# **Including Students with Disabilities** in the Common Core

Welcome to Including Students with Disabilities in the Common Core, where you will learn about the implications of the Common Core State Standards for students with disabilities.

The general education teacher plays an integral role in the life of each student with a disability who is in the classroom. There are important obligations and responsibilities for students with disabilities that every teacher should be aware of. This course is designed to help teachers who have students with disabilities in their classrooms navigate their complex roles.

An overview of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the two laws that ensure education equity for all students, will prepare you for making the decisions that are necessary in a classroom with students with disabilities. These laws call for individualized education plans (IEPs), which are developed and monitored by classroom teachers and other relevant stakeholders. You will learn about the different types of IEP meetings and how to prepare for those meetings.

You will also learn about writing individualized student goals that are aimed at reaching the Common Core standards and how to analyze the standards to determine the requisite skills that students with disabilities will need to be successful. The course will provide instructional strategies that include students with disabilities and review accommodations and modifications that are effective and appropriate for individual situations.

Upon completion of this course, you will feel more confident in working with students with special needs and in their ability to achieve the levels of rigor called for in the Common Core State Standards.

## **Course Objectives**

By the end of this course, you will be able to

#### Module 1

 Articulate six key components of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act that affect the relationship between the Common Core State Standards and students with disabilities.



• Effectively evaluate case studies involving special education students and determine the most likely outcome.

#### Module 2

- Develop a process that guides meaningful discussion and participation in the IEP meetings.
- Collect the information needed to participate in a meaningful manner.
- Evaluate teachers' level of preparation for IEP meetings.

#### Module 3

- Describe the information needed to make informed decisions about a student's ability to achieve the rigorous expectations of the Common Core standards.
- Write individualized goals tied to specific Common Core standards.

#### Module 4

- Analyze the Common Core standards and identify the knowledge and skills students need to achieve success.
- Evaluate your current practice in light of the Common Core instructional shifts and specific students with disabilities.

#### Module 5

- Identify and use instructional strategies for students with disabilities that support achievement to the Common Core standards.
- Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of those strategies.
- Track and improve skills in supplying appropriate and helpful feedback.

#### Module 6

- Articulate the difference between an accommodation and a modification, providing at least three examples of each in relationship to the Common Core standards.
- Use accommodations and evaluate their effectiveness.
- Determine at least three accommodations that may be appropriate for a student with disabilities.





## **Course Syllabus**

Module 1	Understanding Disability Law
	Module Welcome
	Reading 1: The Promise and the Peril for Students with Disabilities
	Podcast: Special Education Law
	Reading 2: Key Components of Special Education Law for Classroom Teachers
	Application 1: Creating a Mnemonic Device
	Check for Understanding
	Application 2: You Be the Judge
	Module Journal
Module 2	Preparing for the IEP Process
	Module Welcome
	Reading 1: Understanding the Purposes of IEP Meetings
	Video: Trevor's IEP Meeting—Part 1
	Reading 2: Tips for a Successful IEP Meeting
	Check for Understanding
	Application: Evaluate Teacher Preparation
	Module Journal
Module 3	Student-Centered Goal Planning
	Module Welcome
	Reading 1: EL—Cracking the Behavior Code
	Reading 2: Student-Centered Goal Planning
	Video: Trevor's IEP Meeting—Part 2
	Check for Understanding
	Application: Student Fact Sheet and Goals
	Module Journal





Module 4	<ul> <li>Task Analyzing</li> <li>Module Welcome</li> <li>Reading 1: EL—Making the Shifts</li> <li>Reading 2: The Importance of Task Analyzing</li> <li>Video: Trevor's IEP Meeting—Part 3</li> <li>Reading 3: EL—Ferrari Engines, Bicycle Brakes</li> <li>Application 1: Analyze Standards for Students with ADHD</li> <li>Check for Understanding</li> <li>Application 2: Evaluate a Lesson Plan</li> <li>Module Journal</li> </ul>
Module 5	Instructional Strategies and Feedback  Module Welcome  Reading 1: Strategies Designed to Include Students with Disabilities  Video: Trevor's IEP Meeting—Part 4  Application 1: Choosing the Right Strategy  Reading 2: EL—Seven Keys to Effective Feedback  Check for Understanding  Application 2: Evaluating Your Feedback  Module Journal
Module 6	Building Independence  Module Welcome  Reading 1: Accommodations: The Tools That Build Independence  Reading 2: EL—Call Me Different, Not Difficult  Video: Trevor's IEP Meeting—Part 5  Check for Understanding  Application: Choosing Appropriate Accommodations  Module Journal



### References

- ACT. (2006). Reading between the lines: What the ACT reveals about college readiness and reading. Iowa City, IA: Author.
- ACT. (2008). The forgotten middle: Improving readiness for high school. Iowa City, IA: Author.
- Alberti, S. (2012). Making the shifts. Educational Leadership, 70(4), 24–27.
- Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities; Final Rule, 71 Fed. Reg. 46,540 (proposed Aug. 14, 2006) (to be codified at 34 C.F.R. pts. 300 and 301).
- Bijou, S. W., Peterson, R. F., & Ault, M. H. (1968). A method to integrate descriptive and experimental field studies at the level of data and empirical concepts. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1(2), 175–191. doi: 10.1901/jaba.1968.1-175
- Bolt, S., & Roach, A. T. (2009). Inclusive assessment and accountability: A guide to accommodations for students with diverse needs. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Burns, M., Ardoin, S., Parker, D., Hodgson, J., Klingbeil, D., & Scholin, S. (2009). Interspersal technique and behavioral momentum for reading word lists. School Psychology Review, 38(3), 428-434.
- Conley, D. T., Drummond, K. V., de Gonzalez, A., Rooseboom, J., & Stout, O. (2011). Reaching the goal: The applicability and the importance of the Common Core State Standards to college and career readiness. Eugene, OR: Educational Policy Improvement Center.
- Domjan, M. P. (2010). The principles of learning and behavior: Active learning edition (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Duke, N. (2004). The case for informational text. Educational Leadership, 61(6), 40–44.
- Durand, V. M. (1990). Severe behavior problems: A functional communication training approach. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Ferriter, W. M. (2009). Student responders: Feedback at their fingertips. Educational Leadership, 67(3), 83-84.



- Gewertz, C. (2012, May 9). Math teaching often doesn't fit with new standards. Education Week. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/04/24/30common.h31.html
- Grandin, T. (2011). Treatments needed for severe sensory sensitivity. Retrieved from http://sfari .org/news-and-opinion/viewpoint/2011/treatments-needed-for-severe-sensory-sensitivity
- Hallowell, E. (2012). Ferrari engines, bicycle brakes. Educational Leadership, 70(2), 36–38.
- Hattie, J. (2008). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. New York: Routledge.
- Himmele, P., & Himmele, W. (2011). Total participation techniques. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq. (West 2004).
- Johns, B. (2007). Preparing test-resistant students for high stakes assessment. Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.
- Johns, B. (2011). 401 practical adaptations for every classroom. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Lee, D. (2006). Facilitating transitions between and within academic tasks: an application of behavioral momentum. Remedial and Special Education, 27, 312–317.
- Lerner, J., & Johns, B. (2012). Learning disabilities and related mild disabilities. Belmont, CA: Cengage.
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Mazur, E. (2009, January 2). Farewell, lecture? Science, 323, 50-51.
- National Center for Learning Disabilities. Accommodations for students with learning disabilities. Retrieved from http://www.ncld.org/students-disabilities/accommodations-education/ accommodations-students-learning-disabilities
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010a). Common core state standards for English language arts and literacy in history/ social studies, science, and technical subjects. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010b). Common core state standards for mathematics. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nolet, V., & McLaughlin, M. J. (2005). Accessing the general curriculum: Including students with disabilities in standards-based reform (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.



Rappaport, N., & Minahan, J. (2012). Cracking the behavior code. Educational Leadership, 70(2), 18-25.

Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 701 et seq. (West 1973).

Robison, J. E. (2012). Call me different, not difficult. Educational Leadership, 70(2), 40-44.

Schmidt, W. H., McKnight, C. C, & Raizen, S. A. (1997). A splintered vision: An investigation of U.S. science and mathematics education. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sulzer-Azaroff, B., Mayer, G. R. (1977). Applying behavior-analysis procedures with children and youth. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Thurlow, M. L. (2012). Common core state standards: The promise and the peril for student with disabilities. The Special EDge, 25(3), 1, 6–8.

Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven keys to effective feedback. Educational Leadership, 70(1), 10–16.

Wright, D., & Gurman, H. (1994). Positive interventions for serious behavior problems: Best practices implementing the Hughes Bill (A.B. 2586) and the positive behavioral intervention regulations. Sacramento, CA: Resources in Special Education. Retrieved from http://www.pent .ca.gov/pos/cl/str/useofreinforcement.pdf



