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Participant Outcomes

1. Initiate a dialogue among schools with a shared focus on improving outcomes for students with disabilities

2. Become familiar with data outlining national outcomes for students with disabilities

3. Understand the research base and basic tenets of inclusion for special education students
## Objectives

1. Understand history and continued need for reform in educational systems to support the success of students at risk of school failure, including SWD

2. Overview of how this is happening in systems across the United States and the components common to these successful systems

3. Examples of what is working and where

4. Inclusion models and how to get started

5. Universal Design for Learning: how we can support all learners in multiple ways

6. Next Steps: 3-5 actionable tasks you can accomplish
Historical Timeline of Reform

Brown v. Board of Education

1954

Education of All Handicapped Children Act

1975

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

1990

No Child Left Behind

2001

IDEA’s latest reauthorization

2004
Changes in Law and Practices

1950s to 1970s
• Separate but not equal
• Disproportionate number of minority students in special education

IDEA 1997 Amendments
• Access to the general education curriculum
• Special education is a service, not a place
• Participation is same state-wide and district-wide assessments
• Presumption that the starting point is the general education classroom with supplemental supports

No Child Left Behind 2001
• Access to highly qualified teachers
• Disaggregating data

2004 IDEA Reauthorization
• More accountability at the state and local levels
• More data on outcomes is required
• Districts providing adequate instruction and intervention for students to help keep them out of special education
What is the historical shift across the decades of this civil rights law?

Then (1975 – 1997)

Special Education was:

- A set of classroom placements
- With a separate curriculum based on differential standards
- With little relationship to general education programs and activities
- Funded based on instructional personnel services units

Now (1997-2004 to present)

Special Education is:

- A set of individually designed services
- To meet the student’s special needs and enable the student to participate in and progress in the general education curriculum
- Provided first in the context of the regular education classroom
- Many states went to “placement neutral funding,” which was based on the regular education population of the LEA
How Our Work Has Changed

**Then (1975 – 1997)**

- Conduct assessments to identify the students' special education needs
- Identify the placement and services that would best address the students' needs
- To expand the variety and quality of special services available in the schools and in the community
- Provide pupil count and fiscal information expenditure reports to SEAs

**Now (1997 and 2004 – present)**

- Conduct assessments to identify the student’s special needs and ability to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum
- To identify the services, modifications, and supports that will address the needs of the child and enable the child to progress in the general education curriculum
- Support and provide instruction in the general education curriculum
- Provide extensive student level data for state and federal accountability reports
- Submit detailed expenditure data to qualify for funds (MOE)
Rationale

At more than 12 percent of the overall student population, students with disabilities are truly a part of—not separate from—the diversity of American public schools. As such, we want to make certain that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) includes children with disabilities and that Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) programs provide extra supports to help students with disabilities achieve challenging standards.

Dr. Alexa Posny, Assistant Secretary
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
U.S. Department of Education
Of Every 100 White Kindergartners...

88 Graduate from high school

58 Complete some college

26 Obtain at least a bachelor’s degree

Of Every 100 African-American Kindergartners...

- 82 Graduate from high school
- 45 Complete some college
- 11 Obtain at least a bachelor’s degree

Of Every 100 Latino Kindergartners...

63 Graduate from high school

35 Complete some college

8 Obtain at least a bachelor’s degree

Of Every 100 Native American Kindergartners...

58 Graduate from high school

7 Obtain at least a bachelor’s degree

Of Every 100 Students in Special Education...

50 Graduate from high school

7 Obtain at least a bachelor’s degree

California’s Special Education Statistics

- California provides special education services to approximately 695,000 individuals, newborn through twenty-two years of age (2011-12).

- California provides specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parent, to meet the unique needs of each child with a disability. This instruction is provided in a variety of settings that allow infants and their families, preschoolers, students, and young adults to be educated with their peers as much as possible; that is, in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Special education services are available in a variety of settings that might include day care settings, preschool, a regular classroom, a classroom that emphasizes specially designed instruction, the community, and the work environment.

(from CDE website)
## Special Education Count % of Statewide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade level</th>
<th>Special Education Pupil Count</th>
<th>Statewide CBEDS Count</th>
<th>SpEd Pupil Count as % of K-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>164,564</td>
<td>1,924,474</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>160,249</td>
<td>1,394,284</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>102,328</td>
<td>936,626</td>
<td>10.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>198,895</td>
<td>1,964,759</td>
<td>10.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungraded Cbreds</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>626,036</td>
<td>6,226,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungraded</td>
<td>69,137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>695,173</td>
<td>6,226,989</td>
<td>11.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SpEd Enrollment Change Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Enrollment by Disability</th>
<th>Change over Time</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>December Special Education Pupil Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>December 2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>December 2002</strong></td>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>43,672</td>
<td>43,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>10,207</td>
<td>6,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>4,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>SLI</td>
<td>162,386</td>
<td>172,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>25,114</td>
<td>26,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>OI</td>
<td>13,385</td>
<td>15,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>OHI</td>
<td>66,509</td>
<td>28,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>279,413</td>
<td>344,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf- Blindness</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disability</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td>6,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>78,629</td>
<td>21,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>TBI</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>695,173</td>
<td>675,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total K-12 Enrollment (CBEDS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,226,989</td>
<td>6,244,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of student receiving special education services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.16%</td>
<td>10.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California High School Completion

Cohort Outcome Data for the Class of 2010-11
California

- Graduation Rate:
  - English Learners: 60.2%
  - Migrant Education: 71.9%
  - Special Education: 69.9%
  - Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 76.3%
  - All Students: 76.3%

- Dropout Rate:
  - English Learners: 17.3%
  - Migrant Education: 18.4%
  - Special Education: 17.6%
  - Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 14.4%
  - All Students: 14.1%

- Still Enrolled Rate:
  - English Learners: 24.8%
  - Migrant Education: 10.1%
  - Special Education: 18.7%
  - Socioeconomically Disadvantaged: 11.6%
  - All Students: 8.6%
Data Sets to Consider

1. Proportion of the National Student Population with Disabilities, 2000-01 to 2009-10
Data Sets to Consider

Special-Education Population by Disability 2000-01 and 2009-10

2000-01: N = 6.30 million students
- 1.5% Autism
- 3.4% Developmental Delay
- 4.8% Other Health Impairment
- 7.6% Emotional Disturbance
- 9.9% Mental Retardation
- 45.4% Specific Learning Disability
- 22.0% Speech or Language Impairment
- 5.3% Other Disabilities

2009-10: N = 6.48 million students
- 5.8% Autism
- 5.7% Developmental Delay
- 10.6% Other Health Impairment
- 6.3% Emotional Disturbance
- 7.1% Mental Retardation
- 37.5% Specific Learning Disability
- 21.8% Speech or Language Impairment
- 5.1% Other Disabilities

Note: The special-education population in 2009-10 was slightly larger in raw numbers than it was in 2000-01, but the proportion of students with disabilities among all students declined from 13.3 percent in 2000-01 to 13.1 percent in 2009-10.
Data Sets to Consider
What works consistently, and where is this type of reform happening?
Successful Reform Initiatives

- Kansas MTSS
- Iowa
- Massachusetts
- Michigan
- Florida
- Illinois
- Arizona
- Pennsylvania
- California
Response to Intervention/Instruction or a Multi-Tiered System of Supports

• It’s about Gifted Education!
• It’s about Special Education!
• It’s about Compensatory Education!
• It’s about General Education!
• It’s about EVERY Education!
Response to Instruction/Instruction (RtI) or MTSS is a problem-solving and instructional decision-making system that includes:

- High-yield instructional strategies to access core
- Research-evidenced interventions to meet individual student needs and the limitations of the core, with a dual focus on both academics and behavioral expectations and interventions
- Ongoing progress-monitoring and problem-solving teams to discuss and utilize data in instructional planning (assessment which includes screening, progress monitoring, diagnosis, and evaluation)
- A planned and purposeful systematic way of soliciting buy-in and participation from all staff and evaluation of that system at realistic junctures in order to meet the needs of all students and staff
To ensure improved results for all students at risk of failure, we must shift thinking from...

- Procedural concerns to instructional focus
- Reliance on formulas and checklists to systematic problem-solving
- Territorial silos to blended expertise
- Label-seeking to instructional solution-seeking
- “Testing” to instructionally relevant assessment
- Categories to whole child as a general education student, regardless of educational needs
Culture Shift

FROM:
Eligibility focus
Diagnose and Place

Get label

TO:
Outcome focus
Problem Solving
Response to Instruction and Intervention

Get Help
Questions?
Districts That Have Made Changes
Challenging Change:
How Schools and Districts are Improving the Performance of Special Education Students
Research on Effect of Instructional Models: Challenging Change from NCLD

- Organization of instruction
- Comprehensive curricula tied to clear standards so teachers know what to teach
- Good data systems so teachers know which students need additional help
- Time and opportunity for teachers to consult and learn from each other and experts in the field
Research on Effect of Instructional Models: Challenging Change from NCLD

• 5 districts examined
• Common issues across the districts:
  • Included students with disabilities in general education classrooms
  • Used data to adjust instruction to each student’s individual needs
  • Changed the ways teachers work together to include inclusive practices and revised roles/responsibilities for both general and special education staff
  • Restructured administrative organization and procedures
Research on Effect of Instructional Models: 
Challenging Change from NCLD

• Quotations that resonate:

  • *When students don’t fit particular programs, then those programs must be modified to fit the needs of the students.*

  • *It is not a special education issue; it is an instructional issue.*
Inclusive Practices
Inclusive Practices: Service Delivery Models that Work

• Models of inclusion: techniques for successful implementation

• All have key elements in common:
  • Collaboration between general and special education teachers
  • Shared responsibilities through team teaching
  • Implementation of different teaching strategies and the modification of assignments to accommodate individual students (UDL)
  • Adaptations and accommodations are both within class for individual students, small groups of students, and occasionally for entire class
  • Utilization of peer tutors and cooperative learning
Collaborative Teaching in an Inclusive Model

• Collaboration is about HOW professionals interact in shared responsibility for all students

• Based on belief of shared responsibility for all students (basic imperatives in both NCLB and IDEA)

• Focus is on access to the general curriculum to maximum extent possible

• Driven by the needs of both the teachers (PD, support, time, etc.) and students
Characteristics of Collaborative Interactions

- Parity in collaboration—each participant’s contribution is equally valued and participants have equal power in decision making
- Voluntary—the most success comes when parties are free to participate and exit by choice
- Mutual goals with agreed upon goals, problems, and shared responsibilities
- Shared responsibilities and equal accountability for outcomes
- Shared resources, including materials and human resources
Research Findings on Inclusion

- Over 20+ years research consistently demonstrated that inclusion results in favorable outcomes (for both high incidence and low incidence disabilities).

- For students with high incidence disabilities, a higher % make academic progress in general education settings as compared to students in resource settings.

- Use of peer mediated instruction strategies results in improved academic outcomes for ALL students.

- Placement in general education results in:
  - Improved IEP quality
  - More student engagement
  - Increase in instructional time
  - Maintenance of individualized supports
Research Findings on Inclusion

• Effective instructional and curricular adaptations, both routine and specialized, include:
  • graphic/advanced organizers
  • Mnemonics
  • content enhancement routines
  • strategy instruction
  • supplemental materials aligned to core
  • inquiry approach to math and science

• Peer support of peers without disabilities providing academic and social support indicate that:
  • Typical peers have higher levels of engagement during support role
  • Peers with severe disabilities spent more time engaged in activities aligned with the general curriculum
Research Findings on Inclusion

• Research on inclusion of students with severe disabilities showed less focus on academics

• Implementation on adaptations is just emerging

• Current evidence shows limited use of accommodations and modifications for students with severe disabilities

• Presence of modifications increases academic responding and decreases competing behavior

• Research on co-teaching shows moderate effect size for student outcomes

• Qualitative studies show predominance of “one teach, one assist model” which is not considered highly recommended
Co-teachers deliver the same instruction simultaneously, playing off each other as they teach the lesson to the whole class.

- Co-teachers are engaged in a conversation, not just taking turns teaching.
- Team teaching requires a high level of planning and collaboration and works best when there is a higher level of trust and interpersonal compatibility between co-teachers.
- Team teaching is most appropriate when all students are working at the same level of rigor and toward mastering the same objectives.
- Team teaching provides less opportunity for co-teachers to stop and assist an individual or group of struggling students.
Parallel Teaching in the Inclusive Classroom

Parallel Teaching

- Co-teachers deliver the same instruction at the same time, but divide the class into groups and teach the lesson separately.
- Parallel teaching is a good option when a lower teacher-to-student ratio is needed.
- Parallel teaching allows for students to receive the same content but in ways that accommodate different learners.
- It's important to be thoughtful of how and when students are placed into groups.
- Parallel teaching is most appropriate when all students are working toward mastery of the same objectives but not necessarily at the same level of rigor.
One Teach, One Observe (Support Teaching) in the Inclusive Classroom

- One co-teacher is responsible for leading the lesson while the other takes the role of observer, noting students’ engagement and progress.
- Co-teachers discuss the focus for observation in advance of the lesson and analyze the data together afterward.
- This form of support teaching allows co-teachers to receive “safe” and nonevaluative feedback.
- Information can be gathered about the learning process of specific students in order to inform future planning and instruction.
- The observing co-teacher does not have the opportunity to assist struggling students.
One Teach, One Circulate (Support Teaching) in the Inclusive Classroom

- One co-teacher is responsible for leading the lesson while the other circulates the classroom and works with individual students who may need assistance.
- This form of support teaching allows for students to receive targeted one-on-one support without interrupting the lead teacher's instruction.
- This form of support teaching works well when students are working on mastery of the same objective but learning gaps have been identified in specific students.
- This form of support teaching has the risk of distracting some students and/or marginalizing others.
- Because this method demands the least amount of change from co-teachers, it can be overused. It’s important that co-teachers switch the roles of teacher and assistant.
Alternative Teaching in the Inclusive Classroom

Alternative Teaching

- One co-teacher delivers a lesson to the large group while the other teaches a smaller group the same lesson on a different level or an alternative lesson.
- Alternative teaching is appropriate when you know mastery of objectives will look different for different students and/or when there is a great degree of difference in learner readiness.
- Alternative teaching requires use and planning of materials of different levels.
- It's important to use this method not only for remediation purposes but also for enrichment.
- Alternative teaching varies the purpose and composition of small groups.
### Station Teaching

- Co-teachers divide the content and students into stations. Each co-teacher instructs at a station and students move from station to station.
- A third station can be used to give students independent practice.
- Station teaching is appropriate when the lesson involves multiple topics or sub-skills.
- Students can be grouped according to their learning strengths and/or gap, allowing station instruction to be tailored to meet their needs.
- Station teaching allows for less collaboration between co-teachers during instruction.
Considerations for Implementation

• Visible leadership at the top levels is vital to the success of an inclusive/collaborative initiative
• An atmosphere of trust is essential
• Effective positive communication is critical to establishing and maintaining relationships
• Features fundamental to appropriate and effective inclusion programs:
  1. Collaborative culture
  2. Shared leadership
  3. Coherent vision
  4. Comprehensive planning
  5. Adequate resources
  6. Sustained implementation
  7. Continuous evaluation and improvement
Getting Started!

- Critical steps are outlined below
- Each step is important and requires administrative planning
- Understanding where staff falls in regards to philosophies of both inclusion and collaboration is critical
- Steps to get started:
  1. Begin identifying and building school teams
  2. Start planning early for the next school year
  3. Recruit and support capable participants
  4. Provide ongoing professional development and resources
  5. Create balanced, well-planned classroom rosters
  6. Provide scheduled collaborative planning time in participants’ schedules
  7. Provide a climate for sustained implementation
  8. Build a plan that includes opportunities for continuous evaluation, reflection, and improvement
Research on Inclusive Education

- *Teaching Tolerance*, A project of the Southern Poverty Law Center, Seamless Teaching, 6 Co-teaching Models for the Inclusion Classroom, 2013
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Universal Design for Learning: Options in Inclusion Settings
Universal Design (UD) Principles

- **Not** one size fits all
- Design from beginning; **not** add on later
- Increase access opportunities for everyone
UD Examples

- Ramps
- Curb cuts
- Electric doors
- Captions on television
- Easy-grip tools
Who Benefits?

- Weather report: "The front is on the move. The front pushing through and delivering some cooler air."
- Man exercising:
- Family at table:
- Ear icon:

Logo: CROSS & JOFTUS
Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

- More ways to access
- More ways to participate
- More ways to demonstrate learning

Resulting in more equitable access to the general education curriculum for ALL learners
Why UDL?

- Current instructional practices are not appropriate for all learners
- Existence of academic achievement gaps
- Benefits of accessibility vs. retrofitting
Goals of UDL

• Improving access, participation, and achievement
• Eliminating or reducing physical and academic barriers
• Valuing diversity through proactive design
Access and Equity is Built In

Designed from the outset to meet the needs of all students
Principles of UDL

Multiple

• means of representation
• means of action and expression
• means of engagement
**Universal Design for Learning Guidelines**

**Principle I: Provide Multiple Means of Representation** - the "WHAT" of learning - Learners differ in the ways that they perceive and comprehend information that is presented to them.

**Principle II: Provide Multiple Means of Expression** - the "HOW" of learning - Learners differ in the ways that they can navigate a learning environment and express what they know.

**Principle III: Provide Multiple Means of Engagement** - the "WHY" of learning - Learners differ markedly in the ways in which they can be engaged or motivated to learn. Some learners are highly engaged by spontaneity and novelty while other are disengaged, even frightened, by those aspects, preferring strict routine.

These UDL Guidelines and checkpoints can assist educators in designing flexible lessons and curricula that reduce barriers to learning and provide innovative and supportive learning to meet the needs of all learners. They can also help educators evaluate existing curricula goals, materials, methods and assessments.

For more detail, examples, and research, visit the National Center on Universal Design at: [http://www.udlc.org/](http://www.udlc.org/)
# Universal Design for Learning Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Provide Multiple Means of Representation</th>
<th>II. Provide Multiple Means of Action and Expression</th>
<th>III. Provide Multiple Means of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide options for perception</td>
<td>4. Provide options for physical action</td>
<td>7. Provide options for recruiting interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Offer ways of customizing the display of information</td>
<td>4.1 Vary the methods for response and navigation</td>
<td>7.1 Optimize individual choice and autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Offer alternatives for auditory information</td>
<td>4.2 Optimize access to tools and assistive technologies</td>
<td>7.2 Optimize relevance, value, and authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Offer alternatives for visual information</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Minimize threats and distractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide options for language, mathematical expressions, and symbols</td>
<td>5. Provide options for expression and communication</td>
<td>8. Provide options for sustaining effort and persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Clarify vocabulary and symbols</td>
<td>5.1 Use multiple media for communication</td>
<td>8.1 Heighten salience of goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Clarify syntax and structure</td>
<td>5.2 Use multiple tools for construction and composition</td>
<td>8.2 Vary demands and resources to optimize challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Support decoding of text, mathematical notation, and symbols</td>
<td>5.3 Build fluencies with graduated levels of support for practice and performance</td>
<td>8.3 Foster collaboration and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Promote understanding across languages</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.4 Increase mastery-oriented feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Illustrate through multiple media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Activate or supply background knowledge</td>
<td>6.1 Guide appropriate goal-setting</td>
<td>9.1 Promote expectations and beliefs that optimize motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Highlight patterns, critical features, big ideas, and relationships</td>
<td>6.2 Support planning and strategy development</td>
<td>9.2 Facilitate personal coping skills and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Guide information processing, visualization, and manipulation</td>
<td>6.3 Facilitate managing information and resources</td>
<td>9.3 Develop self-assessment and reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Maximize transfer and generalization</td>
<td>6.4 Enhance capacity for monitoring progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resourceful, knowledgeable learners**

**Strategic, goal-directed learners**

**Purposeful, motivated learners**

© 2011 by CAST. All rights reserved. www.cast.org, www.udlcenter.org
APA Citation: CAST (2011). Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.0. Wakefield, MA: Author
Universal Design for Learning: Examples

**REPRESENTATION**
Input
The “What?” of learning
Options to see, hear and perceive information:

- **EXAMPLES:** Video, Lecture, Demonstration, Diagram, Story, Textbook, Website

Options to decode language, math, symbols:

- **EXAMPLES:** Text to speech, Manipulatives, Pictures

Options to make sense and understand knowledge:

- **EXAMPLES:** Graphic Organizer, Clues, Prompts, Aided Questions, Models

**ACTION/EXPRESSION**
Output
The “How?” of learning
Options to do, move and interact:

- **EXAMPLES:** Game, Acting/Role playing, Demonstrate, Lab, Speech, Typing, Recording

Options to differentiate expression of knowledge:

- **EXAMPLES:** Journaling, Oral expression, Timeline, Worksheet, Exam

Options to plan, strategize and initiate action:

- **EXAMPLES:** Project, Portfolio, Create a video

**ENGAGEMENT**
Connection
The “Why?” of learning
Options to care, value and find relevance:

- **EXAMPLES:** Discussion, Guest speaker, Journaling, Video, Experiment

Options to set goals and self regulate:

- **EXAMPLES:** Interest Inventory, Reflection, Survey, Goal Setting Activity

**ENGAGEMENT**
Connection
The “Why?” of learning
Options to vary challenge and/or support:

- **EXAMPLES:** Learning Center, Small Group Activity, Discrepant Event, Worksheet, Internet
UDL Resources and Research

- Center for Applied Special Technology  www.cast.org
- National Task Force on UDL  www.udl4all.org
  IDEA Partnership Community of Practice - UDL  www.sharedwork.org
- NEA Research Spotlight on UDL  http://www.nea.org/tools/29111.htm

- Universal Design for Learning (UDL): Making learning accessible and engaging for all students.  (NEA, 2008)
- A Practical Reader in Universal Design for Learning
  Edited by David H. Rose and Anne Meyer  (Harvard Education Press, 2006)
- A Policy Reader in Universal Design for Learning
  Edited by David T. Gordon, Jenna W. Gravel, and Laura A. Schifter  (Harvard Education Press, 2009)
- The Universally Designed Classroom: Accessible Curriculum and Digital Technologies
  Edited by David H. Rose, Anne Meyer, and Chuck Hitchcock  (Harvard Education Press, 2005)
- Teaching Every Student in the Digital Age: Universal Design for Learning
  David H. Rose and Anne Meyer  (ASCD, 2002)
Questions?

Thank you!

Alice Parker
alice@edstrategies.net
Final Thoughts
We can develop systems, policies, procedures, and practices that lead to improved outcomes for all of our students.

It’s a matter of will—not skill, not money, not bureaucracy.

How will you start?
The slides and materials for this webinar may be downloaded at:

https://wested.box.com/CORE