

Nine Plans, Six Supports

Facilitator's Guide

A 45–60 minute working session for general education teachers. The deck is 19 slides. Every slide reference in this guide is a number you will see in PowerPoint's slide sorter — no letters, no sub-slides.

This is not a compliance training. It is a session in which teachers physically discover that the nine plans they are carrying are, functionally, about six things — and that six things is a job a person can actually do.

You are the one standing in front of them. Read this before you present.

What this session is actually doing

Teachers are not failing to implement accommodations because they don't understand them. They are failing because nine plans were each written as though the teacher had one student, nobody crosswalked them, and the collision lands in exactly one place: the classroom.

The intervention is a reframe:

Stop thinking in students. Start thinking in supports.

When accommodations are sorted by what you would actually do rather than by whose name is on the paperwork, they collapse. Roughly forty accommodations become six repeated actions. And once a support is a routine rather than a per-child delivery, three things happen at once: cognitive load drops, the fairness objection evaporates, and implementation fidelity goes up — because a routine gets delivered every period, and a thing you have to remember gets delivered when you remember.

The bonus, which lands hard: the crosswalk is also a data sheet.

The one number to keep straight

The example classroom in the deck holds nine plans across eight students — 4 IEPs, 2 BIPs, 3 504s (Marcus has both an IEP and a BIP). Roughly forty accommodations. They collapse into six supports.

The threshold is three. Any row with three or more marks is no longer an accommodation — it is how the class runs. The slides, the worksheet, the workbook, and the Summary tab all use three. Do not say four; teachers who marked three will think they failed.

Timing

MINUTES	SEGMENT	SLIDES
0–3	Name the load. Say it isn't their fault.	1–2
3–6	Why it feels impossible: every plan written as if you had one student.	3
6–8	The turn: you are managing six supports.	4
8–13	The crosswalk — the collapse.	5
13–16	The one that does NOT universalize: access vs. dose.	6
16–18	What changes: written per student → built into the room.	7
18–22	The hardest one: reinforcement is a schedule problem.	8
22–28	Why this is the law's first instruction.	9–11

MINUTES	SEGMENT	SLIDES
28-32	Triage: three kinds of accommodation.	12
32-36	STAAR: where this logic stops — and why it needs you anyway.	13-15
36-56	Hands-on. They build their own crosswalk.	16
56-58	The chart is your data sheet.	17
58-60	Monday: one thing.	18
60	The offer.	19

If you only have 30 minutes:

Cut slides 10 and 11, cut slide 8, and trim the work block to 12 minutes with one instruction — "Mark only the rows that involve reminding, checking in, prompting, or redirecting." They will find the collapse in a single slice. It's less satisfying and it still works.

Keep slide 9 no matter what. The impairment-is-real / disability-is-relational distinction is what makes the whole session honest. Without it the deck is just tips.

If you have 60: extend the share-out. Table groups reporting their highest-count row is where the real conversation happens.

Before the day

Send this exact email.

"Bring your IEPs" will produce a room of people holding nothing.

Subject: Bring one page from each of your plans on Thursday

For Thursday's session, please bring the accommodations and supports page from every IEP and 504 you currently hold, plus any BIP. Not the whole document. Just that page. We're going to put them all on one chart and I think you're going to be surprised by what you see. Bring a pen.

- **Print the worksheet.** One per teacher, plus 20% extra. Landscape, single page.
- **Have a sign-up sheet at the door.** You are going to make an offer at the end. Make it easy to accept.
- **Table groups, not rows.** Seat by grade level or team. Teachers who share students will find overlap across their own plans — a second payoff you don't have to explain.
- **Decide in advance whether you're running paper or laptops.** Both work. The Excel workbook turns a row amber the instant a third x is typed, so the collapse announces itself; the paper sheet makes them count. Teachers split about evenly. Bring both.
- **Have the worked example open and ready to project.** accommodation-crosswalk-EXAMPLE.xlsx — the same eight students from the slides, fully filled in, with ten days of fidelity logged and one routine deliberately left unlogged so the red flag fires. Ninety seconds on the projector before the work block saves you ten minutes of confused questions.

Running it

The first three minutes decide everything

SLIDES 1-2

These are tired people at the end of a day who have been told before that they need to do more. Say, more or less:

"You did not come here to be told to do more. So let me tell you up front what this is: I think we have been asking you to do something impossible, and I think there is a way to make it smaller. Not easier. Smaller."

Then on slide 2, there are two beats and you must not collapse them into one.

FIRST — release the guilt. Say it slowly and do not soften it into "it's hard for everyone."

"As written, this is not doable. That is not a failure of effort. It is a failure of design — and it is not yours."

THEN — give back the credit. This is the beat the whole deck now rests on.

"And yet your room has been running. Nobody handed you a system. You built one anyway. You have been solving this in ways that never got written down and never got credit."

If you only do the first beat, they leave feeling absolved. If you do both, they leave feeling seen. Do not flatter — you are not saying they solved it perfectly. You are saying they have been solving it invisibly.

Adjust the numbers on slide 2 to your campus if you know them. Real numbers land harder than round ones.

The diagnosis

SLIDE 3

Ninety seconds. Be careful of tone: you are not throwing ARD committees under the bus, and you are on those committees. The point is structural, not personal — nobody's job is to look at the whole room. That's the gap.

If a teacher says "so why don't you write them differently?" — good. Say yes, we should, and we're working on it. Then move on. Don't get pulled into a systems argument you can't win in a faculty meeting.

The thesis

SLIDE 4

Pause before you advance. Let it sit.

"Here is the whole presentation in one sentence. Everything after this is just proof."

Note the subtitle. This is NOT a correction. You are not telling them to stop doing something and start doing something else — you are naming something they already do.

"You already think in supports. When you put the headphones out for anybody who wants them, you were not thinking about Marcus's IEP. You were thinking about your room. That is support-level thinking. Nobody has ever let you write it down that way, so it has never counted."

The money slide

SLIDE 5

This is a live reveal, not a lecture. Slow way down.

Step one — walk the overlap. Run your finger down the right-hand column. Six names. Six names. Five names. The point has to land visually before you say a word about it.

"Look at the overlap. These are not six students with six different needs. This is one classroom with six repeated needs, spread across nine documents so that you could never see it."

Step two — the hands. Go row by row and ask the room. This is the part that makes the session.

- "Row one — chunked tasks. Who already breaks the assignment into pieces on the board, for everybody?"
- "Row three — posted directions. Who has a word wall or a misspelled-word list up, available to anybody?"
- "Row five — break or exit. Who has a cool-down corner or a spot a kid can go to without asking?"
- "Who has headphones out that anyone can pick up? Who runs a visible timer for the whole class?"

Name these as things you have SEEN on this campus, not things you are suggesting.

Step three — the line at the bottom.

"If you just raised your hand on three or four of those — you have been doing this all along. It has simply never been counted. Not by the plans, not by an ARD, not by anybody."

"You were never going to find this by reading the plans one at a time. The plans are organized by child. Your day is organized by time. That mismatch is the whole problem — and you have been quietly working around it without anyone noticing."

Caution: some hands will not go up. Do not make that a thing. "Some of these are already in your room and some aren't. Either way, six is a number you can work with. Forty is not."

The one that does NOT universalize

SLIDE 6

This slide keeps you honest, and a good teacher will push back on it hardest. Give it three minutes. Do not rush it.

"Five of the six go to the whole room. This one does not. I want to tell you exactly why, because if I hand-wave this, you should not trust the other five."

Give them the test as a question they can actually use on Monday:

Is the twenty there because the skill needs twenty reps — or because twenty fit on the page?

- **If it is the page:** cut it for everyone. You have not accommodated anybody — you have written a better assignment.
- **If it is the skill:** cut it only for the child whose plan says so. The child who needed twenty reps and got twelve has not been accommodated. He has been shorted, and the gap he already had will be wider in May.

Walk the left column first — the access case. Twenty problems where the last twelve are the same skill as the first eight. The child who writes at half speed never reaches the end, and the blank half of her page tells you nothing you did not already know at problem eight. Cutting the count did not lower the demand; it removed a stamina tax you were never measuring.

Then the right column — the dose case. This is the version teachers are RIGHT to worry about, and you should say so out loud: "This is the objection I would raise if I were sitting where you are sitting, and it is correct."

Naming this limit is what makes the other five believable. A presenter who claims everything universalizes has told them something they know is false, and they will discount the whole session.

If someone raises extended time — same logic, and it's worth twenty seconds: more unstructured minutes is not more work produced. Extended time without structure inside it is a dose change dressed up as an access change.

What changes

SLIDE 7

Move quickly — this is reinforcement, not new information.

The framing matters. The right column is not aspirational. For a lot of this room it is DESCRIPTIVE — they are already doing it.

"Read the right-hand column. For most of you this is not a plan. This is Tuesday. The problem is that the paperwork still describes the LEFT column — and so does the ARD, and so does the fidelity question, and so does your own sense of whether you're doing enough."

The fourth row is the one to land on. The Tier 2 and Tier 3 kids are getting the intervention for free, because they are sitting in the same room. That is not a happy accident — it is the entire argument for why this is less work, not more.

The hardest one

SLIDE 8

This slide gets the most resistance and is the most worth defending. Three to four minutes.

Lead with the frame.

| *"ADHD is not a deficit of caring. It is a deficit of holding the reward long enough for it to steer behavior."*

Say it and pause. Half the room has privately believed the opposite about at least one child, and they will not admit it out loud.

Then walk the three columns:

- **The finish line is too far.** A grade in three weeks does not reach a brain that discounts delayed reward steeply. It is not that he does not want the A. It is that the A cannot compete with what is happening at 10:14.
- **So nothing steers the middle.** Between the direction and the grade lie forty minutes of unpriced behavior. Neurotypical kids bridge that with an internal signal — and that signal is exactly the thing that is impaired. You are not asking him to try harder; you are asking a broken instrument to read itself.
- **So you become the signal.** Not with prizes. With frequency. Say the word frequency twice. This is a SCHEDULE problem, not a REWARDS problem, and that distinction is the whole slide.

Then the payoff — and it's why the slide sits here:

| *"You already have the schedule. It is the check-in loop — row two of the crosswalk you just looked at. Every 5–8 minutes you are already walking past his desk. You do not have to build the reinforcement schedule. You have to say something when you get there."*

The script. Two seconds, at the desk: "You got the first four done." Name what was DONE. That is information, not applause. It is not "good job." It is a fact about his own progress that he could not generate for himself.

The not-this column, and say it before they raise it: tokens, treasure box, name charts, anything he has to cash in later. If the reward is delayed, you have rebuilt the exact problem. A token he redeems Friday is a grade in three weeks with extra steps.

Why this is the law's first instruction

SLIDES 9–11

This is the intellectual spine of the session, and it is what separates it from a classroom-management tip sheet. It sits here — immediately after the collapse and the reinforcement beat — while the collapse is still concrete in the room.

Start with what did NOT happen (slide 9)

Do not skip the left column. Do not lead with the strong claim.

If you open by telling teachers that the environment IS the disability, every person in that room who has taught a child with severe dyslexia will conclude — correctly — that you don't know what you're talking about, and you will lose them for the rest of the session.

So say it plainly first:

| *"The dyslexia did not go away. Neither did the ADHD. Neither did the working-memory impairment. Those are real, they're measurable, and they'll still be there in June. Nobody is claiming otherwise."*

Then the turn:

"But the room stopped producing failure. The demands the environment placed on executive function dropped below the level where the impairment turns into failure. Same child. Same impairment. Different outcome."

The precise claim, and the one to hold:

The impairment is in the child. The disability is in the gap between the child and the room.

And that isn't a philosophy — it's the statutory definition. IDEA defines a "child with a disability" as a child with a qualifying impairment and "who, by reason thereof, needs special education and related services." (20 U.S.C. § 1401(3)(A))

Two prongs. The impairment alone is not the disability. The need is. And need is a fact about a child in a setting. Which means — say this slowly —

"When you change the setting, you are not cheating. You are operating on the exact variable the law says determines whether a disability exists at all."

If someone asks "so could we accommodate kids out of special education?" Answer honestly. No, and that isn't the goal. Severe impairments need specially designed instruction no matter how good the room is. What you are saying is that a portion of what we currently call disability is manufactured by rooms that were never built for these children — and that portion, we own.

The room comes first — and the statute says so (slide 10)

Read this aloud. Slowly.

"...removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily." — 20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(5)(A), the Least Restrictive Environment mandate

"Look at the order of operations. Supplementary aids and services come first. A child is removed only when the regular classroom with supports cannot work — not when the classroom without supports isn't working."

And the consequence:

"So when the supports were never actually, consistently in place, we have not yet asked the question the law asks. We asked a different, easier question — and we got a child moved."

Watch your tone here. This is not an accusation of the teacher. She is the person who has been set up to fail by nine uncrosswalked plans. It is an indictment of the system, and she is one of its casualties too.

This is where the whole deck ties together: the fidelity column isn't compliance theater. It is the record of whether the LRE question was ever honestly asked — the exact question an ARD committee, a hearing officer, or a parent's attorney will ask.

The category error (slide 11)

Ninety seconds. You are planting a seed, not litigating it.

Congress found that "disability is a natural part of the human experience" (20 U.S.C. § 1400(c)(1)) and built a statute whose first instruction is to change the environment. Then we built a compliance apparatus whose instruments only point one way — at the child. Look at what we write:

- "Student will learn to self-monitor."
- "Student will request help as needed."
- "Student will use organizational strategies."
- "Supports will be faded as the student demonstrates independence."

Every one of those locates the problem inside the child.

A support the student has to remember to use is not a support for a student who can't remember. It's the disability, restated as a goal.

Own it out loud. If you write IEPs, say so: "I have written these. Some of them are in plans I signed this year." That admission is what makes the room trust you. Do not present as though the problem is somewhere else.

On fading, if there's time: we fade supports because fading signals progress. But a ramp is not faded once the student gets stronger. When we remove the prosthetic and the student regresses, we call it a failure to generalize — and we charge it to the child.

Then stop and move on. You have a room of teachers who need to get to their cars. Do not turn this into a policy lecture.

The triage slide — a word of caution

SLIDE 12

This slide will generate the most conversation and the most relief. Budget time for it.

It sorts accommodations into non-negotiable / build-into-the-routine / verify-it's-still-needed. What that third category actually means is: somebody had a box to fill. That is the correct diagnosis. It may or may not be the right thing to say out loud, depending on who is in the back of the room and whether you have talked to them first. Read your building — the slide is worded to be defensible either way.

Critical framing, so this does not become permission to ignore an IEP:

"Verify does not mean skip. It means ask. Bring it to me or the case manager and we will tell you what it is actually for — and if the honest answer is nothing, then we should amend the document rather than have you quietly not do it."

That last sentence is what keeps this legal and keeps you credible. Do not omit it.

The STAAR question

SLIDES 13-15

Someone will raise this, and they will be right to: "Not everyone can have a certain accommodation on STAAR." Correct. Answer it head-on, and then turn it.

The hard line (slide 13)

Instruction and state assessment are two different legal categories, and the universalizing logic applies to only one of them.

- **Classroom instruction — universalize freely.** TEA's accessibility features are, in the agency's own framing, procedures and materials available to any student who regularly benefits from their use during classroom instruction. No eligibility gate. No approval. Nobody is harmed if the whole class gets chunked tasks and a check-in loop.
- **State assessment — never improvise, never universalize.** Designated supports have eligibility criteria set by TEA, decided by the ARD or 504 committee at the local level. Four require TEA approval in advance, submitted by district testing personnel through an Accommodation Request Form in TIDE: Extra Day, Complex Transcribing, Mathematics Scribe, and Other.

"Nothing I have shown you today changes what a student gets on STAAR. Not one thing. Testing supports are eligibility-gated, they're the committee's decision, and you don't improvise them on test day."

Then turn the page — because the next slide is where this becomes an argument FOR the crosswalk, not against it.

The turn (slide 14)

Now read them TEA's actual requirement:

"The use of any designated support during a state assessment requires that the student routinely and effectively use it during classroom instruction and testing." — STAAR Accommodations Educator Guide, TEA (© 2026)

And TEA defines routine and effective use as two things — both of which a teacher has to be able to show:

- The student has used the support often enough during classroom instruction and testing that they can use it independently on the state assessment, as appropriate. (Not every day. Often enough that it isn't new to them when it counts.)
- The support has been proven effective for that student's specific needs — "as evidenced by student scores or teacher observations with and without accommodation use."

Teacher observation is not a soft form of evidence here. TEA names it.

Why this is an argument for the crosswalk (slide 15)

"So the question isn't whether the chart conflicts with the testing rules. The question is: when the committee asks whether this student routinely uses this support — can you answer?"

The teacher with a fidelity column can answer. The teacher delivering from memory cannot. And if she cannot, the committee may not be able to justify the support — and the student may not get it.

Inconsistent delivery doesn't just fail the student in April. It can cost them the support in May.

If asked: "So is a tick sheet legally required?" No — and do not overclaim. TEA does not prescribe a documentation form. What the guide names as evidence is student scores or teacher observations. A dated tick sheet is teacher observation, recorded contemporaneously. That is simply stronger than a recollection in April. You are not telling them a log is required. You are telling them it is the easiest way to have an answer when the question is asked.

Before you present this on your campus: cite the current year's guide. TEA revises the accessibility framework and the eligibility criteria annually — the slides cite the © 2026 STAAR Accommodations Educator Guide, and the full policy documents for each designated support live in the Accommodations section of the District and Campus Coordinator Resources. Check both against the current administration before you stand up in front of a faculty. Your testing coordinator will know what changed.

The activity

SLIDE 16 • 20-25 MINUTES

Set a visible timer. Yes — model the intervention. Say that out loud. It gets a laugh and it makes the point better than a slide can.

Say this before they start, or you'll get the question anyway.

The worksheet and the workbook have seventeen support rows. The crosswalk on slide 5 has six. That is not a mistake, and a teacher who thinks she got the wrong handout will disengage.

"The sheet in front of you has seventeen rows. The slide had six. That is not a mistake. The six on the screen are what showed up in ONE example classroom. The seventeen on your sheet are the full menu — every support that commonly appears in a plan, sorted by when it fires. Your room will light up somewhere between four and eight of them. Which ones is the whole point of the next twenty-five minutes."

The one rule, and repeat it twice:

Find the ROW first. Then mark the COLUMN.

The naming rule, and say it before the confidentiality rule: first name and last initial. Marcus T. — not the full name, and not just M.T. Full initials are unreadable back at your desk in April; full names don't belong on a chart that travels.

Say the confidentiality rule plainly before they start:

"Initials only. The chart stays with you, it goes in your plan book, and it's a working document — treat it the way you'd treat your grade book."

If someone asks whether admin will collect these: be straight. The workbook is theirs. If a campus wants aggregate information, the useful numbers are the counts on the Summary tab — which supports does this building keep being asked for? — not the student columns. That question needs counts, not children. Say so plainly and the room will trust the tool.

Then circulate. Do not sit at the front. The questions that matter get asked quietly at tables.

Watch for the one failure mode: teachers who organize by student anyway — a column per kid with a list underneath. Redirect immediately: "Find the row first, then mark the column." If they organize by student, nothing collapses and the activity dies.

If someone came empty-handed: pair them with someone who didn't. Don't make it a thing.

If they're on laptops: the row turns amber on its own the instant they type the third x. Do not explain that in advance. Let them see it happen.

The share-out

One question, asked to the room:

"What was your highest-count row?"

You will hear "chunking" and "check-ins" over and over. That repetition is the finding. Let the room hear itself.

The chart is your data sheet

SLIDE 17

This is the bonus that turns a good session into one they talk about in the hallway. The point is NOT "here is a new tracking system." The point is: you have been doing the work and getting no credit for it, and this is how it finally counts.

"The most painful ARD I sit in is the one where a teacher has been implementing faithfully all year — headphones out, chunks on the board, cool-down corner open — and cannot show a single piece of evidence that she did it. She did the work. The record says nothing. So the committee treats it as though the supports were never tried."

"A date column fixes that. Not because you need to do more. Because what you already do finally leaves a trace."

The closing line at the bottom of the slide is the thesis of the data section. Teachers do not hate data collection because of the writing — they hate it because they are asked to document something that was never scheduled. Unscheduled things cannot be tallied.

Monday: one thing

SLIDE 18

Do not send them away with six things. Send them away with one — and make it one they are ALREADY DOING.

"I am not asking you to add a support. I am asking you to take one you already have and make it visible — on the board, and on a chart. That's the whole Monday."

The two-column box is the leave-behind. Point at it and tell them it's on the back of their worksheet. Note that the "what we are NOT asking for" column is mostly things they were never doing anyway — that is the point, and it lowers the temperature.

The italic line at the bottom is the single most important sentence in the deck for anyone who writes plans. If there are case managers or admin in the room, that is the line they should carry out.

The close

SLIDE 19

End on the offer. Do not add a summary slide. Do not add a questions slide.

"Bring me your plans. I will show you what you have already built. You should not have to be the first person who ever looked at all nine at once."

The offer is not "let me fix this for you." It is "let me show you what you have already built." That distinction is the whole reason the session works: you did not come to add to their workload, and you did not come to correct them. You came to count what they have been doing for free.

Mean it. If you offer this, you have to actually do it. Do it for two teachers and the other twenty will come to you — which is exactly the outcome you want, because now you are seeing what implementation actually looks like on your campus.

Practical: bring a sign-up sheet. Names on paper, not "come see me sometime."

Handling the objections

These will come. Have the answers ready.

"So now I have to track this TOO?"

"No. You track this instead of what you're doing now. You are already trying to remember whether you gave Marcus his break. You are already reconstructing three weeks of Tier 2 data the night before a referral. I'm not adding a log. I'm replacing a memory task with a checkbox."

"This is just handing out prizes."

"Nobody's getting a prize. They're getting to know whether they're on track. That's information, not candy — and I've never met a kid who did worse for having it."

"What about fairness to the other kids?"

"Everything on this chart is something you do to the room. If a support only works for the child it's written for, it's a bad support. Most of these help the whole class, and the Tier 2 and 3 kids in your room are getting the intervention for free."

"I have 28 students. I can't do this three separate times."

"Right — and you shouldn't. If you're doing three separate things, we designed it wrong. One timer. One board. One loop. The accommodation is a change to the structure of the task, not a service you deliver to individual children."

"I don't have time for this."

"You're already spending the time. You're spending it on redirection, on re-explaining directions, on the kid who's been staring at the same problem for eleven minutes, and on the conversation after class about why nothing got done. This front-loads that time into something predictable instead of something reactive. Check-ins are cheaper than redirections — because they happen before the derailment instead of after."

"Are you saying the disability isn't real?"

"No. The opposite. The dyslexia is real, the ADHD is real, the working-memory impairment is real and measurable and will still be there in June. What changes is whether the room turns that impairment into failure. The impairment is in the child. The disability is in the gap between the child and the room. That's

not my opinion — IDEA defines a child with a disability as one who has an impairment and who, by reason thereof, needs special education. Two prongs. The need is a fact about a child in a setting."

"So could we just accommodate kids out of special education?"

"No, and that isn't the goal. Severe impairments need specially designed instruction no matter how good the room is. What I'm saying is that some of what we call disability is manufactured by rooms that were never built for these kids — and that part, we own."

"But not everyone is allowed that accommodation on STAAR."

"You're right, and that's exactly why the testing row is marked non-negotiable. Nothing on this chart changes what a student gets on the state test. What it changes is whether you can prove they routinely use it — which is the condition TEA sets for them getting it at all."

"Cutting the number of problems is just lowering the bar."

"Sometimes it is, and you're right to say so. Ask one question: is the twenty there because the skill needs twenty reps, or because twenty fit on the page? If it's the page, cut it for everyone and you've written a better assignment. If it's the skill, cut it only for the child whose plan says so. That's why reduced items is the one row that stays per-student."

"So can I skip the ones you called 'verify'?"

This is the dangerous one. Answer carefully:

"Verify does not mean skip. It means ask. Bring it to me or the case manager and we'll tell you what it's actually for. And if the honest answer is that it isn't for anything, then we should amend the document — not have you quietly not do it."

That sentence is what keeps this session legal and keeps you credible. Do not omit it.

What teachers should walk out holding

- **Their own completed crosswalk** — in their plan book by Monday.
- **One action:** chunk the assignment on the board.
- **One sentence:** *You cannot collect data on a support you deliver inconsistently. Make the support a routine, and the data collects itself.*

A note for whoever presents this

If you write IEPs, this session should make you uncomfortable, and it should. The reason teachers are drowning is partly that we write plans without ever asking what else is in the room, and we write accommodations — "student will use a planner," "student will request help as needed," "student will self-monitor" — that hand the job back to the exact executive system that isn't working.

Those aren't accommodations. They're restatements of the disability.

The teacher-facing session is the short-term fix. The long-term fix is upstream, and it's ours.

Sources cited on the slides

IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), 20 U.S.C. ch. 33

- **§ 1400(c)(1)** — Congressional findings: "Disability is a natural part of the human experience and in no way diminishes the right of individuals to participate in or contribute to society." **(Slide 11.)**
sites.ed.gov/idea/statute-chapter-33/subchapter-i/1400/c

- **§ 1401(3)(A)** — Definition of "child with a disability": a child with a qualifying impairment "and who, by reason thereof, needs special education and related services." The two-prong relational test. sites.ed.gov/idea/statute-chapter-33/subchapter-i/1401/3 **(Slide 9.)**
- **§ 1412(a)(5)(A)** — Least Restrictive Environment: removal from the regular educational environment "occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily." Implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. § 300.114(a). **(Slide 10.)** sites.ed.gov/idea/statute-chapter-33/subchapter-ii/1412/a/5

Texas Education Agency

- **STAAR Accommodations Educator Guide, TEA (© 2026)** — accommodation categories, the routine-and-effective-use requirement, and the four designated supports requiring TEA approval. **(Slides 13–15.)** tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/test-administration/staar-accommodation-educator-guide.pdf
- **Accommodations Resources, TEA** — the three-category framework (accessibility features / locally-approved designated supports / designated supports requiring TEA approval). tea.texas.gov/student-assessment/accommodations-resources
- **District and Campus Coordinator Resources, Accommodations section** — individual policy documents with the eligibility criteria for each designated support, and which local team has decision authority.

Verify against the current administration year before presenting. TEA updates these annually.