



Needs of the Field

When a large group of leaders working in state agencies, universities, school districts and family organizations from across nation were asked, “What issue do your colleagues most want to have addressed?” they replied:

On the Common Core State Standards

1. The transition from current standards to the Common Core
2. Understanding the difference in the current level of expectation and the new level of expectation
3. Gaps in knowledge as the current standards switch to the common core
4. The impact of the Common Core on instruction and assessment
5. Curricular frameworks to support the Common Core
6. Rollout of the Common Core, many at the local level have only a vague notion of the change
7. Changes to state assessments to reflect the Common Core. *Will assessments go beyond one time / paper and pencil tests?*
8. Impact of the Common Core on teacher training
9. Outreach to families in learning about the Common Core
10. Access the standards and the assessments by students with disabilities and English language learners? *Will special education and ELL be ‘at the table?’*
11. Alignment between curricular options for the Common Core support Universal Design for Learning (UDL)?
12. Utilizing the common core without losing focus on the functional needs of students? *Does the common core restrict curricular options for students with disabilities?*
13. *College and Career Readiness* as a concept needs to be discussed more fully with greater participation in the discussion
14. The impact of Common Core on Transition under IDEA
15. Social/emotional/behavioral aspects of the standards
16. Will the collaboration in development of the Common Core follow to implementation

On the General Assessment

17. There is more anticipation than knowledge right now. The field needs to know what is happening along the way.
18. Funding of the consortia for development



Common Core State Standards an IDEA Partnership Collection

19. Alignment of states with the consortia developing the assessments
20. Approaches being pursued by the various consortia.
21. Information shared, with urgency, to teachers in the classroom.
22. Computerized testing explained to teachers and families
23. How to implement computer administered assessments discussed before they are here (e.g. cost, equipment, training, etc.)
24. Alignment of UDL with assessments made clear
25. Movement away from one time/paper and pencil tests prominent
26. Ongoing professional development for local implementers during the change over
27. Alignment of assessments with formative assessments under Response to Intervention (RTI) initiatives.
28. Social/ emotional/behavioral aspects of assessments
29. Accommodations for assessments
30. Collaboration and learning across the general and alternate assessment
31. Extended standards and alternate assessment

On the Alternate Assessment (1%)

32. Consortia funded to develop the Alternate Assessment
33. Approaches taken by the funded consortia
34. Alignment of states with the 1% consortia
35. Approaches by states not in either 1% consortium Difference between current and new 1% assessments
36. End of the 2% option
37. Timetable for the new alternate assessments and learning along the way
38. Technological capacity for administering/documenting computer-based alternate assessments
39. Relationship between the IEP and the Alternate Assessment
40. Anticipated changes in identifying students eligible for the Alternate Assessment
41. The meaning of '*college and career ready*' for students with significant disabilities
42. Infusing transition and functional skills into the alternate assessment
43. Linking the alternate assessment meaningfully to the general assessment
44. Linking the alternate assessment meaningfully to the individual
45. Research-based interventions for students with low incidence disabilities that will support the Common Core and new alternate assessment.
46. Embedding assessment in instruction



**Common Core State Standards
an *IDEA Partnership Collection***

This document was generated with over 200 practitioners and family members at the 2011 Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Project Directors meeting. This cross-stakeholder group includes teachers, administrators, related service personnel, family members and youth, state education agencies, higher education, and technical assistance providers.