had no observable awareness of print or Braille. In mathematics across all NCSC partner states, 42% of students performed computational procedures with or without a calculator, and 26% of students could count with 1:1 correspondence to at least 10, or made numbered sets of items; 15% of students reportedly had no observable awareness or use of numbers. Compared to other NCSC partner states, State 16 reported a relatively low percentage of students who did computational procedures with or without a calculator (18%), and conversely, it had a relatively high percentage of students who counted with 1:1 correspondence to at least 10 (51%) or who counted by rote to five (27%).
Segue: Clear delineation of what the student will know and be able to do in relation to the standard will need to reside in the IEP or personal learning plan for the specific student.

Source: Federal Register

Ideas for sharing with participants

- Federal Register addresses implementation of the special education statute
- §300.320 is about defining IEP further -- the difference between the definition in §300.22 and the definition in §300.320 is that in .320 the words "in a meeting" have been added and then .320 goes on to delineate the components of and IEP
- §300.321 is about IEP team
- §300.322 is about parent participation
- §300.323 is about when an IEP is to be in effect
- §300.324 is about development, review, and revision
Ideas for sharing with participants:

- Required elements of an IEP
- All components are essential to the document
- There is (and has been for quite some time) and assumption of participation in both the general education curriculum and the general education setting

**Presenter Note:** depending on the make-up and background of the participants, you may wish to give an example of what may be included in one or more components of the IEP as listed on the slide.
Ideas for sharing with participants:

- **Grade level standards**
  - With the expectation that instructional units and lessons will be developed utilizing the principles of universal design for learning; many needed accommodations for students with IEPs will be already present in the classroom.
  - Accommodations needed beyond that will be planned individually.

- **Foundational skills**
  - Finding the splinter/scatter skills; skill gaps.
  - Determining the specialized instruction to address gaps; strategies for:
    - Academics
    - Behaviors
    - Motivation

- In some states guidance on goal-writing may come from the state level; in others it may be guidance from the local level; it is important to remember that goals for students must be individualized relative to that student’s specific strengths and needs as demonstrated by student data.
Optional slides to expand on content of IEPs

Presenter Note: Given the context of the training/presentation and the level of experience(s) among the participants, either or both of these slides may be used to stimulate a discussion of current practice and/or implications for future practice.

Ideas to share with the participants:

- Standards-aligned IEPs is not a new concept; relatively common across districts and states around the time of the 1997 reauthorization
- Specifically designed instruction addresses the issue of “individualized” education program
  - May involve any aspect of the student’s instruction
  - Should inform accommodations for assessments
Segue: Annual goals should chart the developmental progression of skills to be learned that will allow the student to successfully and meaningfully navigate, participate and function in 21\textsuperscript{st} century life.

IEP considerations...

- What must student know and be able to do?
- What accommodations and supports are needed to achieve the goal?
- What specialized, individualized instruction is needed to achieve the goal?
- How will progress toward the goal be monitored?
- What data must be collected? How often?

Ideas for sharing with participants:
- Determining and setting clear goals critical to IEP
- Slide is self-explanatory with respect to questions to consider
**Presenter Note: Handout #3:** Thinking and doing differently… is available for use at this time. It is intended as an adult note-taking organizer.

**Optional Activity for longer presentations:** Thinking and doing differently

*Depending on number of Participants and how conducted, 15 to 20 minutes*

Think, Pair, Share Activity

**Lead in question**
- In what ways will these different roles (people) need to think and do differently in relation to the past, based on CCSS?

**Format of activity:**
- Take a few moments (30 to 45 seconds for each role – presenter may signal at the end of the allotted time) to silently think about the question
- Turn to a partner and check in to see if you agree and/or disagree with the same statements.
- At your table, you will then have five minutes to share your thoughts. At the end of that time your table will be given a minute to build consensus around the most important points from your discussion.
- Each table will then share their ideas.
- **Sharing options:**
  - Each spokesperson shares for 2 minutes, 1 minute – dependent on number of tables
  - Each spokesperson shares, careful not to repeat what has been said before and add new insights

Presenter summarizes the statements includes any pertinent information in the notes below that participants may not have thought of and presented, and moves on to next slide.
• For us, the adults, it means…
  o Parents – our children will be learning in new ways; we need to know how to support them
  o Teachers and administrators – students will be assessed in more authentic ways, our curriculum and instruction must match the expectations on which students will be assessed
  o Policy-makers – will need to review existing policy, requirements, and financial incentives; and make changes that may be needed to implement the standards
  o Community and business leaders – will need to facilitate implementation of standards by providing information on the application of the standards in the workplace and community settings; support authentic assessments; partners with schools to support any required changes in delivery methods of instruction
  o Students – will need to be actively engaged in the learning process
Segue: Common Core State Standards set expectations for student learning and demonstration of learning which have implications for ensuring aligned state assessments.

Ideas for sharing with participants:

- Common Core includes both knowledge and skills
- In schools, assessment is valuable to developing curriculum and designing instruction
- Curriculum design determines what is taught in lessons from day to day and week to week, at what grade level, and in what order
- Lesson planning begins with planning for students of all ability and disability ranges; such planning provides for instruction that benefits all learners
- Instruction focuses on both knowledge and skills and processes
- Students learn in a variety of modalities (visual, auditory, kinesthetic) and demonstrate learning in a variety of ways (paper and pencil, projects, performances, process development)
- The standards and common core are driving instruction and student learning; these assessments will match/align with the common core – it is circular – assessments inform instruction

- CLICK – the word “assessments” magnifies – segue to next slide
Segue: Common core demands a different way of assessing.

Presenter Tip: Graphics on this slide appear through a series of CLICKs which are noted along with the points to share with the participants. Practice prior to presentation of this slide is recommended.

Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- Most current state assessments cannot tap into the knowledge and skills of the common core.
  - More writing and problem solving
  - Assessing process as well as knowledge and skills
  - A different way of thinking about assessment
- CLICK - Bell curve
  - Traditionally think of achievement of students in a bell curve
  - Most student achievement outcomes fall in the middle
  - With few at each end of the continuum
- CLICK – no symbol
  - Not applicable to a standards-based learning environment
- CLICK – arrow and runners enter one after the other
  - Goal is to support all students so that they are to the right on that curve; to move toward independence and greater proficiency in each standard; to transition to being college and/or career ready
  - It is about progress in the standards and demonstration of growth by each and all students, regardless of
    - Ability or disability
    - Language/communication preference/mode
    - Preferred way of taking in information or demonstrating use of knowledge and skills
Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- US Department of Education HAS awarded grants to support the development of assessments aligned to the Common Core State Standards
  - September 2010 – two grants to develop general (for the majority of students) assessments
  - October 2010 – two grants to develop alternate assessments for those students with significant/intensive support disabilities (approximately 1% of the student population)
  - October 2011 and November 2012 – two grants to develop assessments for students who are limited English Proficient; assessing their progress in the CCSS
- **States electing to administer** these aligned assessments will begin statewide in 2014-2015
- **Although your state may choose to develop its own assessments**, many will administer assessments that are in the development stages within these consortia
- In the end – all states will still have 3 tests
  - General assessment (most students) – PARCC, Smarter Balance, or their own
  - Alternate assessment (1% of students) – Dynamic Learning Maps, NCSC, or their own
  - English Language Learners with limited proficiency – ASSETS, ELPA21, or their own
- CLICK – Let’s take a look at the similarities and differences of the two general assessments being developed.

**Important to note:** Consortia creating the tests as we speak and so the information presented in the session is as current as could be at the time of writing/printing; please check websites for most current information

**Recommended:** Presenter and participants go to websites to see the upcoming activities and provide feedback as requested from time to time
Optional slides: The following three slides are available for the mid-level and expanded presentation timeframes.

Segue: Let us take a look at what is happening in the area of general assessments, those being developed for the majority of the students in our schools.

Source: Coming together to raise achievement. April 2012. ETS

Ideas for sharing with the participants:
- Both the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers and Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium are designing
  - Online assessments; grades 3-8 and high school; ELA and math
  - Mix of item types – selected response, constructed response, complex performance tasks
  - Two components administered at end of school year; summative
    - Performance-based – extended tasks such as research, oral response, exhibit, product development, etc.; human scoring
    - End of year comprehensive – online and computer scored
Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- Optional interim assessments – for instructional decision-making; not part of the summative results for students
- Professional development modules – both web-based and face-to-face delivery systems to be utilized
- Formative items/tasks for classroom use – at the discretion of classroom teachers
- Model curricular/instructional units – in both ELA and math
- Online reporting suite – for efficiency
- Digital library – of resources and tools
Presenter Note: Throughout the slides there may be abbreviations or acronyms used in order to save space on the slide so that the font is large enough to be read by participants. In such cases, be sure to state the full term when referring to the slide. PARCC = Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers; SBAC = Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium

Source: Coming together to raise achievement. April 2012. ETS

Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- **PARCC**
  - Fixed-form summative assessment – assesses students on the standards at the grade level/course in which they are enrolled
  - Optional diagnostic and mid-year assessments – for each grade level; diagnostic is computer–based; mid-year is performance/task-based
  - Required non-summative speaking and listening assessment (gr 3-8 & high school) – required to administer and score; score does not add into the summative score for the student

- **SBAC**
  - Computer adaptive summative assessment – assesses across full spectrum of standards; responds to student responses; adapts to student’s skill level
  - Retake option available
  - Optional interim assessments; timing and scope locally determined (gr 3-12)
Segue: Additionally, both general assessment consortia are considering, and piloting, embedded assessment accommodations. Much like universally designed classrooms, units of study, and lesson plans: the assessments are being designed to afford the greatest number of students accessibility. Both consortia, at time of writing, have draft accommodations guidelines which are subject to revision. The latest version may be accessed at their respective websites.

Presenter Note: These two slides are self-explanatory. At this point you may want to re-emphasize that these are not guaranteed to be included or embedded in the assessment. These are supports being discussed.

It is important to note that both the general assessment consortia know and acknowledge that there are students who have a large discrepancy between skill areas (e.g. some students with ASD) and the ability of these assessments to adjust to these students – esp. the ones too high for inclusion in the alternate assessment and really not up to the level to take the general assessment; therefore, incorporating the principles of Universal Design for Learning are of utmost importance.
Optional Activity for longer presentations:  Personal/Professional Connection

Whole Group Discussion Activity
[depending on time available; 10-20 minutes]

Lead in statement and questions:
Now that we have spent time in an overview of consortia developing general assessments aligned to the Common Core State Standards…
  • What issues are coming to the forefront for you?
  • What questions are uppermost in your mind?

Format of activity:
  • Open the floor for discussion
  • Paraphrase and repeat whenever clarity is needed
  • Answer questions that are answerable
  • Record
    o Questions for which there are no answers at this time
    o Issues to explore
    o Suggestions for moving forward
  • Facilitate so that all may share in the discussion. Should one or two persons seem to be dominating the discussion, ask for a response from a specific table or from a specific person.

Trainer Tip: Capture key ideas on chart paper. Visual recording for all to see indicates that there will be something done after the discussion and that this is not an exercise in futility.

Presenter paraphrases and summarizes the discussion. He/she indicates where the responses from the discussion will go from here.
Segue: Two consortia are developing Alternate Assessments for those children who cannot show what they know on a typical assessment even with accommodations, as determined by the student’s IEP team.

- CLICK – brings in blue overlay
**Optional slides:** The following two slides are available for the mid-level and expanded presentation timeframes.

**Segue:** Let’s take a look at the similarities and differences of the two alternate assessments being developed.

Source: Coming together to raise achievement. April 2012. ETS

Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- Online assessment system – building in efficiency
  - Student response when possible – students may respond online; teacher recording is an option
  - Teacher management of data
- Attend to communication, sensory, and motor needs – taking into consideration needs of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities
- Professional development resources – curriculum, instruction, assessment administration, accommodations
**Presenter Note:** Throughout the slides there may be abbreviations or acronyms used in order to save space on the slide so that the font is large enough to be read by participants. In such cases, be sure to state the full term when referring to the slide. DLM = Dynamic Learning Maps; NCSC = National Center and State Collaborative Partnership

Source: Coming together to raise achievement. April 2012. ETS

Ideas for sharing with the participants:

- **DLM**
  - Common Core Essential Elements – how DLM defines links to grade level CCSS; statements of essential elements and achievement descriptors; includes precursor academic skills, communication skills, attention skills
  - Embedded tasks – integrating assessment and instruction
    - Series of 100 or more items/tasks throughout year
    - 5-10 minutes per task
  - Optional stand-alone summative assessment – adapts based on the mastery of concepts throughout the year; administered in the spring

- **NCSC**
  - Grade-level assessment content targets – and alternate achievement standards for each grade level
  - Trained teachers in each state to support implementation – 10 to 40 teachers in each participating state; to lead implementation of NCSC-developed curriculum and assessment materials
Optional Activity for longer presentations: Personal/Professional Connection

Whole Group Discussion Activity
[depending on time available; 10-20 minutes]

Lead in statement and questions:
Now that we have spent time in an overview of consortia developing alternate assessments aligned to the Common Core State Standards…

- What issues are coming to the forefront for you?
- What questions are uppermost in your mind?

Format of activity:
- Open the floor for discussion
- Paraphrase and repeat whenever clarity is needed
- Answer questions that are answerable
- Record
  - Questions for which there are no answers at this time
  - Issues to explore
  - Suggestions for moving forward
- Facilitate so that all may share in the discussion. Should one or two persons seem to be dominating the discussion, ask for a response from a specific table or from a specific person.

**Trainer Tip:** Capture key ideas on chart paper. Visual recording for all to see indicates that there will be something done after the discussion and that this is not an exercise in futility.

Presenter paraphrases and summarizes the discussion. He/she indicates where the responses from the discussion will go from here.
Reminder: There are currently six assessment consortia creating assessment tools based on the Common Core State Standards; accessibility issues; we will look at the general and alternate assessments; there are also two assessments being developed for English Language learners; for more information on all six assessment consortia see the IDEA Partnership Power Point and Presenter Guide “Assessments aligned to the Common Core State Standards” at http://www.ideapartnership.org/using-tools/learning-together/collections.html?id=1522:ccss-and-a-collection-tools&catid=327:common-core-state-standards-ccss-collection

Segue to the summary statement slide.

Source: CCSS: Implications for students with disabilities. Martha L. Thurlow, Director, National Center on Educational Outcomes. NASBE Regional Meeting August 12, 2011

For sharing with participants:
- Literature on expectations suggests students learn what we expect them to learn.
- Some students – with and without disabilities – may not achieve to the levels we hope even after high quality standards-based instruction.
- But we have no way to predict which students so we have to teach them ALL well!
- CLICK brings in overlay (first two bullets are on slide prior to overlay)
Further information and resources:

**Presenter Note:** These slides are included to summarize and remind the participants of the websites referenced throughout the presentation. **Handout #4: Common Core State Standards Websites** is available for distribution.
Question and Answer:

**Presenter Note:** This slide is recommended for use with the longer presentations.

Q&A: *depending on time available, takes 5 to 10 minutes*

Whole Group Discussion Activity

Lead in statement and questions:
Now that we have spent time in an overview of Common Core State Standards and application to students with disabilities…
- What issues are coming to the forefront for you?
- What questions are uppermost in your mind?

Format of activity:
- Open the floor for discussion
- Paraphrase and repeat whenever clarity is needed
- Answer questions that are answerable
- Record
  - Questions for which there are no answers at this time
  - Issues to explore
  - Suggestions for moving forward
- Facilitate so that all may share in the discussion. Should one or two persons seem to be dominating the discussion, ask for a response from a specific table or from a specific person.

**Trainer Tip:** Capture key ideas on chart paper. Visual recording for all to see indicates that there will be something done after the discussion and that this is not an exercise in futility.

Presenter paraphrases and summarizes the discussion. He/she indicates where the responses from the discussion will go from here.
Optional Activity: To encourage discussion and/or application, 30 minutes

Presenter Note: You may wish to insert a slide or slides with relevant question(s).

The following is a partial list of challenges to implementation of the Common Core State Standards with students with disabilities. Lead a group discussion choosing from one of the topics below or a topic of interest to the participants.

- Addressing the balance between standards and individualization
- Perceived competition between academics and life skills
- Extent of new learning… and PD to provide it
  - Choosing materials and strategies that will meet higher expectations
  - UDL as a expected practice
  - Incorporating instructional materials with embedded accessibility
- Time in the curriculum for transition
- Availability of technology
Handout #1: *Mission Statement of the Common Core State Standards Initiative*
Handout #2: *Thinking and Doing Differently* (activity)
Handout #3: *UDL Guidelines*
Handout #4: *Common Core State Standards Websites*
Mission Statement of the Common Core State Standards Initiative

The Common Core State Standards provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn, so teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them. The standards are designed to be robust and relevant to the real world, reflecting the knowledge and skills that our young people need for success in college and careers. With American students fully prepared for the future, our communities will be best positioned to compete successfully in the global economy.

To address…

Disparate standards across states

Student mobility

Skills needed for today’s jobs/careers and jobs/careers of tomorrow

Global competition
### Universal Design for Learning Guidelines

#### I. Provide Multiple Means of Representation

1. Provide options for perception
   - Options that customize the display of information
   - Options that provide alternatives for auditory information
   - Options that provide alternatives for visual information

2. Provide options for language and symbols
   - Options that define vocabulary and symbols
   - Options that clarify syntax and structure
   - Options for decoding text or mathematical notation
   - Options that promote cross-linguistic understanding
   - Options that illustrate key concepts non-linguistically

3. Provide options for comprehension
   - Options that provide or activate background knowledge
   - Options that highlight critical features, big ideas, and relationships
   - Options that guide information processing
   - Options that support memory and transfer

#### II. Provide Multiple Means of Action and Expression

4. Provide options for physical action
   - Options in the mode of physical response
   - Options in the means of navigation
   - Options for accessing tools and assistive technologies

5. Provide options for expressive skills and fluency
   - Options in the media for communication
   - Options in the tools for composition and problem solving
   - Options in the scaffolds for practice and performance

6. Provide options for executive functions
   - Options that guide effective goal-setting
   - Options that support planning and strategy development
   - Options that facilitate managing information and resources
   - Options that enhance capacity for monitoring progress

#### III. Provide Multiple Means of Engagement

7. Provide options for recruiting interest
   - Options that increase individual choice and autonomy
   - Options that enhance relevance, value, and authenticity
   - Options that reduce threats and distractions

8. Provide options for sustaining effort and persistence
   - Options that heighten salience of goals and objectives
   - Options that vary levels of challenge and support
   - Options that foster collaboration and communication
   - Options that increase mastery-oriented feedback

9. Provide options for self-regulation
   - Options that guide personal goal-setting and expectations
   - Options that scaffold coping skills and strategies
   - Options that develop self-assessment and reflection
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**Thinking and doing differently…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Parents</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>School personnel (teachers, administrators, counselors, etc.)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy-makers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Community and business leaders</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Students</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Common Core State Standards Websites

Common Core State Standards Initiative
www.corestandards.org

Co-Teaching: General and Special Educators Working Together
http://nichcy.org/schoolage/effective-practices/coteaching

Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System Consortium
www.dynamiclearningmaps.org

National Center and State Collaborative Partnership
www.ncspartners.org

Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers
www.parcconline.org

Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium
www.smarterbalanced.org

Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports
www.pbis.org

The IDEA Partnership Website; Common Core Collection
www.ideapartnership.org

Universal Design for Learning
www.udlcenter.org