IMPLEMENTING THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

by

Natalie E. Benson

A Master's Thesis/Project Capstone work
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science in Education
Curriculum and Instruction in Inclusive Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
State University of New York at Fredonia
Fredonia, New York

May 2019

State University of New York at Fredonia
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

CERTIFICATION OF THESIS/PROJECT CAPSTONE WORK

We, the undersigned, certify that this project entitled IMPLEMENTING THE COMMON CORE
STATE STANDARDS TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES, Natalie Benson, candidate for
the Degree of Master of Science in Education, Curriculum and Instruction, is acceptable in form
and content and demonstrates a satisfactory knowledge of the field covered by this project.

_____   5/2/2019
Robert Dahlgren, PhD.   Date
Master's Capstone Advisor
EDU 691 Course Instructor
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

_____   5/2/2019
Robert Dahlgren, PhD.   Date
Department Chair
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

_____   5/20/2019
Dean Christine Givner, PhD.   Date
College of Education
State University of New York at Fredonia

IMPLEMENTING THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

ABSTRACT

With the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2010, challenge and rigor for all students is a must. With the passing of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), students with disabilities (SWD) are required access to these challenging standards with any necessary supports and modifications needed. A multitude of research has already been made on the instructional strategies, such as explicit and scaffolded instruction, that would be helpful in implementing the standards and the concerns teachers who have SWD have on instructing these standards, such as time constraints and academic ability. Although much research has been conducted on the strategies to use in order to help implementation, there was little to no research on the implementation of actual modified lessons. Due to this, I created a curriculum project where I modified a Common Core 6th grade ELA figurative language unit in order to appropriately teach it to my special education class. The unit resulted in 17 lessons and two summative assessments. After evaluating the results upon completion of the modified unit, results indicated three major areas where I made appropriate accommodations in order to fit the needs of my students. Those accommodations include, adding in a lesson of the teaching the different types of figurative language before reading the required texts, creating exit tickets for formative assessments that were easier to understand and limited the number of questions given, and adding in accommodations to the summative assessments in order for the students to not feel overwhelmed. The use of this modified unit can be used as a guide for other teachers creating a modified unit and future research and work will be completed in order to create other modified units for other grades and subject areas.

Table of Contents

Implementing the Common Core State Standards to Students with Disabilities

Introduction

The rise of the use of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) started in 2010 and is now used by more than 40 states in schools throughout the country. The CCSS are known as skills and knowledge used for grades k-12 to get students college and career ready. The content is rigorous and challenging and provides access to higher order thinking skills (Caruana, 2015). In schools where the CCSS are implemented, all students are required access to their grade level standards, including students with disabilities (SWD). Many SWDs have Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), which are made for each individual student in order to indicate the extra services and supports there are needed for that student to achieve in school (Lowman, 2015). In the classroom, teachers have to teach the CCSS content as well as provide the accommodations-services needed to help the students with IEPs reach their personalized goals. Many of these students may have an instructional level well below their grade level standards. The problem that arises for teachers is with teaching the grade level CCSS within the deadlines and time restraints given, while also focusing on each student's IEP, which is meant to help students improve on the content and skills with which they struggle. In the following essay, I will summarize the research currently conducted regarding this problem, and explain the steps I will plan to take to implement change to that problem in the classroom by creating a modified 6th grade ELA unit.

Current research in this topic has focused on both Mathematics and ELA CCSS and the ways to teach those SWD, learning difficulties or IEPs (Simmons, Darch, Hinton and Padgett, 2017). A problem/issue that arose many times in research journals, media and newspapers was implementing and modifying the challenging, rigorous standards in order to reach both students

with disabilities, learning difficulties and English Language Learners. Every student learns differently and Catherine Gewertz (2013) stated:

> Designing such lessons for the typical student is tough enough for teachers; adapting them to children at wildly varied points on the skills spectrum is tougher still. Meeting the needs of students with disabilities, those learning English, those from disadvantaged backgrounds, and gifted students is a challenge that goes to the core of education's purpose, however. And it's a challenge that is largely unmet, more than two years after every state but four adopted the standards. (para. 4-5)

There truly is not a one-size-fits-all approach when it comes to teaching students. Every student is varied in learning styles, backgrounds, and academic ability. With that being said, it is a definite challenge to get the CCSS grade level standards to meet every unique student.

Teachers also can't forget to make sure they are also teaching the basic skills and ideas that students need to know before learning the standards. Students who are on a second grade instructional level but are in 6th grade, still need to learn those skills in order to reach the 6th grade standards. Powell, Fuchs and Fuchs (2013) explained that, in order to reach the standards, teachers must teach the foundational skills to students. This allows for teachers to teach the basics along with the grade level CCSS throughout while still focusing on those skills needed to further learning (Jimenez & Staples, 2015). Many of these foundational skills are included in a students' IEP as an annual goal to complete. These goals are meant to help each individual SWD work on important skills need to continue to learn. Kanso (2015) spoke to a long-time special education teacher, Julie Cavanagh, on her feelings towards the CCSS and SWD. She stated:

> Cavanagh, who teaches third and fifth grade at PS 15 Patrick F. Daly in Red Hook, Brooklyn, said the new standards represent a "developmentally inappropriate curriculum"

for special education students and has had the additional effect of taking away from

schools' and educators' ability to really focus on differentiated and individualized sort of

goals for those students." (para. 10)

SWD already have added skills that they need to master, which should be seen as an important

piece to their individual learning. Cavanagh believes that the CCSS is creating a block to what is

most important for SWD.

Along with the problem of effectively implementing the standards for our diverse

learners, we also need adequate time and support through professional development, especially

due to the strict deadlines for CCSS units and modules. A study interviewing U.S teachers

revealed that students were worried about the time allotted and the professional development

given to effectively implement the CCSS for students with disabilities (Murphy & Haller, 2015).

Cramer and Gallo (2017) revealed that special education teachers are also worried that their

students wont be able to grasp the rigor of the standards. The authors stated:

While teachers appeared aware of the implementation of the new standards, the lack of

confidence, lack of training, and concerns about their students' abilities to be successful

with the new standards was evident across both the open-ended and closed-ended

responses. (p. 40)

If teachers do not have proper training and support in order to incorporate/modify these standards

for their SWD, they will not know how to appropriately facilitate those standards in a successful

way.

Personal Statement of Interest

Before researching and finding that many other special educators are struggling with teaching the CCSS to students with disabilities, I found myself in a new 6th grade ELA classroom with all students who have IEPs and are learning at an instructional level of second to third grade. I questioned how I was going to focus on basic skills that the students need to learn, while at the same time teaching the grade level standards. It was also a startling realization when I saw the deadlines by which each unit and module had to be completed by. The pacing was revealed to be rigorous, meaning that, fitting in both the basic foundational skills needed and the grade level CCSS, may be a challenging task to complete. I questioned the idea that everyone learns in different ways and different paces. Shouldn't we be able to align and modify the content as individual teacher in order to support our students' in the best way for them? Diane Ravitch (2016) stated:

> If we really cared about improving the education of all students, we would give teachers
> the autonomy to tailor instruction to meet the needs of the children in front of them and to
> write their own tests. (para. 11)

This is something that I have heard many teachers, both general and special education, discuss many times and the problem has aligned itself with the problem of implementation of the standards. Due to these realizations, I wanted to play a part in making appropriate modifications to the CCSS ELA modules for SWD that other teachers who are struggling with the same problem can use as guide or to implement it themselves.

Purpose Statement

This problem is one that I am encouraged to find the answer to in order to incorporate ways for students to both achieve their individual goals and to also have access to the rigorous

grade level standards meant for college and career readiness. The purpose of this curriculum

project is to design a unit that both aligns to the grade level standards while also applying

appropriate scaffolds/modifications to focus on important skills needed for students with

disabilities.

The unit covered the importance of word choice used in a text or passage. The unit is a

module made that aligns with the CCSS. The book "Bud, Not Buddy" by Christopher Paul Curtis

and the Steve Job's Commencement Address was used as the main passages during this unit

(Curtis, 1999). Students will identify figurative language in text and determine its meaning. In

order to support each student in the classroom with diverse disabilities and needs, I have

modified this module unit and will use it in my classroom. The following chapter will review the

relevant literature regarding the challenging CCSS and SWD and the difficulties teachers of

SWD have had when trying to implement those standards.

Review of the Literature

In the previous chapter, I identified the problem of introducing the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to students with disabilities (SWD) in an appropriately challenging way. Many policies and laws have been put into place in order to create the curriculum and instruction in which our students are currently immersed. These changes could cause anxiety for both the teachers to add in all necessary content in before the test and for the students to learn the material at a pace not suitable for them. Students are required to take tests that include questions that are above their cognitive levels. Many students, even in the general education classroom, are learning and comprehending at levels below their grade level. The following chapter will summarize the existing research collected on the topic of the CCSS and SWD and the gap that still exists in the research.

Policies that have altered instruction of all students

Much of the concern for fitting in all of the content in a little amount a time with limited planning time came even before the CCSS were established. In the year 2001, a new law came into action known as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Under this act, all students were held to the same academic standards. Ravitch (2013) stated:

> The law declared that all states must test every child annually in grades 3 through 8 in reading and mathematics and report test scores by race, ethnicity, low-income status, disability status, and limited-English proficiency. By the year 2014, all students were supposed to achieve proficiency in test scores. (p. 11)

This brought in a necessity of data from standardized test scores and all students were required to take it (although parents are now allowed to omit their students from taking it).

The CCSS is one of the biggest and potentially most controversial changes that have been implemented in the NYS school systems. The Common Core State Standards Initiative (2019) defined the CCSS as follows:

> The Common Core is a set of high-quality academic standards in mathematics and English language arts/literacy (ELA). These learning goals outline what a student should know and be able to do at the end of each grade. The standards were created to ensure that all students graduate from high school with the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in college, career, and life, regardless of where they live. (Para. 2)

These standards are meant to provide rigorous academics in order for all students to be prepared for life beyond grade school. SWD, however, may find these standards and the curriculum made around them at a frustrating level instead of an instructional level and will need extra support in order for successful implementation (Cramer & Gallo, 2017).

Two other policies that have made drastic changes to the way we teach our students are the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), which is embedded within IDEA as one of its core principles. One important part of the concept of LRE is that academics for the student are at the highest extent possible while still being appropriate for that individual student. Through the implementation of LRE, SWD have the right to the same education as all students and in the same school environment, while receiving the appropriate supports and accommodations (DeLorenzo, 2015). These services and supports for SWD are made possible through the IDEA, which is a law that provides public education that is both free and appropriate for each student. The IDEA provides these services and supports through early intervention, special education and other related services such as speech, occupational and physical therapies (IDEA, 2015).

 In order to further explain the importance of the LRE, which was updated in 2015, DeLorenzo (2015) sated that:

> Students with disabilities will attend the same schools they would have attended if they did not have disabilities and that removal or restriction from their regular schools and classrooms can only occur for reasons related to the student's disability when the student's individualized education program (IEP) cannot be satisfactorily implemented in that setting, even with the use of supplementary aids and services. (p. 1)

Through the development of the IDEA and then the LRE, they have made sure that students receives the most appropriate education in the most appropriate and challenging education for all each individual. All of these policies have made drastic changes to the way all students are taught and there will surely be more changes in the future for the betterment of our school system.

Having enough time and experience to efficiently teach the CCSS

Many researchers have studied teachers' perspectives on teaching the CCSS to all students, especially those with diverse needs (Cramer and Gallo, 2017), (Murphy and Haller, 2015). Cramer and Gallo (2017) interviewed Florida special education teachers on the new state standards. The study revealed that many teachers did not feel comfortable implementing the standards and were unsure if their students would be able to grasp these higher-order thinking skills. The authors explained that, "Clear concerns were raised that students with disabilities would not be able to meet the new standards and that philosophically these standards did not take the individual needs of students into consideration" (p. 41). This could, in turn, cause more stress on the teachers and the students when given higher standards. In a similar study, Murphy and Haller (2015) interviewed both teachers of English Language Learners (ELLs) and SWD.

The study focused on the teachers' first year experiences with using the CCSS and results showed that most teachers felt the biggest challenge was effectively implementing the standards with a limited amount of time to do it. The article stated that:

> Nevertheless, the teachers admitted to some anxiety concerning their ability to adapt their curriculum to the CCSS, which they frequently connected to the fact that the designers of the standards have not spelled out a path to alignment for teachers of ELLs and SWDs.
>
> (p 523)

Due to the population of students that these teachers work with, modifications and accommodations are vital in order to fit the needs of each individual student. In order to provide the most effective modifications for students, an adequate amount of time and planning is needed for teachers to do so.

Implementing the CCSS in classrooms with SWD

The ways to provide effective and supportive instruction of the grade level CCSS to SWD and students with learning difficulties is a topic that has had much research done since the implementation of the CCSS (Baker, Santaro, Ware, Cuellar, Oldham, Cuticelli, Coyne, Loftus-Rattan and Raoch, 2015), (Solari, Denton & Haring, 2017), (Simmons, Darch, Hinton and Padgett, 2017). Baker, et al. (2015) described the difficulty teachers can have on effectively incorporating the CCSS; however, they explained the ways in which to still engage the higher order thinking skills through a variety of modified strategies and activities meant to reach every student with diverse needs. The article focused on the teaching of important Common Core vocabulary that includes higher order thinking skills throughout. Incorporating tiered, scaffolded instruction that aligns to the CCSS, allows struggling learners to receive the standards at their instructional level (Solari, Denton & Haring, 2017). The authors stated:

Teaching the skills and strategies required to create fluent readers and comprehenders

requires finesse, if a teacher is to remain responsive to the needs of students, especially

those experiencing difficulty learning to read. (p. 158)

It is important to know the strategies that are useful and the strategies that are not when

implementing these rigorous CCSS. Simmons, et al (2017) conducted a research study

investigating the use of explicit instruction or another instructional method when teaching the

CCSS. The study found that explicit instruction was more beneficial. Coming up with positive

instructional methods/strategies came up multiple times as a positive support to teaching SWD.

Explicit instruction is one strategy that showed gains in multiple studies. Simmons, et al (2017)

stated:

Explicit instruction is a manner of providing instruction in which an unobservable

process (e.g., thinking) is turned into an overt observable task. For instance, a teacher not

only explains a concept, but delivers a series of carefully sequenced set of examples and

provides students guidance in the implementation of tasks using the new knowledge. (p.

661)

Giving verbal instruction along with visual/kinesthetic tasks, allows students to connect what

they hear to what they are doing. Watt, Watkins and Abbitt (2016) also found that, when faced

with the challenge of implementing the CCSS, explicit instruction was the most beneficial

strategy. It is also important when using explicit instruction, to provide the information in a set of

smaller segments in order to allow the learner to look at one piece at a time instead of as a whole

(Spooner, Saunders, Root & Brosh, 2017).

It is also necessary to consider the content and skills that students are being limited to

when they are not given access to the CCSS. If SWD aren't given the opportunity to be engaged

and immersed in the CCSS, they may not get exposed to the same challenges and rigor as do

their same age peers may (Blank & Smithson, 2014). When aligning the students' Individualized

Education Program (IEP) goals to the standards in an appropriate and instructional way for

students, we can give students that challenge and rigor (Caruana, 2015).

There have been a multitude of studies explaining what strategies to use in order to

effectively implement the CCSS and the variety of concerns both teachers and administrators

have on teaching these standards with their SWD or students with leaning difficulties. However,

I found a gap in the amount of research that actually modified a Common Core unit and studied

its results and the effects it had on SWD. The research has shown us that explicit instruction is an

effective teaching strategy to use to teach the CCSS, but unfortunately, the question remains

regarding the incorporation of these strategies and unit of instruction. When constructing the idea

of creating this curriculum project, I wanted to create a unit that was still challenging for my

students, but also instructional for their academic levels. I continued to think of the importance

of giving SWD the LRE for them. Due to the principles of the LRE, the IDEA and the CCSS, I

needed to create a unit for 6th grade SWD that is both appropriate for each student but also lets

them be a part of the same CCSS content as their general education peers. These policies and

historical/educational changes will be used as a baseline when creating the curriculum unit.

Conclusions

In order to address this gap, I will be creating and analyzing a modified 6th grade English

Language Arts (ELA) unit that aligns to the CCSS. This unit will attempt to give other New

York State (NYS) teachers a unit to use in their classrooms or as an example to look at when

creating their own modified unit. The two research questions driving this curriculum project are:

- How can we modify and scaffold the CCSS curriculum in order to implement it into the

  classroom for students with disabilities and learning difficulties?

- How can we manage time constraints and gain proper training supports in order to

  effectively create and implement the CCSS to students with disabilities and learning

  difficulties within the deadlines given?

The next chapter will give a detailed description of the modified curriculum that will be created

and the audience intended to use this curriculum.

Methodology

Introduction

The curriculum project I will be creating will seek to design a unit that will align the grade level Common Core State Standards (CCSS) with a 6th grade special education ELA class. I will be making appropriate accommodations in order to incorporate important foundational reading/writing skills needed for each student. The challenge and rigor that the CCSS bring to the classroom leads to the difficulty of effectively implementing them for students with disabilities (SWD) (Baker, Santaro, Ware, Cuellar, Oldham, Cuticelli Coyne, Loftus-Rattan and McCoach, 2015). It is important to give all students the opportunity to be immersed in the standards, while at the same time modifying those standards in order to be responsive to each student's needs and to address the services and goals reflected on the SWD's individualized education plan (IEP). In order to create a curriculum that addresses these different issues regarding the CCSS and SWD, teachers need adequate time, guidance and examples on which to build. Due to this, my goal in developing this curriculum project is to create a unit that can be used by other teachers in whole, or as baseline when making their own modified unit when following the CCSS. We need to make sure that all students, and in this case, SWD, are accessing the standards in an appropriate way that allows them learn foundational skills and to receive the accommodations needed to continue to grow. The following essay will state why and to whom the curriculum project is being created for and what it will be covering.

Conceptual Framework

When constructing the idea of the curriculum project, I continued to think of the importance of giving SWD the least restrictive environment (LRE) for them. DeLorenzo (2015) explained that:

> Students with disabilities will attend the same schools they would have attended if they
>
> did not have disabilities and that removal or restriction from their regular schools and
>
> classrooms can only occur for reasons related to the student's disability when the
>
> student's individualized education program (IEP) cannot be satisfactorily implemented in
>
> that setting, even with the use of supplementary aids and services. (p. 1)

Through the implementation of the principle of Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), SWD

have the right to the same education as all students and in the same school environment, while

receiving the appropriate supports and accommodations. These services and supports for SWD

are made possible through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which is a

law that applies to SWD providing public education that is both free and appropriate for each

student (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2015). One important part of the LRE is

that academics for the student are at the highest extent possible while still being appropriate for

that individual student (DeLorenzo).

Due to the principles of the LRE, I needed to create a unit for 6th grade SWD that is both

appropriate for each student but also lets them be a part of the same CCSS content as their

general education peers. This framework will be used to as a baseline when creating the

curriculum unit.

Audience

I plan to create this curriculum project for special education teachers or teachers of SWD

who are required to teach the CCSS but have difficulty finding time to effectively modify and

scaffold the curriculum. This project can be used for all districts in New York State (NYS) due to

the state adopting the CCSS. In previous interviews with teachers, responses indicated that

teachers of SWD were worried about the methods with which to effectively implement the CCSS

in the limited amount of time they had to do it (Murphy & Haller, 2015). Having a modified unit

that incorporates the CCSS at the appropriate grade level will help special education teachers and

teachers of SWD to save time and to have a baseline to use when creating units of their own.

This may also give these teachers the reassurance needed to feel confident in using the CCSS for

SWD while incorporating important foundational skills and scaffolds with their districts' stated

curriculum deadlines.

Procedure

When creating my 6th grade English Language Arts (ELA) unit for my curriculum

project, I will begin by selecting the CCSS to be addressed in the unit. The standards include

(Standards for English Language Arts, 2012):

- R.6.1: Cite textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as

  well as inferences drawn from the text.

- R.6.4: Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text,

  including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of a specific

  word choice on meaning and tone.

- W.6.1: Write arguments to support claims with clear reasons and relevant

  evidence. (p. 46-49)

 I will then align those CCSS with the foundational skills and the students' IEP goals needed to

achieve. Another important step in the unit building process is asking the other 6th grade

teachers, both general and special education, what areas of the CCSS they find important for all

students to know and the concerns that they feel need to be addressed in the unit for SWD to

comprehend. The next step will be to modify the original unit previously made and to

incorporate the important foundational skills that were chosen in the earlier steps. I will do this

by taking the original assignments and while still targeting the 6th grade standard for each

assignment, I will alter it in a way that is appropriately challenging for the students and addresses

the basic skills that the students need to practice as well. I may also have a limited number of

assignments given depending on time, in order to take more time to focus on one assignment and

to go at a slower pace. Although assignments are reduced, we will still be targeting each standard

but in a way that is not overwhelming for the students. The next step will be to check on if any

modifications may also have to be made for formative assessments throughout the unit, along

with creating appropriate student-led activities for the students that incorporate the standards and

engage the students. Once each section of the unit is made, I will review it and check to see if the

order is sufficient and that the standards and basic needs of the students are being addressed.

    To create and design this unit, I took a sequence of steps. The steps are as follows:

1.) Determine what grade level standards are needed to be incorporated in the unit.

2.) Identify the foundational skills the students' need to develop

3.) Review the original module used for the unit

4.) Incorporate appropriate scaffolds, modifications and foundational skills aligning to each individual student into the original module.

5.) Modify formative and summative assessments that both, align to the standards and are appropriate for the students.

6.) Ask colleagues such as special education teachers or 6th grade teachers for advice on the modified unit created thus far.

7.) Review the modified unit and check if the order is correct and if any other modifications are needed.

Some steps in the procedure may need to be repeated or adjusted depending on time restraints or needs of the students.

Scope and Sequence

The curriculum will cover one unit and will take the length of the time allotted for that unit, which was created by the district. For the unit being modified in this curriculum project, which is titled "Jobs" and covers the book *Bud, Not Buddy*, we will have three weeks to complete it (Curtis, 1999). The students will be covering the CCSS skills of citing evidence, word choice and making claims. The students will also be learning the history of the Great Depression and will get a first hand narrative of someone living during that time through the book they will be reading. Along with the book, the students will get to have a face-to-face interview with a member of the community that has a living memory of the Great Depression. Although modifications will be made, the students will still be learning the same standards and will be immersed in the same text as are their peers in the general education ELA class.

<div align="center">Grade 6, Module 2, Unit 1: Jobs (Word Choice/ Claims)</div>

I.   Figurative Language

    a. Poetic devices

        i. Idiom

        ii. Simile/Metaphor

        iii. Hyperbole

        iv. Alliteration

        v. Personification

        vi. Onomatopoeia

II.   Connecting the text, *Bud, Not Buddy* to The Great Depression

      a.   Photographs from The Great Depression (Making inferences)

      b.   Summary of The Great Depression

      c.   Identifying things we know about Bud using text evidence

III.   Connecting figurative language to the text, *Bud, Not Buddy*

      a.   Tone (The way Bud speaks)

          i.   Experiences, personality, and setting all affect the way Bud speaks.

      b.   Similes and Metaphors

          i.   Looking at quotes from the book and identifying its literal meaning

IV.   Author's Word Choice

          i.   Feeling/Meaning

          ii.   Looking at one word and describing the emotion it conveys.

          iii.   Interpreting the figurative language

V.   Interpreting figurative language from the *Stanford University Commencement Address: Steve Jobs*

      a.   Creating a gist of the address

      b.   Determining meaning of quotes from the address

      c.   Making connections between Steve Jobs and Bud from *Bud, Not Buddy* (venn diagram)

VI.   Making a Claim

      a.   Using the *Stanford University Commencement Address: Steve Jobs* to see examples of claims.

      b.   Forming evidence-based claims using both, *Bud, not Buddy* and the *Stanford University Commencement Address: Steve Jobs*

Validity

Any teacher working in a school district that has adopted the CCSS can use this curriculum

project unit in their classroom or as a model when creating their own modified unit. The unit

covers all necessary CCSS that are required to be addressed in that unit and allows for pacing

flexibility depending on the assignments chosen. This unit also uses the practice of instructional

differentiation, which is a component needed in every classroom. Ismajli and Imami-Morina

(2018) stated:

> Differentiated instruction requires from the teacher to be familiar with the curriculum and
>
> the learners' characteristics. Based on the new approach of the curriculum, the fact that
>
> "teaching styles should match learning styles (…) being familiar with learners' learning
>
> styles we can organize the class to suit their individual needs. (p. 208)

Teachers need to both, know the curriculum they are teaching, while also knowing the students

they are teaching and adjust/modify the curriculum to fit those needs of the individual classroom.

This unit will be an example of incorporating both the content and the students into the planning

and instruction in the lessons. This paper summarizes the current research studied on the problem

of incorporating the CCSS for SWD and lists the steps that will be taken to develop a unit that

attempts to solve this problem.

Conclusion

Modification and scaffolding when creating a unit for SWD will be a useful tool for other

special education and general education teachers. This unit will show the possibility of creating a

unit using the CCSS that also covers foundational skills that are appropriate for each student.

This unit also aligns with the idea of the LRE and gives SWD access to challenging and rigorous

content in a scaffolded manner. I hope to encourage and guide other teachers toward the idea of

incorporating the standards for SWD is possible, even with the limited time given. In the next

chapter, I will present the results of creating and implementing my curriculum project.

Results

In the previous chapters, I outlined the purpose and need for making/implementing a modified English Language Arts (ELA) unit and gave an outline of the methods with which the unit will be created. The following chapter includes the results from creating a modified 6th grade ELA unit that is aligned to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). I will explain the ways that each lesson will be taught and the reasons that certain modifications were made from the existing unit.

Prerequisite

Some prior background knowledge is needed for the students before partaking in this unit. The students will have had to have prior experience in correctly citing text evidence. This includes using quotation marks at the beginning and ending of quotations, citing the page/paragraph numbers corresponding with the area where the quote was found, and explaining the reasons that the quotation helps support the claim. Although this lesson does provide practice in correctly citing text evidence, prior knowledge will benefit the unit in order to keep the lessons moving.

Online Resources

In order to create the unit and to provide materials at an instructional level for my students, I found many materials from superteacherworksheets.com (2019) and brainpop.com (2019). These resources provided videos and worksheets appropriate for the academic levels of the students with whom I work.

Learning Standards

In order to create a unit that still aligns with the CCSS, I began by identifying all of the necessary standards I needed to include in the unit. I incorporated standards for both reading and

speaking and listening into this unit. The writing standards would be included in the next unit in

order to focus on reading first, then writing.

- o 6.R.1 Cite textual evidence to support an analysis of what the text says

  explicitly/implicitly and make logical inferences.

- o 6.R.4**:** Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text,

  including figurative and connotative meanings. Analyze the impact of specific

  word choices on meaning, tone, and mood, including words with multiple

  meanings.

- o 6SL1**:** Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions with diverse

  partners; express ideas clearly and persuasively, and build on those of others.

- o 6R5: In literary texts, analyze how a particular sentence, paragraph, stanza,

  chapter, scene, or section fits into the overall structure of a text and how it

  contributes to the development of theme/central idea, setting, or plot. (Rubicon

  Atlas, 2018)

Once I identified the standards I needed to include, I was then able to begin creating each lesson,

which is listed in chronological order below.

Outline/Schedule

In this section, I have laid out each lesson included in the unit and the materials needed.

For each lesson, I have listed the objectives I anticipate the students achieving, the procedure of

how the lesson will be instructed and the assessment given for that lesson. There is also a mid

unit assessment to see how the students are doing thus far in the unit and a summative

assessment at the end of the unit to see how the students did overall.

Unit Materials

o   Lessons 1-5 Figurative Language packets

o   Writing utensil

o   Sticky notes

o   Individual whiteboards with eraser and marker

o   Figurative language assessment

o   Lessons 7-10 "Bud, Not Buddy" packets

o   ELMO and overhead projector

o   "Bud, Not Buddy" text

o   Copy of Steve Jobs' Commencement Address

o   Video of Steve Jobs' Commencement Address

o   Highlighters

o   Mid unit assessment

o   End of unit 1 assessment

o   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Mb6NxixRk8

o   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C1TXfXiilXE

o   3 talking chips for each student: these talking chips are used to make sure that all students

     are answering questions and participating.

o   https://www.brainpop.com/english/writing/moodandtone/

Lesson 1: Figurative Language (Simile)

o   Objective:

     o   I can identify a simile

     o   I can write an example of a simile in my own words.

- o Procedure:

    - o Notice/Wonder activity on the cover of the book, "Bud, Not Buddy"

    - o Introduction: Simile Brain Pop (Find a definition of simile and write it on a sticky note while watching the video)

    - o Students complete a simile worksheet with a partner

- o Assessment:

    - o Simile Exit ticket

Lesson 2: Figurative Language (Metaphor)

- o Objective

    - o I can Identify the meaning of a metaphor

    - o I can write my own metaphor

- o Procedure

    - o Reviewing what a simile is.

    - o Students will watch a Brain Pop video on simile and metaphor

        - ▪ Students will determine the similarities and differences between simile and metaphor and write it on a sticky note.

    - o Create examples of metaphors as a whole group and write them on the board.

- o Assessments

    - o White board activity- students work in partner groups.

        - ▪ One student writes an example of a simile or a metaphor. The other student determines if that example is a simile or metaphor and vise versa.

    - o Second white board activity-students work independently

- The teacher gives examples of either a simile or a metaphor and the students write which one they think it is on their whiteboard.

Lesson 3: Figurative Language (Alliteration and Hyperbole)

- o Objective
    - o I can determine the meaning of alliteration
    - o I can determine the meaning of hyperbole
    - o I can give an example of alliteration
    - o I can give an example of hyperbole
- o Procedure:
    - o Review: Simile and Metaphor
        - White board activity: give definition of simile and metaphor
    - o Teacher will give multiple examples of simile and metaphor
        - Students think, pair, share with a partner to determine a definition based on examples given.
        - Teacher will then create a definition with the class as a whole (Definition: extreme exaggeration).
    - o Use stand up, hand up, and pair up engagement activity to choose partners to complete a hyperbole activity with a partner.
        - Determining if a statement is a hyperbole or not.
- o Assessment
    - o Hyperbole and alliteration exit ticket: write an example of both in own words.

Lesson 4: Figurative Language (Idiom and Onomatopoeia)

- o Objective

- o I can determine the meaning of idiom

- o I can determine the meaning of onomatopoeia

- o I can distinguish between an idiom and an onomatopoeia

- o I can write an example of an idiom

- o I can write and example of an onomatopoeia

- o Procedure

  - o Review: give an example of alliteration and hyperbole.

  - o Teacher will give the students multiple examples of idioms (ex: under the weather or it's raining cats dogs).

    - ▪ Students have to find the actual meaning of each.

    - ▪ From these examples, we will create a definition of idiom.

      - • Definition: using a phrase to mean something else.

      - • Students will then work with a partner in their figurative language packets to create silly pictures of what the idiom says and will then write the actual meaning below it.

  - o After the idiom assessment, the teacher will pass out sticky notes and give students the definition of onomatopoeia (word sounds).

    - ▪ With just the definition, the students will write what they think an example of onomatopoeia is.

    - ▪ The students will then share and we will create actual examples as a whole group (splash, crash, boom).

      - • If many students struggle with coming up with correct examples, I will give them more examples as a whole group.

- Using partner-matching cards, students will work with their partner in the onomatopoeia worksheet in their figurative language packets.

  - Go over as a whole group after 10 minutes.

o Assessment

  o Idiom exit ticket: choosing two idioms in the figurative language packet examples, the students will determine the actual meaning and use it in a sentence.

  o Onomatopoeia exit ticket: in the last page in figurative language packets, the students will look at the picture given and will have to determine the word sound it is showing.

Lesson 5: Figurative Language (Personification)

o Objective

  o I can identify personification in a sentence

  o I can give an example of personification

o Procedure

  o Review: give an example of an idiom and onomatopoeia

  o To begin, the students will watch two short videos on personification.

    - As they are watching, the students will write down one example of personification they saw in one of the videos.

    - After the videos, each student will share the example they found and put their sticky note in either the video 1 column or the video 2 column.

    - Through the examples, we will come up with a definition of personification as a whole group (Giving human qualities to non human things.)

o Next, in their figurative language packets, the students will work in partner groups to analyze personification examples and determine their actual meaning.

▪ We will come back as a whole group after about 10 minutes and go over the meaning of each example.

o Assessment

o Personification exit ticket: identifying personification in a sentences and then write and example of personification.

Lesson 6: Figurative Language (Review and Test)

o Objective

o I can identify each type of figurative language (onomatopoeia, personification, metaphor, simile, idiom and alliteration) in a sentence.

o I can find meaning in the figurative language given.

o Procedure

o Students will be broken up into 3 groups based on how well they have done in the prior exit tickets.

▪ Students who have mastered most/all of the exit tickets will be independently working in one group. Students who have mastered half or more than half of the exit tickets will be independently working in another group. Students who have struggled with most/all of the exit tickets will be in a group with the teacher.

▪ The groups will have 10-15 minutes at each center.

• Center #1: Students will have to match their figurative language word card to its correct example.

- Center #2: Students will have two worksheets to complete in order to practice identifying each type of figurative language.

- Center #3: There will be examples of figurative language on the white board, the students will have to identify each type of figurative language and will come to the teacher at the end to get their answers checked.

o Assessment

o Figurative language assessment

Lesson 7: The Great Depression: Figurative Language and Word choice

o Objective

o I can use evidence for a text to make inferences about Bud

o I can use evidence from a passage to make inferences about life during the Great Depression

o I can identify the difference between survive and thrive

o Procedure

o Review: the students will list the seven different types of figurative language we just learned about.

  ▪ After listing, we will review each definition.

o To begin, the teacher will ask the students what they think the difference between survive and thrive is and we will work together to come up with similarities and difference between the two words.

  ▪ Survive: continue to live or exist in spite of hardship

  ▪ Thrive: to prosper or flourish

- This will lead into the discussion of the Great Depression and the text, "Bud, not Buddy".

o I will briefly explain what the Great Depression is and how it connects to the book we will be reading.

- "Bud, not Buddy" takes place during the Great Depression when many people could not find jobs and were homeless.

- The students will then get their lessons 7-10 "Bud, Not Buddy" packets and open to the first page with 6 pictures taken during the Great Depression.

  • The students will work with their desk partners to complete a notice and wonder activity on each picture.

  • After about 10 minutes, we will go over each picture and discuss notices and wonders the students made.

  • The teacher will then read a short passage describing the Great Depression at their instructional reading level.

  • Questions to ask after reading the passage:

    o Why did the Great Depression happen?

    o How would people live during the Great Depression?

    o Would you have wanted to live during this time period? Why or why not?

o We will then read the first chapter of "Bud, Not Buddy", pausing throughout for comprehension questions and checks for understanding.

o Assessment

o "Bud, Not Buddy" exit ticket: the students will have to state one thing they know

about Bud so far and cite one piece of text evidence to support it.

Lesson 8: Word Choice: Mood and Tone

o Objective

o I can identify the mood/tone in a given passage/quote.

o I can determine the meaning of unfamiliar words using context clues

o Procedure

o Review: Would you want to live during the Great Depression? Why or why not?

o To begin, we will watch a Brain Pop video on mood and tone.

▪ As the students are watching the video, they will have to find one example

of a word that can be used to describe someone's tone when they are mad.

▪ After the video, the students will have to state the word they picked and

show the class the facial expression of what the word would look like.

o Next, the students will complete a hands up, stand up, pair up to form partner

groups to work on a style/tone worksheet.

▪ After about 10 minute, we will go over as a whole group.

o After the tone lesson, we will read chapters 2 and 3 in "Bud, Not Buddy" pausing

throughout for comprehension questions and checks for understanding.

▪ After reading, the students will pull out their Lessons 7-10 "Bud, Not

Buddy" packets and analyze quotes from the book.

• The students will determine the actual meaning of the quote and

decide what type of tone the quote has.

o Assessment

- o Tone exit ticket: determine the actual meaning and tone of on quote from "Bud, Not Buddy".

Lesson 9: Determining the Meaning of Figurative Language

- o Objective
    - o I can determine the meaning of figurative language in a text
    - o I can identify the tone of a passage
- o Procedure
    - o Review of chapters 2 and 3
        - ▪ How would you react to having to sleep in the shed like Bud did? Why or why not?
    - o To begin the lesson, one student from each desk partner group will get out a whiteboard, marker and eraser for a tone review.
        - ▪ The teacher will be giving the students quotes from the book we are reading and the students will have to determine the type of tone the passage is giving (irritated, angry, excited, nervous).
    - o After review, we will read chapter 4 of "Bud, Not Buddy" pausing throughout for comprehension questions and checks for understanding.
        - ▪ Once the chapter has been read, we will complete a page in our lesson 7-10 "Bud, Not Buddy" packets as a whole group.
            - • The students will have to read a quote from the book and determine the actual meaning of the figurative language used and identify the tone as well.
- o Assessment

    o   Exit ticket: identifying meaning/feeling and tone of a quote for "Bud, Not Buddy"

Lesson 10: Interpreting Figurative Language

- Objective

  - I can determine the meaning of a quote that uses figurative language

  - I can determine the tone of a quote

- Procedure

  - Entrance ticket: students will determine a title for chapter 4 and cite one piece of text evidence from the chapter to support it.

  - To begin the lesson, we will read chapters 5 of "Bud, Not Buddy" as a whole group pausing throughout for comprehension questions and checks for understanding.

  - Once completing both chapters, we will complete a close read of pages 41-43 in chapter 5 and have a agree/disagree discussion with the class.

    - If you were Bud, would you have run away? Why or why not?

    - Why was bud's suitcase so important?

  - After the discussion, the students will take their lessons 7-10 "Bud, Not Buddy" packets and open to their lesson 10 quotes.

    - In groups of four, each group will have one quote from "Bud, not Buddy" that they will have to determine its literally meaning and determine the tone of the quote.

    - Assessment

      - Group work: determining the meaning and tone of a quote.

Lesson 11: Unit 1, Mid Module Assessment

o Objective

    o I can determine the meaning of figurative language in a text

Lesson 12: Steve Jobs' Commencement Address (para. 1-8)

o Objective

    o I can get the gist of a passage

    o I can use context clues to determine the meaning of unfamiliar words

    o I can identify figurative language in a text and determine its meaning

o Procedure

    o Review of book: What would you have done at the soup kitchen if you were Bud and why?

    o To begin the lesson, the students will be watching a commencement address given by Steve Jobs.

        ▪ The teacher will explain that a commencement is ceremony for graduates and Steve Job's is the creator of Apple.

        ▪ While the students are watching the video, they will have to identify 2 facts about Steve Jobs.

    o After watching the video, we will complete a close read of paragraphs 1-8 of "Bud, Not Buddy".

        ▪ We will gist each paragraph to get the main idea of each.

        ▪ As we read, we will also highlight pieces of figurative language in the speech and determine the meaning of it.

    o Assessment

o   Exit ticket: students will gist paragraph 8 on their own and highlight one piece of

figurative language from it.

Lesson 13: Text Dependent Questions on para. 1-8

o   Objective

o   I can make a claim and support it using text evidence

o   I can correctly cite evidence to support a claim

o   Procedure

o   Review of commencement address: Give one fact about Steve Job's life you

learned about when reading his address.

o   To begin the lesson, we will review paragraphs 1-8 of Steve Job's

Commencement Address.

▪   The students will then have to answer questions based on the address.

▪   Questions 1-2: whole group

▪   Question 3: independent

o   Assessment

o   Question 3 from paragraphs 1-8 text dependent questions

Lesson 14: Steve Jobs' Commencement Address (para. 12-14)

o   Objective

o   I can get the gist of a passage

o   I can compare two texts using a venn diagram

o   Procedure

o   Review of commencement address

o   To begin the lesson, we will complete a close read of paragraphs 12-14.

- We will gist each paragraph and highlight and determine the meaning of any figurative language found in the paragraphs.
  - o We will read chapters 6 and 7 as a whole groups pausing throughout for comprehension questions and checks for understanding.
  - o Once finished gisting, the students will open their lessons 12-15 "Bud, Not Buddy" packets and open to the venn diagram.
    - Here, the students will compare Bud from the "Bud, Not Buddy" book and Steve Jobs.
    - We will find a few similarities and differences as a whole group and then the students will independently find two similarities and two differences on their own.
  - o Assessment
  - o Independently determining similarities between Steve Jobs and Bud.

Lesson 15: Text Dependent Questions on para. 12-14

- o Objective
  - o I can correctly cite evidence to support a claim.
- o Procedure
  - o Review of "Bud, not Buddy" book: what would you do if you were bud and couldn't get any breakfast at the mission.
  - o To begin the lesson, we will review paragraphs 12-14 as a whole group and do a close-read of paragraph 14.
    - After reading paragraph 14, we will come up with a claim about what Steve Jobs is telling the graduates in this paragraph.

- Once we have come up with a claim, we will locate evidence to support our claim.

    - We will find one piece of evidence as a whole group and that students will have to determine another piece of text evidence independently.

- Assessment

    - Citing one piece of text evidence to support a claim.

Lesson 16: Steve Jobs' Commencement Address (para. 20-23)

- Objective

    - I can get the gist of a passage

    - I can identify figurative language in a passage

- Procedure

    - Review of commencement address.

    - To begin, we will read chapters 9 and 10 of "Bud, Not Buddy" pausing throughout for comprehension questions and checks for understanding.

    - After reading the chapters, the students will get out the Steve Job's Commencement address complete a close read of paragraphs 20-23.

        - We will be gisting each paragraph and highlighting figurative language and determining its meaning.

- Assessment

    - The students will gist the last paragraph of the speech on their own and will highlight one piece a figurative language used.

Lesson 17: Text Dependent Questions on para. 20-23

- o Objective

    - o I can make a claim and find text evidence to support it.

    - o I can correctly cite evidence to support a claim.

- o Procedure

    - o Review of "Bud, Not Buddy": Why couldn't bud get on the train?

    - o As a whole group, we will read chapter 11 of "Bud, Not Buddy" pausing throughout for comprehension questions and checks for understanding.

        - ▪ After reading chapter 11, the students will have to pick out one example each showing how Bud what brave in the chapter, write it on a sticky note and hand it in.

    - o After reading, the students will get out their lessons 16-17 "Bud, Not Buddy" packets.

        - ▪ The students will be given a claim about paragraphs 20-23 and will have to work with a partner to identify to pieces of text evidence to support that claim.

- o Assessment

    - o Exit ticket: Comparing Steve Jobs and Bud and providing text evidence from each text to support it.

End of Unit Assessment: Obama Speech

This end of unit assessment is based on President Obama's commencement address given to college graduates at Howard University (Rubicon Atlas, 2018). The students will watch the video of the address first. They will then listen to the teacher reach the speech while follow along

on their copy of the speech. After watching and listening to the speech, the students will answer

each question citing evidence from the text to support their answers (Rubicon Atlas, 2018).

- o Objective

    - o I can determine the meaning of figurative language in a passage.

    - o I can determine the tone of a passage.

Conclusions

The unit created above provides students with disabilities (SWD) access to the general

education curriculum using their grade level CCSS and the district-wide mandated assessments

based on those standards. However, this unit is modified in order for it to be at an instructional

instead of a frustrational level for the SWD. Some of the modifications made in the unit include

adding in lessons on each type of figurative language before diving into the unit's book and the

main part of the lesson. I chose to do this in order to allow the students to understand each type

and to see examples of each in order to more easily find meaning of the figurative language used

in the texts. Another modification I chose was to create my own exit tickets for each lesson.

These exit tickets have easier-to-understand directions and also a limited number of questions

given in order to not overwhelm the students. Materials given in larger font, limited wording in

practice passages, and usage of videos to explain certain ideas/concepts were also used

throughout the unit. In the following chapter, I will discuss what went well with creating the unit,

what limitations the unit has and what may be next steps after completing the unit.

Discussion

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I revealed the modified unit created for a 6th grade, special education English Language Arts (ELA) classroom. The unit consists of 17 lessons, one mid unit assessment and one summative assessment. Using the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) as a base with which to create the unit, along with the use of the CCSS module, the unit was developed. Although the topics and standards that needed to be addressed are included, a variety of modifications were made to the original module in order to provide an appropriate instructional level for the students. In the following chapter, I will evaluate and reflect on the results of my curriculum projects and identify any limitations and next steps in the research.

Evaluation of Results

While creating the unit and identifying the modifications that I wanted to make, I realized that the original module did not provide an adequate number of lessons directed solely on types of figurative language. Due to this, I decided to add the teaching of each type into the unit. I thought long and hard about the ways that I would incorporate these lessons into the unit in order to effectively instruct the students on each element. My final decision was to begin the unit with teaching the students about each type of figurative language. I chose this order due to the multiple uses of figurative language used in all of the texts/passages throughout the unit. This will give students the familiarity they need with each type the ways in which to determine its meaning when seeing it used in a passage. Also, due to the students reading well below their grade level, the texts used might be difficult to read and decipher. Giving students examples of each type of figurative language in passages that are at their independent reading level first, may give them adequate practice before moving on to more challenging texts. All of these

independent level passages and figurative language practice, including poems and short stories

and worksheets, came from superteacherworksheets.com (2019). This site allowed me to easily

search through a variety of grade levels and Fountas and Pinnell reading levels in order to find

the most appropriate for the group of students I based the unit on. Students reading at levels A-D

are at kindergarten level. Students reading at levels E-J are reading at first grade level. Students

reading at levels K-M are at second grade level. Students reading at levels N-P are at third grade

level. Students reading at levels Q-S are at fourth grade level. Students reading at levels T-V are

reading at fifth grade level. Students reading at levels W-Y are and sixth grade level (Fountas &

Pinnell Literacy, 2019). The students that are currently in my classroom are reading at Fountas

and Pinnell reading levels K-P, meaning they are reading at a second to third grade level. Once

students get comfortable with finding the meaning of figurative language in these practice sheets,

the grade level texts may not seem as challenging to find meaning in.

Another modification that I used in this unit was the use of engaging/amusing videos. I

used videos that are at an appropriate academic level for the students and will keep them focused

on the information being given. I found many helpful videos from the educational video site,

brainpop.com (2019). These videos are easy to understand for the students and incorporate a side

of humor that keeps the students engaged. Other videos I found gave multiple examples of

figurative language through visuals and creative stories. My hope through the use of these videos

is to introduce a lesson to the students that makes them want to learn more about it.

The use of formative and summative assessments was an additional modification I

wanted to implement due to the complex wording of some questions and directions and an

overwhelming number of questions given in the module's assessments. For formative

assessments, I decided to create simple, one problem exit tickets at the end of each lesson in

order to check for understanding. Using this idea, I will be able to know how the students are doing with understanding the meaning of figurative language and identifying the tone of a quote from a passage/book. I will then know if I need to do any review or re-teaching of a certain idea or topic based on the results from the exit tickets. After analyzing the summative assessments created in the module, I decided that I should only print out the pages from the book that are needed for the assessment in order for the students to not feel overwhelmed. If the pages are printed off, the students will also be able to highlight in the text in order to find key information and examples of figurative language. This will limit the amount of writing that the students will have to do and help them remember what they found and where they found it in the text.

Significance

The curriculum project created is in addition to the multitude of policy changes and research already completed in regards to the CCSS and Students with Disabilities (SWD). The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) gave free and public education for all students, no matter their disabilities or needs (Ravitch, 2013). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) made it possible for SWD to be provided with an appropriate, yet challenging education with the necessary supports and services needed (IDEA, 2015). Research has also been completed stating the best strategies to use when implementing the CCSS to SWD, such as explicit instruction (Simmons, Darch, Hinton and Padgett, 2017), and using tiered, scaffolded instruction aligning to the CCSS (Solari, Denton & Haring, 2017). Although, research has been conducted in order to identify the best strategies to use, I could not find any fully modified Common Core units when completing my research. Due to this, I found a dire need to create a unit in order for other special education teachers and teachers who are working with SWD in their classrooms to use this as example for their own modifications. All students learn in

different ways, and this unit may not only help students with disabilities, but it may also help

struggling learners as well. This unit could also inspire other teachers to modify their own

curricula in order to best instruct their diverse learners in their classroom.

Limitations

Although there are many positive attributes to creating the modified Common Core unit

for other teachers who have struggling learners or are working with SWD, there are some

limitations to the curriculum project that I created as well. One limitation is that this curriculum

was created for a very specific unit in a 6th grade ELA special education classroom. This unit

may be easy to follow for someone who is teaching 6th grade ELA, but it could be difficult for

someone who teaches a different grade/subject to use as an example for their modifications. The

standards will be different depending on the module as well even if the grade level and subject is

the same.

Another limitation is in regard to the fact that my unit is created only for districts/states

that have adopted the CCSS. Teachers who do not use the CCSS, but still need help modifying

lessons, in order to align with different standards, may not be able to use my unit as an example

because it is designed to fit the CCSS. The standards that other districts/states have adopted may

not connect well enough for my unit to be used interchangeably.

Future Investigations

In order to make further efforts in providing examples of modified Common Core units,

the creation of more modified units in a variety of grade levels and subjects would be a future

step. This would allow me to help a greater number of teachers who struggle with finding

appropriate and effective ways to implement the CCSS to their work with SWD. This unit is just

the beginning in a series of modified units in a variety of grades and subjects. Although

modifications may look different depending on the students and the class as a whole, these units can still be used a guide when teachers are creating their own curricula.

Future research in the implementation of standards other than the CCSS would be beneficial in finding if there were any similarities and differences in what was found when researching about the CCSS. Also, I would like to see if other states that use different standards have created modified units as I have done. This could allow me to gain more strategies that may work with the CCSS as well.

Conclusions

After reviewing and analyzing prior research on implementing the CCSS for SWD and creating a Common Core unit that is modified in order to appropriately instruct SWD, I have evaluated the results of the unit. The unit provides important modifications through the use of adding necessary lessons to give the students more practice and background knowledge on figurative language. Modifications using engaging videos to peak the interest of the students and modifications of all assessments that are still challenging but also appropriate were used in the unit as well. This unit provides an example for teachers who have adopted the CCSS and have SWD/struggling learners and can guide those teachers in creating their own modified Common core units. Although I have only created one unit for a specific grade and subject level, further research and development will be conducted in order to provide teachers with more examples in their specific teaching area.

References

Baker, D.L., Santaro, L., Ware, S., Cuellar, D., Oldham, A., Cuticelli, M., Coyne, M.D., Loftus-

Rattan, S., McCoach, B. (2015). Understanding and implementing the Common Core

vocabulary standards in kindergarten. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 47*(5), 264-271.

DOI: 10.1177/0040059915580028.

Blank, R.K. & Smithson J.L. (2014). Analysis of opportunity to learn for students with

disabilities: Effects of standards-aligned instruction. *Journal of Research in Education,*

25(1), 139-153. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1098308.pdf

Brain Pop. (2019). *Mood and tone.* BrainPOP. Retrieved from: https://www.brainpop.com/

english/writing/moodandtone/.

Caruana, V. (2015). Accessing the Common Core State Standards for students with learning

disabilities: strategies for writing standards-based IEP goals. *Preventing School Failure,*

59(4), 237-243. DOI: 10.1080/1045988X.2014.924088.

Chungdahm Learning. (2015). *What is personification?* YouTube. Retrieved from: https://www

.youtube.com/watch?v=1Mb6NxixRk8.

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2019) About the standards. Retrieved from:

http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/.

Cramer, E.D. & Gallo, R.F. (2017). Special educators' perceptions of state standards in a large,

urban school district. *JULTR,* 34-44. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/

EJ1150164.pdf.

Curtis, C. P. (1999). *Bud, Not Buddy.* New York: Yearling Random House Children's Books.

DeLorenzo, J. P. (2015). School districts' responsibilities to provide students with disabilities

with specially-designed instruction and related services in the least restrictive

environment. *NYSED.gov/specialeducation.* Received from http://www.p12.nysed.gov/

specialed/publications/2015-memos/least-restrictive environment-district-

responsibilities.html.

Fountas and Pinnell Literacy. (2019) *F&P text level gradient.* Fountas and Pinnell Literacy:

Elavating Teacher Expertise. Retrieved from: https://www.fountasandpinnell.

com/textlevelgradient/

Gewertz, C., (2013). A Common-Core challenge: learners with special needs. *Education Week.*

Retrieved from: https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2013/10/30/10cc-intro.h33.html

Green, M. (2015). *Personification.* YouTube. Retrieved from: https://www.youtube.com/

watch?v=ClTXfXiilXE

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (2015). About IDEA. *IDEA.* Received from

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/#.

Jimenez, B.A. & Staples, K. (2015). Access to the Common Core State Standards in mathematics

through early numeracy skill building for students with significant intellectual disability.

Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 50(1), 17-30.

Retrieved from: http://daddcec.org/Portals/0/CEC/Autism_Disabilities/Research/

Publications/Education_Training_Development_Disabilities/Full_Journals/ETADD_50(1

)_17-30.pdf

Kanso, H. (2015). Common Core: what's right for special education students? *CBS News.*

Retrieved from: https://www.cbsnews.com/news/common-core-whats-right-for-special-

eductions-students/.

Murphy, A.F. & Haller, E. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of the implementation of the

literacy Common Core State Standards for English language learners and students with

disabilities. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 29*, 510-527. DOI:

10.1080/02568543.2015.1073200.

New York State P-12 Common Core Learning standards for English Language Arts and

      Literacy. (2012). *Engage NY.* Received from https://www.engageny.org/resource/new-

      york-state-p-12-common-core-learning-standards-for-english-language-arts-and-literacy.

Powell, S.R., Fuchs, L.S. & Fuchs, D. (2013) Reaching the mountaintop: Addressing the

      Common Core Standards in mathematics for students with mathematics difficulties.

      Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 28(1), 38-48. Retrieved from: https://sde.ok.

      gov/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/CCS%20and%20Students%20with%20Math%20Difficulties.p

      df

Simmons, K.D., Darch, C.B., Hinton, V., Padgett, A. (2017). Considering the new Common

      Core Standards for teaching spelling to urban students with disabilities. *International*

      Journal of Special Education, 32(4), 659-670. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/

      fulltext/EJ1184114.pdf.

Solari, E.J., Denton, C.A., Haring, C. (2017). How to reach first-grade struggling readers: An

      integrated instructional approach. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 49*(3), 149-159. DOI:

      10.1177/004005.

Spooner, F., Saunders, A., Root, J., Brosh, C. (2017). Promoting access to Common Core

      mathematics for students with severe disabilities through mathematical problem solving.

      Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 42(3), 171-186.

      DOI:10.177/1540796917697119.

Super Teacher Worksheets. (2019) *S*uper Teacher Worksheets. Retrieved from: https://www.sup

      erteacherworksheets.com/.html

Ravitch, D. (2015) *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and danger to*

      America's public schools. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Ravitch, D. (2016) The Common Core costs billions and hurts students. *The New York Times.*

Retrieved from: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/24/opinion/sunday/the-common core-

costs-billions-and-hurts-students.html.

Rubicon Atlas. (2018). *6th grade, module 2, unit 1: Jobs (word choice/claims).* Rubicon Atlas.

Retrieved from: https://jamestownpublicschools.rubiconatlas.org/Atlas/Develop/

UnitMap/View/Default?EditMode=0&SourceSiteID=&UnitID=1257&YearID=2019&C

urriculumMapID=178.