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## STATE RISE Part 1: Focus Area Reflection

The RISE Part 1 provides your team with the opportunity to reflect on and discuss the “big ideas” of inclusive education. These ideas are organized into 4 Focus Areas (i.e., Placement and Settings, General Education Curriculum Content and Access, Instructional Practices, and Student and System Outcomes). Your team will discuss and rate your system’s current practices for each Focus Area and then choose 1 or 2 Focus Areas you want to address first.
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## RISE Part 1: Today’s Agenda

1. Read the RISE Frame of Reference and consider it in all conversations.
2. Reflect on features of inclusive education within each Focus Area and:
   1. make connections to the TIES outcomes,
   2. identify positive examples of the focus area in your system,
   3. identify areas for improvement in your system, and
   4. rate your system’s current level of practice across features.
3. Rank the Focus Areas to identify 1 or 2 for a more in-depth reflection in RISE Part 2.
4. Review the list of potential stakeholders and add any others you might want to include in future meetings.



## RISE Frame of Reference:

* **“All means all”** specifically includes all students with significant cognitive disabilities.
* **Placement** is in same grade general education classes and other inclusive settings in neighborhood schools.
* **Student-centered** strengths-based approaches for inclusive education occur within the general education curriculum, classes, lessons, activities, and routines.
* **Specially-designed instruction** occurs within general education instruction, classes, activities, and routines.
* **Barriers to inclusive education** exist within systems and environments, not within students or staff.

## Focus Area 1: Placement and Settings

1. To what extent does your **state mission statement** demonstrate advocacy for students with significant cognitive disabilities (SwSCD) being placed in their neighborhood schools and general education classes?
2. To what extent do all **state education leaders advocate** for policies, practices, and procedures related to increasing placement of SwSCD in neighborhood schools and general education classes for 80% or more of the day?
3. To what extent do your **state monitoring, policies, practices, and procedures facilitate** placement of students with SwSCD in neighborhood schools and general education classes?
4. To what extent are state policies, practices, and procedures increasing the use of **evidence-based practices** to provide effective instruction and engagement in general education settings for SwSCD?
5. To what extent do the **state personnel practices** ensure the recruiting, training, and retaining of personnel who facilitate a system that results in placement of SwSCD in effective general education settings?
6. To what extent does the state system **evaluate, monitor, and improve their technical assistance with coaching** to districts, and increase placement of students in effective general education settings?

| * **T:** Time in general * education * **I:** Instructional * effectiveness * **E:** Engagement with * general education * curriculum and * peers * **S:** Support at the * state, district and * school levels | **Positive Examples and Areas for Improvement** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Type positive examples and areas for improvement in this cell* | **1: Some** features are in place for **some students,** but **not yet for SwSCD**.  **2: Most** features are in place for **most** students, but **not yet for** **SwSCD.**  **3: Most** features are in place for **most** students, including **for some SwSCD.**  **4: Most** features are in place for **most** students, including **most** **SwSCD.**  **5: All** features are in place for **all** students, including **all** **SwSCD.** |

### [Add RISE Focus Area 1 rating to summary table](#_Summary_Table_RISE)

## Focus Area 2: General Ed Curriculum Content and Access

1. To what extent does the **mindset** of the state department of education personnel reflect an unwavering belief in the power of engagement in general education curriculum to improve outcomes for SwSCD?
2. To what extent do the state department of education personnel ensure SwSCD are engaged and make progress in the **general education curriculum** rather than an alternate curriculum or alternate content standards?
3. To what extent does the state facilitate each district’s use of **an individualized decision-making process** to ensure all SwSCD have the supports and services they need to access and make progress in the general education curricula?
4. To what extent does the state provide technical assistance with coaching to support **technology, communication, and collaborative practices** core to increasing student access to the general education curriculum?
5. To what extent does the state system annually evaluate and monitor the **impact of its technical assistance with coaching** to ensure SwSCD have access and are making progress in general education curriculum?
6. To what extent do the state policies, practices, and procedures reflect **an inclusive system of education** that includes SwSCD?

| * **T:** Time in general * education * **I:** Instructional * effectiveness * **E:** Engagement with * general education * curriculum and * peers * **S:** Support at the * state, district and * school levels | **Positive Examples and Areas for Improvement** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Type positive examples and areas for improvement in this cell* | **1: Some** features are in place for **some students,** but **not yet for SwSCD**.  **2: Most** features are in place for **most** students, but **not yet for** **SwSCD.**  **3: Most** features are in place for **most** students, including **for some SwSCD.**  **4: Most** features are in place for **most** students, including **most** **SwSCD.**  **5: All** features are in place for **all** students, including **all** **SwSCD.** |

### [Add RISE Focus Area 2 rating to summary table](#_Summary_Table_RISE)

## Focus Area 3: Instructional Practices

1. To what extent does the **mindset** of all state department of education personnel reflect a belief in presumed competence leading to instruction based on high expectations for all SwSCD?
2. To what extent do **all offices of the state department of education collaborate** to embed specially-designed instruction (SDI) for SwSCD in effective general education settings?
3. To what extent does the state department of education **promote district and school** **collaboration** to embed SDI for SwSCD in effective general education settings?
4. To what extent does the state department of education provide technical assistance with coaching that ensure **instructional design and delivery** that meet the needs of SwSCD in general education settings?
5. To what extent does the state department of education provide technical assistance with coaching that ensure **communication, behavior, and transition needs** of SwSCD are met within general education settings?
6. To what extent does the state department of education leadership ensure **state and district systemic improvement** that increases the use of instructional practices that meet the needs of SwSCD in general education settings?

| * **T:** Time in general * education * **I:** Instructional * effectiveness * **E:** Engagement with * general education * curriculum and * peers * **S:** Support at the * state, district and * school levels | **Positive Examples and Areas for Improvement** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Type positive examples and areas for improvement in this cell* | **1: Some** features are in place for **some students,** but **not yet for SwSCD**.  **2: Most** features are in place for **most** students, but **not yet for** **SwSCD.**  **3: Most** features are in place for **most** students, including **for some SwSCD.**  **4: Most** features are in place for **most** students, including **most** **SwSCD.**  **5: All** features are in place for **all** students, including **all** **SwSCD.** |

### [Add RISE Focus Area 3 rating to summary table](#_Summary_Table_RISE)

## Focus Area 4: Student and System Outcomes

1. To what extent does the **mindset** of all state department of education personnel reflect a commitment to measuring outcomes that result in SwSCD transitioning to and leading inclusive adult lives?
2. To what extent does the state department of education collect, disaggregate, and analyze data to **determine trend** **and identify barriers** in student outcomes and systemic inequalities related to inclusive education placement, curriculum, and instruction practices?
3. To what extent does the state department of education **use those data to eliminate barriers** to develop, scale up and sustain inclusive practices through technical assistance, coaching, effective partnerships, and state personnel practices?
4. To what extent does the state department of education evaluate how **alternate assessment policies, procedures, and practices** impact a student’s inclusive education opportunities?
5. To what extent does the state department of education use **partnerships to develop, scale up, and sustain** an inclusive system of education to improve outcomes for SwSCD?

| * **T:** Time in general * education * **I:** Instructional * effectiveness * **E:** Engagement with * general education * curriculum and * peers * **S:** Support at the * state, district and * school levels | **Positive Examples and Areas for Improvement** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Type positive examples and areas for improvement in this cell* | **1: Some** features are in place for **some students,** but **not yet for SwSCD**.  **2: Most** features are in place for **most** students, but **not yet for** **SwSCD.**  **3: Most** features are in place for **most** students, including **for some SwSCD.**  **4: Most** features are in place for **most** students, including **most** **SwSCD.**  **5: All** features are in place for **all** students, including **all** **SwSCD.** |

### [Add RISE Focus Area 4 rating to summary table](#_Summary_Table_RISE)

## Summary Table RISE Part 1: Focus Area Reflection

Fill in this summary table with the ratings from above and rank the Focus Areas in order of priority for reflecting more deeply about the features they include. Ranking considerations include:

* Which Focus Area speaks most directly to the changes you want to make first?
* Are there current initiatives, programs, or restructuring efforts happening in your system that could tie in with your work on a Focus Area?
* Which 1 or 2 Focus Areas might be an easier place to start the change process within your system’s culture and processes?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area:** | **Placement**  **and Settings** | **General Education**  **Curriculum**  **Content & Access** | **Instructional**  **Practices** | **Student and**  **System**  **Outcomes** |
| **Focus Area Rating (1-5 from above)** | [View Placement and Setting Rating](#_What_is_your) | [View General Education Curriculum Content & Access Rating](#_What_is_your_1) | [View Instructional Practices Rating](#_What_is_your_2) | [View Student and System Outcomes Rating](#_What_is_your_3) |
| **Focus Area Priority Ranking** |  |  |  |  |

## Team Members RISE Part 1: Focus Area Reflection

**Are there any additional stakeholders to add to your team and invite to the RISE Part 2 meetings? Please identify them below.**

* Diverse community stakeholders
* School administrators/leaders
* District administrators/leaders
* State administrators/leaders
* Key regional administrators/leaders
* Family and advocacy organizations
* Board of Education/Cabinet members
* University Personnel Preparation Program representative

**Additional Stakeholders to Invite:**

* *Type additional stakeholders*

**Organization:** *Type organization*

**Review date:** *Type review date*

**Facilitators:** *Type facilitators*

**Team Members and Roles**:

* *Type team member, role*
* *Type team member, role*
* *Type team member, role*
* *Type team member, role*
* *Type team member, role*
* *Type team member, role*
* *Type team member, role*
* *Type team member, role*
* *Type team member, role*

## Next Steps: RISE Part 2

1. Choose a time and place to complete RISE Part 2: Features Reflection for the 1 or 2 priority Focus Areas.
2. Distribute copies of this completed RISE Part 1: Focus Area Reflection to current team members.
3. Connect with identified additional stakeholders to invite their participation. Send them a copy of the completed RISE Part 1 and offer to meet with them to discuss this document to assist them in becoming contributing members of the team.
4. Distribute the RISE Part 2 for your 1 or 2 prioritized Focus Areas for review prior to the meeting.
5. Send invitations to the meeting.