DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS

FOR

Mathematics

The Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements are copyrighted by the University of Kansas Center for Research. They are based substantially on an earlier version that was copyrighted by Edvantia. The Essential Elements may be reprinted, with appropriate citation, in part or entirety by anyone. However, no text in the document may be modified. Comments, explanations, or other additional materials may be interspersed as long as they are clearly indicated that they are not part of the Essential Elements and are not the opinions of DLM. Appropriate citations follows.

Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium (2013). *Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements for English Language Arts.* Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

and

Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium (2013). *Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements for Mathematics.* Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

Background on the Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements

The Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements are specific statements of knowledge and skills linked to the grade-level expectations identified in the Common Core State Standards. The purpose of the Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements is to build a bridge from the content in the Common Core State Standards to academic expectations for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The initial draft of the Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements (then called the Common Core Essential Elements) was released in the spring of 2012.

The initial version of the Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements (DLM EEs) was developed by a group of educators and content specialists from the 12 member states of the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment Consortium (DLM) in the spring of 2011. Led by Edvantia, Inc., a sub-contractor of DLM, representatives from each state education agency and the educators and content specialists they selected developed the original draft of DLM EEs. Experts in mathematics and English language arts, as well as individuals with expertise in instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities reviewed the draft documents. Edvantia then compiled the information into the version released in the spring of 2012.

Concurrent with the development of the DLM EEs, the DLM consortium was actively engaged in building learning maps in mathematics and English language arts. The DLM learning maps are highly connected representations of how academic skills are acquired, as reflected in research literature. In the case of the DLM project, the Common Core State Standards helped to specify academic targets, while the surrounding map content clarified how students could reach the specified standard. Learning maps of this size had not been previously developed, and as a

result, alignment between the DLM EEs and the learning maps was not possible until the fall of 2012, when an initial draft of the learning maps was available for review.

Alignment of the DLM EEs to the DLM Learning Maps

Teams of content experts worked together to revise the initial version of the DLM EEs and the learning maps to ensure appropriate alignment of these two critical elements of the project. Alignment involved horizontal alignment of the DLM EEs with the Common Core State Standards and vertical alignment of the DLM EEs with meaningful progressions in the learning maps. The alignment process began when researchers Caroline Mark and Kelli Thomas compared the learning maps with the initial version of the DLM EEs to determine how the map and the DLM EEs should be adjusted to improve their alignment. The teams of content experts most closely involved with this alignment work included:

Mathematics	**English Language Arts**
Kelli Thomas, Ph.D. (co-lead)	Caroline Mark, Ph.D. (lead)
Angela Broaddus, Ph.D. (co-lead)	Jonathan Schuster, Ph.D.
Perneet Sood	Russell Swinburne Romine, Ph.D.
Kristin Joannou	Suzanne Peterson
Bryan Candea Kromm	

These teams worked in consultation with Sue Bechard, Ph.D. and Karen Erickson, Ph.D., who offered guidance based on their experience in alternate assessments of students with significant cognitive disabilities.

The Alignment Process

The process of aligning the learning map and the DLM EEs began by identifying nodes in the maps that represented the essential elements in mathematics and English language arts. This process revealed areas in the maps where additional nodes were needed to account for incremental growth reflected from an essential element in one grade to the next. Also identified

were areas in which an essential element was out of place developmentally, according to research, with other essential elements. For example, adjustments were made when an essential element related to a higher-grade map node appeared earlier on the map than an essential element related to a map node from a lower grade (e.g., a fifth-grade skill preceded a third-grade skill). Finally, the alignment process revealed DLM EEs that were actually written as instructional tasks rather than learning outcomes.

This initial review step provided the roadmap for subsequent revision of both the learning maps and the DLM EEs. The next step in the DLM project was to develop the claims document, which served as the basis for the evidence-centered design of the DLM project and helped to further refine both the modeling of academic learning in the maps and the final revisions to the DLM EEs.

Claims and Conceptual Areas

The DLM system uses a variant of evidence-centered design (ECD) as the framework for developing the DLM Alternate Assessment System. While ECD is multifaceted, it starts with a set of claims regarding important knowledge in the domains of interest (mathematics and English language arts), as well as an understanding of how that knowledge is acquired. Two sets of claims have been developed for DLM that identify the major domains of interest within mathematics and English language arts for students with significant cognitive disabilities. These claims are broad statements about expected student learning that serve to focus the scope of the assessment. Because the learning map identifies particular paths to the acquisition of academic skills, the claims also help to organize the structures in the learning map for this population of students. Specifically, conceptual areas within the map further define the knowledge and skills required to meet the broad claims identified by DLM.

The claims are also significant because they provide another means through which to evaluate alignment between the DLM EEs and the learning map nodes, and serve as the foundation for evaluating the validity of inferences made from test scores. DLM EEs related to a particular claim and conceptual area must clearly link to one another, and the learning map must reflect how that knowledge is acquired. Developing the claims and conceptual areas for DLM provided a critical framework for organizing nodes on the learning maps and, accordingly, the DLM EEs that align with each node.

The table below reveals the relationships among the claims, conceptual areas, and DLM EEs in mathematics. The DLM EEs are represented with codes that reflect the domains in mathematics. For example, the first letter or digit represents the grade of record, the next code reflects the domain, followed by the number that aligns with the Common Core State Standard grade level expectation. As such, K.CC.1 is the code for the DLM EE that aligns with kindergarten (K), counting and cardinality (CC), standard 1. Keys to the codes can be found under the table.

Clearly articulated claims and conceptual areas for DLM served as an important evidence-centered framework within which this version of the DLM EEs was developed. With the claims and conceptual areas in place, the relationship between DLM EEs within a claim and conceptual area or across grade levels is easier to track and strengthen. The learning maps, as well as the claims and conceptual areas, had not yet been developed when the original versions of the DLM EEs were created. As such, the relationship of DLM EEs within and across grade levels was more difficult to evaluate at that time.

Table 1. Dynamic Learning Maps Claims and Conceptual Areas for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities in Mathematics

Claim 1	**Number Sense: Students demonstrate increasingly complex understanding of number sense.** Conceptual Areas in the Dynamic Learning Map: **MC 1.1 Understand number structures (counting, place value, fraction)** *Essential Elements Included: K.CC.1, 4 ,5; 1.NBT.1a-b; 2.NBT.2a-b,3; 3.NBT.1,2,3; 3.NF.1-3; 4.NF.1-2,3; 5.NF.1,2; 6.RP.1; 7.RP.1-3; 7.NS.2.c-d; 8.NS.2.a* **MC 1.2 Compare, compose, and decompose numbers and sets** *Essential Elements Included: K.CC.6; 1.NBT.2, 3, 4, 6; 2.NBT.1, 4, 5b; 4.NBT.2, 3; 5.NBT.1, 2, 3, 4; 6.NS.1, 5-8; 7.NS.3; 8.NS.2.b; 8.EE.3-4;* **MC 1.3 Calculate accurately and efficiently using simple arithmetic operations** *Essential Elements Included: 2.NBT.5.a, 6-7; 3.OA.4; 4.NBT.4, 5.NBT.5, 6-7; 6.NS.2, 3; 7.NS.1, 2.a, 2.b; 8.NS.1; 8.EE.1; N-CN.2.a, 2.b, 2.c; N-RN.1; S-CP.1-5; S-IC.1-2*
Claim 2	**Geometry: Students demonstrate increasingly complex spatial reasoning and understanding of geometric principles.** Conceptual Areas in the Dynamic Learning Map: **MC 2.1 Understand and use geometric properties of two- and three-dimensional shapes** *Essential Elements Included: K.MD.1-3; K.G.2-3; 1.G.1, 2; 2.G.1; 3.G.1; 4.G.1, 2; 4.MD.5, 6; 5.G.1-4; 5.MD.3; 7.G.1, 2, 3, 5; 8.G.1, 2, 4, 5; G-CO.1, 4-5, 6-8; G-GMD.1-3, 4* **MC 2.2 Solve problems involving area, perimeter, and volume** *Essential Elements Included: 1.G.3; 3.G.2; 4.G.3; 4.MD.3; 5.MD.4-5; 6.G.1, 2; 7.G.4, 6; 8.G.9; G-GMD.1-3; G-GPE.7*
Claim 3	**Measurement Data and Analysis: Students demonstrate increasingly complex understanding of measurement, data, and analytic procedures.** Conceptual Areas in the Dynamic Learning Map: **MC 3.1 Understand and use measurement principles and units of measure** *Essential Elements Included: 1.MD.1-2, 3.a, 3.b, 3.c, 3.d; 2.MD.1, 3-4, 5, 6, 7, 8; 3.MD.1, 2, 4; 4.MD.1, 2.a, 2.b, 2.c, 2.d; 5.MD.1.a, 1.b, 1.c; N-Q.1-3* **MC 3.2 Represent and interpret data displays** *Essential Elements Included: 1.MD.4; 2.MD.9-10; 3.MD.3; 4.MD.4.a, 4.b; 5.MD.2; 6.SP.1-2, 5; 7.SP.1-2, 3, 5-7; 8.SP.4; S-ID. 1-2, 3, 4*
Claim 4	**Algebraic and functional reasoning: Students solve increasingly complex mathematical problems, making productive use of algebra and functions.** Conceptual Areas in the Dynamic Learning Map: **MC 4.1. Use operations and models to solve problems** *Essential Elements Included: K.OA.1, 1.a, 1.b, 2, 5.a, 5.b; 2.OA.3, 4; 3.OA.1-2, 8; 4.OA.1-*

	2, 3, 4; 6.EE.1-2, 3, 5-7; 7.EE.1, 4; 8.EE.7; A-CED.1, 2-4; A-SSE.1, 3 **MC 4.2 Understand patterns and functional thinking** *Essential Elements Included: 3.OA.9; 4.OA.5; 5.OA.3; 7.EE.2; 8.EE.5-6; 8.F.1-3, 4, 5; A-REI.10-12; A-SSE.4; F-BF.1, 2; F-IF.1-3, 4-6; F-LE.1*

A-CED = creating equations; A-SSE = seeing structure in equations BF = building functions; CC = counting & cardinality; EE = expressions & equations; F-BF = basic fractions; F-IF = interpreting functions; G = geometry; G-GMD = geometric measurement & dimension; G-GPE = general properties & equations; MD = measurement & data; NBT = numbers & operations in base ten; N-CN = complex number system; NF = numbers & operations - fractions; N-RN = real number system; NS = number systems; N-Q = number & quantity; OA = operations & algebraic thinking; RP = ratios & proportional relationships; S-IC- statistics & probability - making inferences/justifying conclusions; S-ID = statistics & probability - interpreting categorical & quantitative data; SP = statistics & probability

Resulting Changes to the DLM Essential Elements

The development of the entire DLM Alternate Assessment System guided a final round of revisions to the DLM EEs, which can be organized into four broad categories: alignment across grade levels, language specificity, common core alignment, and defining learning expectations (rather than instructional tasks). The first type of revision was required to align the DLM EEs across grade levels, both vertically and horizontally. The maps, and the research supporting them, were critical in determining the appropriate progression of skills and understandings from grade to grade. This alignment across grade levels was important within and across standards, strands, and domains. For example, in determining when it was appropriate to introduce concepts in mathematics regarding the relative position of objects, we had to consider the grade level at which prepositions that describe relative position were introduced in English language arts. Examining the research-based skill development outlined in the learning map aided in these kinds of determinations.

The articulation of the claims and conceptual areas reinforced the need for specific language in the DLM EEs to describe learning within an area. Because teams assigned to grade bands developed the first round of DLM EEs, the language choices from one grade to the next were not consistent. Even when closely related skills, concepts, or understandings were

targeted, the same terms were not always selected to describe the intended learning outcome. The teams of content experts who worked on this revised version of the DLM EEs were very intentional in selecting a common set of terms to reflect the claims and conceptual areas and applied them consistently across the entire set of DLM EEs.

Another important change in this version of the DLM EEs involved alignment to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Given that the DLM EEs are intended to clarify the bridge to the CCSS expectations for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, it is critical that alignment be as close as possible without compromising learning and development over time. While there was never a one-to-one correspondence between the CCSS and the DLM EEs, the revisions have made the alignment between the two more precise than it was in the first version.

Finally, revisions to the DLM EEs involved shifting the focus of a small number of DLM EEs that were written in the form of instructional tasks rather than learning expectations, and adding “With guidance and support” to the beginning of a few of the DLM EEs in the primary grades in English language arts to reflect the expectations articulated in the CCSS.

Members of the DLM consortium reviewed each of the changes to the original version of the DLM EEs. Four states provided substantive feedback on the revisions, and this document incorporates the changes those teams suggested.

Access to Instruction and Assessment

The DLM EEs specify learning targets for students with significant cognitive disabilities; however, they do not describe all of the ways that students can engage in instruction or demonstrate understanding through an assessment. Appropriate modes of communication, both

for presentation or response, are not stated in the DLM EEs unless a specific mode is an expectation. Where no limitation has been stated, no limitation should be inferred. Students' opportunities to learn and to demonstrate learning during assessment should be maximized by providing whatever communication, assistive technologies, augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) devices, or other access tools that are necessary and routinely used by the student during instruction.

Students with significant cognitive disabilities include a broad range of students with diverse disabilities and communication needs. For some students with significant cognitive disabilities, a range of assistive technologies is required to access content and demonstrate achievement. For other students, AAC devices or accommodations for hearing and visual impairments will be needed. During instruction, teams should meet individual student needs using whatever technologies and accommodations are required. Examples of some of the ways that students may use technology while learning and demonstrating learning are topics for professional development, and include:

- communication devices that compensate for a student's physical inability to produce independent speech.
- alternate access devices that compensate for a student's physical inability to point to responses, turn pages in a book, or use a pencil or keyboard to answer questions or produce writing.

Guidance and Support

The authors of the CCSS use the words "prompting and support" at the earliest grade levels to indicate when students are not expected to achieve standards completely independently. Generally, "prompting" refers to "the action of saying something to persuade,

encourage, or remind someone to do or say something" (McKean, 2005). However, in special education, prompting is often used to mean a system of structured cues to elicit desired behaviors that otherwise would not occur. In order to clearly communicate that teacher assistance is permitted during instruction of the DLM EEs and is not limited to structured prompting procedures, the decision was made by the stakeholder group to use the more general term *guidance* throughout the DLM EEs.

Guidance and support during instruction should be interpreted as teacher encouragement, general assistance, and informative feedback to support the student in learning. Some examples of the kinds of teacher behaviors that would be considered guidance and support include verbal supports, such as

- getting the student started (e.g., "Tell me what to do first."),
- providing a hint in the right direction without revealing the answer (e.g., Student wants to write *dog* but is unsure how, so the teacher might say, "See if you can write the first letter in the word, /d/og [phonetically pronounced]."),
- using structured technologies such as task-specific word banks, or
- providing structured cues such as those found in prompting procedures (e.g., least-to-most prompts, simultaneous prompting, and graduated guidance).

Guidance and support as described above applies to instruction and is also linked to demonstrating learning relative to DLM EEs, where guidance and support is specifically called out within the standards.

Conclusion

Developing the research-based model of knowledge and skill development represented in the DLM Learning Maps supported the articulation of assessment claims for mathematics and English language arts. This articulation subsequently allowed for a careful revision of the DLM EEs to reflect both horizontal alignment with the CCSS and vertical alignment across the grades, with the goal of moving students toward more sophisticated understandings in both domains. Though the contributions made by Edvantia and our state partners in developing the initial set of DLM EEs were a critical first step, additional revisions to the DLM EEs were required to ensure consistency across all elements of the Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System.

APPENDIX

Development of the Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements has been a collaborative effort among practitioners, researchers, and our state representatives. Listed below are the reviews and the individuals involved with each round of improvements to the Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements. Thank you to all of our contributors.

Review of Draft Two of Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements

A special thanks to all of the experts nominated by their state to review draft two of the Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements. We are grateful for your time and efforts to improve these standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Your comments have been incorporated into this draft. The states with teams who reviewed draft two include:

Illinois	Oklahoma
Iowa	Utah
Kansas	Virginia
Michigan	West Virginia
Missouri	Wisconsin

Development of the Original Dynamic Learning Maps Common Core Essential Elements

A special thanks to Edvantia and the team of representatives from Dynamic Learning Maps consortium states who developed the original Common Core Essential Elements upon which the revised Dynamic Learning Maps Essential Elements are based. The team from Edvantia who led the original effort included:

Jan Sheinker, Sheinker Educational Services, Inc.
Beth Judy, Director, Assessment, Alignment, and Accountability Services
Nathan Davis, Information Technology Specialist
Kristen Deitrick, Corporate Communications Specialist

Linda Jones, Executive Assistant

Representatives from Dynamic Learning Maps consortium states included:

IOWA
SEA Representatives: Tom Deeter, Emily Thatcher
Stakeholders: Peggy Akins, Judy Hamer, Kathleen Kvamme-Promes, Donna Shaw

KANSAS
SEA Representatives: Debbie Matthews, Kris Shaw
Stakeholders: Debby Byrne, Holly Draper, Dawn Gresham, Linda Hickey

MICHIGAN
SEA Representatives: Joanne Wilkelman, Adam Wyse
Stakeholders: Debra Susan Asano, Thomai Gersh, Marcia O'Brian, Terri Portice

MISSOURI
SEA Representatives: Lynn Everett, Jane VanDeZande
Stakeholders: Melia Franklin, Lou Ann Hoover, Debbie Jameson, Kate Sadler

NEW JERSEY
SEA Representatives: Melanie O'Dea
Stakeholders: Brenda Berrios, Neal Webster, Tina Yurcho

NORTH CAROLINA
SEA Representatives: Claire Greer, Sarah Reives
Stakeholders: Emma Hatfield-Sidden, Judy Jennings, Jennifer Michalenok,

OKLAHOMA
SEA Representatives: Jennifer Burnes, Amy Dougherty
Stakeholders: Pam Cox, Dianna Daubenspeck, Sondra LeGrande, Christie Stephenson

UTAH
SEA Representatives: Wendy Carver, Kurt Farnsworth
Stakeholders: James Bray, Janice Hill, Linda Stallviere, Ryan Webb

VIRGINIA
SEA Representative: John Eisenberg
Stakeholders: Maria Beck, Daniel Blegun, Al Klugh, Cheryl Ann Prevatte

WASHINGTON

SEA Representatives: Judy Kraft, Janice Tornow
Stakeholders: Annalisa Brewster, Kim Cook, Jeffrey Dunn, Kimberly Perisho

WEST VIRGINIA
SEA Representatives: Beth Cipoletti, Melissa Gholson
Stakeholders: Robert Bartlett, Gerald Hartley, Angel Harris, Angela See

WISCONSIN
SEA Representatives: Emilie Amundson, Kristen Burton
Stakeholders: Lori Hillyer, Tamara Maxwell, Connie Persike, Sara Vold

DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS FOR KINDERGARTEN

Kindergarten Mathematics Domain: Counting and Cardinality

CCSS Grade-Level Standards	DLM Essential Elements
CLUSTER: Know number names and the count sequence.	
K.CC.1. Count to 100 by ones and by tens.	**EE.K.CC.1.** Starting with one, count to 10 by ones.
K.CC.2. Count forward beginning from a given number within the known sequence (instead of having to begin at 1).	Not applicable. See **EE.2.NBT.2.b**.
K.CC.3. Write numbers from 0 to 20. Represent a number of objects with a written numeral 0–20 (with 0 representing a count of no objects).	Not applicable. See **EE.2.NBT.3**.
CLUSTER: Count to tell the number of objects.	
K.CC.4. Understand the relationship between numbers and quantities; connect counting to cardinality.	**EE.K.CC.4.** Demonstrate one-to-one correspondence, pairing each object with one and only one number and each number with one and only one object.
K.CC.4.a. When counting objects, say the number names in the standard order, pairing each object with one and only one number name and each number name with one and only one object.	
K.CC.4.b. Understand that the last number name said tells the number of objects counted. The number of objects is the same regardless of their arrangement or the order in which they were counted.	
K.CC.4.c. Understand that each successive number name refers to a quantity that is one larger.	
K.CC.5. Count to answer "how many?" questions about as many as 20 things arranged in a line, a rectangular array, or a circle, or as many as 10 things in a scattered configuration; given a number from 1–20, count out that many objects.	**EE.K.CC.5.** Count out up to three objects from a larger set, pairing each object with one and only one number name to tell how many.

CCSS Grade-Level Standards	DLM Essential Elements
CLUSTER: Compare numbers.	
K.CC.6. Identify whether the number of objects in one group is greater than, less than, or equal to the number of objects in another group, e.g., by using matching and counting strategies.[1]	**EE.K.CC.6.** Identify whether the number of objects in one group is more or less than (when the quantities are clearly different) or equal to the number of objects in another group.
K.CC.7. Compare two numbers between 1 and 10 presented as written numerals.	Not applicable. See **EE.2.NBT.4**.

[1] Include groups with up to ten objects.

[2] Drawings need not show details but should show the mathematics in the problem. (This applies wherever drawings are mentioned in the Standards.)

Kindergarten Mathematics Domain: Operations and Algebraic Thinking

CCSS Grade-Level Standards	DLM Essential Elements
CLUSTER: Understand addition as putting together and adding to, and understand subtraction as taking apart and taking from.	
K.OA.1. Represent addition and subtraction with objects, fingers, mental images, drawings[2], sounds (e.g., claps), acting out situations, verbal explanations, expressions, or equations.	**EE.K.OA.1.** Represent addition as "putting together" or subtraction as "taking from" in everyday activities.
K.OA.2. Solve addition and subtraction word problems, and add and subtract within 10, e.g., by using objects or drawings to represent the problem.	Not applicable See **EE.2.NBT.6–7**.
K.OA.3. Decompose numbers less than or equal to 10 into pairs in more than one way, e.g., by using objects or drawings, and record each decomposition by a drawing or equation (e.g., 5 = 2 + 3 and 5 = 4 + 1).	Not applicable. See **EE.1.NBT.6**.
K.OA.4. For any number from 1 to 9, find the number that makes 10 when added to the given number, e.g., by using objects or drawings, and record the answer with a drawing or equation.	Not applicable. See **EE.1.NBT.2**.
K.OA.5. Fluently add and subtract within 5.	Not applicable. See **EE.3.OA.4**.

[2] Drawings need not show details but should show the mathematics in the problem. (This applies wherever drawings are mentioned in the Standards.)

Kindergarten Mathematics Domain: Number and Operations in Base Ten

CCSS Grade-Level Standards	DLM Essential Elements
CLUSTER: Work with numbers 11–19 to gain foundations for place value.	
K.NBT.1. Compose and decompose numbers from 11 to 19 into ten ones and some further ones, e.g., by using objects or drawings, and record each composition or decomposition by a drawing or equation (such as 18 = 10 + 8); understand that these numbers are composed of ten ones and one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, or nine ones.	Not applicable. See **EE.1.NBT.4** and **EE.1.NBT.6**.

Kindergarten Mathematics Domain: Measurement and Data

CCSS Grade-Level Standards	DLM Essential Elements
CLUSTER: Describe and compare measurable attributes.	
K.MD.1. Describe measurable attributes of objects, such as length or weight. Describe several measurable attributes of a single object.	**EE.K.MD.1-3.** Classify objects according to attributes (big/small, heavy/light).
K.MD.2. Directly compare two objects with a measurable attribute in common, to see which object has "more of"/"less of" the attribute, and describe the difference. *For example, directly compare the heights of two children, and describe one child as taller/shorter.*	
CLUSTER: Classify objects and count the number of objects in each category.	
K.MD.3. Classify objects into given categories; count the numbers of objects in each category and sort the categories by count.[3]	**EE.K.MD.1-3.** Classify objects according to attributes (big/small, heavy/light).

[3] Limit category counts to be less than or equal to 10.

Kindergarten Mathematics Domain: Geometry

CCSS Grade-Level Standards	DLM Essential Elements
CLUSTER: Identify and describe shapes (squares, circles, triangles, rectangles, hexagons, cubes, cones, cylinders, and spheres).	
K.G.1. Describe objects in the environment using names of shapes, and describe the relative positions of these objects using terms such as *above*, *below*, *beside*, *in front of*, *behind*, and *next to*.	Not applicable. See **EE.1.G.a**.
K.G.2. Correctly name shapes regardless of their orientations or overall size.	**EE.K.G.2–3.** Match shapes of same size and orientation (circle, square, rectangle, triangle).
K.G.3. Identify shapes as two-dimensional (lying in a plane, "flat") or three-dimensional ("solid").	
CLUSTER: Analyze, compare, create, and compose shapes.	
K.G.4. Analyze and compare two- and three-dimensional shapes, in different sizes and orientations, using informal language to describe their similarities, differences, parts (e.g., number of sides and vertices/"corners") and other attributes (e.g., having sides of equal length).	Not applicable. See **EE.7.G.1**.
K.G.5. Model shapes in the world by building shapes from components (e.g., sticks and clay balls) and drawing shapes.	Not applicable.
K.G.6. Compose simple shapes to form larger shapes. *For example, "Can you join these two triangles with full sides touching to make a rectangle?"*	Not applicable. See **EE.1.G.3**.