UDL Reporting Criteria
Developed by the UDL Research Committee

These UDL Reporting Criteria were developed a UDL-IRN Research Committee Workgroup comprised of:
1. Kavita Rao, University of Hawaii, Associate Professor**
2. Sean J. Smith, University of Kansas, Professor**
3. Dave Edyburn, University of Central Florida, Associate Dean of Research
4. Christine Grima-Farrell, University of New South Wales, Lecturer, Leader of Special Education Services
5. George Van Horn, Bartholomew Consolidated School Corporation, Director of Special Services
6. Shira Yalon-Chamovitz, Ono Academic College, Dean of Students

**workgroup co-chairs

Abstract:
Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a framework that can be applied to pedagogy to reduce barriers and address learner variability in the classroom. In order to describe how Universal Design for Learning framework has been applied and implemented in educational settings, it is useful to have a set of guidelines for reporting the UDL-based components. A working group of the UDL-IRN Research Committee convened several times in person and online in 2017 to draft a set of UDL Reporting Criteria. These criteria are intended to provide guidelines for researchers and practitioners who are designing and reporting on UDL implementation. In this white paper, we present Reporting Criteria, developed by the working group in 2017-2018.

Background
In March 2017, during a pre-conference session of the UDL-IRN Annual Summit in Orlando Florida, a working group of the UDL-IRN Research Committee convened to discuss pressing issues for the operationalization and application of UDL. The workgroup identified the need for criteria to establish a UDL claim. That is, to say that a practice or intervention is using UDL, it is useful to report some basic information on how UDL is applied and what components of UDL are being used.

This need aligned with the recommendation for more detailed reporting on how UDL is being used by researchers and practitioners (Rao, Ok, & Bryant, 2014; Ok, Rao, Bryant, & McDougall, 2016). Criteria for reporting on UDL application can further the field not only by establishing guidelines to describe how UDL is used but also to guide design of UDL-based practices and interventions (e.g., to ensure that essential elements of UDL usage are included from the outset).

The workgroup established this purpose for the UDL Reporting Criteria
- To establish reporting criteria when making a UDL claim, relevant for design, implementation, and reporting of how UDL is applied
- To provide varied groups of stakeholders involved in UDL research and development (e.g., researchers and practitioners) a format for reporting on how they applied UDL when designing and implementing UDL-based interventions and practices.

Development of Reporting Criteria
The workgroup met online in 2017-2018 to discuss the development of the reporting criteria and to establish what these criteria should include. We considered the following reporting standards developed for various related purposes in the fields of health and education. Booth (2006) describes the Standards for Reporting Literature Searches (STARLITE) for health technology assessments and for the conduct of systematic reviews in this field. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) standards, developed in 2009, are a minimum set of standards for reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyses in all fields. In the field of education, several sets of quality indicators guide the development and reporting for research [e.g., Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), 2014; What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), 2014; Gersten et al., 2005, Horner et al., 2005].

Workgroup members concurred that the UDL Reporting Criteria should:
   a) define the essential elements of UDL application (for example, how UDL was taken into consideration during the planning or design phase, which guidelines/checkpoints are being applied).
   b) provide a guideline for describing essential elements of a UDL-based application and are not intended to be prescriptive or to standardize how UDL is used
   c) support clear reporting of key components in relation to UDL

The workgroup concurred that the Reporting Criteria were not "quality indicators" and are not used to evaluate the way UDL is used or to evaluate the quality of a study.

In this paper, we present the Reporting Criteria established by the UDL-IRN Research Committee Workgroup. These criteria represent an initial draft for use and testing by UDL researchers and practitioners.

The three guiding tenets for the criteria are that they are intended to be:
1. **Simple:**
   To ensure that the criteria are usable, they are limited to three main categories with 2-3 criteria within each section.
2. **Essential:**
   The RCs focus on essential aspects that can/should be present when *making a UDL claim*. The criteria are worded to capture whether essential elements of the UDL construct (reducing barriers, designing proactively, applying the guidelines/checkpoints) are present. By keeping the RCs focused on these essential elements, we can ensure the criteria are not restrictive or prescriptive, allowing researchers and practitioners to apply the UDL framework in varied and flexible ways relevant to their specific practices and interventions.
3. **Non-evaluative**
   The criteria are for marking Yes/No (whether an element is present or not) in order to provide a snapshot of the basic elements that are reported People using the RCs to evaluate studies may want to focus on additional aspects related to quality or use of UDL *(e.g., whether practices are student-centered, how UDL is used in inclusive environments, how UDL is used for students with a particular disability, how expert learning is addressed, etc)*. These evaluations go beyond basic reporting of essential UDL elements present. Reviewers can use the Notes column to capture additional information of interest when assessing the presence of basic elements.

UDL Reporting Criteria

Area and Criteria	Y/N	Notes (Reviewer uses this column to take notes)
1. Learner Variability and Environment UDL provides guidelines for addressing learner variability and designing learning environments that are supportive for all learners. The following criteria relate to the information provided on learner and the environment in relation to the use of UDL.		
a) Participant information Authors describe learner variability by providing: ● *description of participants and general variability factors* ● information on specific participant characteristics *(e.g., addressing literacy skills for students with a disability or a language learner, IEP objectives, disability information)*		
b) Setting Authors describe the setting for the practice/intervention (e.g., inclusive classroom, grade level, type of school or university)		
2. Proactive and Intentional Design An essential aspect of UDL is proactive and intentional design of curriculum, instructional and educational environments. The following criteria relate to the use of UDL in the design phase.		
a) Addressing Barriers and/or Increasing Access Authors provide a description of: ● specific challenges or barriers** that the practice or intervention is intended to reduce or eliminate ● Issues of access being addressed by UDL This can include barriers and/or access related to environment, curriculum, and/or instruction. **NOTE: *Authors do not have to use the term "barrier" or "access"; other terminology that describes needs, challenges or issues being addressed can meet this criterion.*		
b) Designing to Address Variability Authors describe aspects of design that address variability. This can include a description of how flexibility, choice, or engagement will be addressed in the practice/intervention.		
c) Application of UDL Guidelines and Checkpoints Authors provide details about how and which of the nine UDL guidelines and/or the 31 checkpoints are applied to their practice/intervention. This can include information on how UDL guidelines and checkpoints are applied to goals, assessments, methods, and/or materials.		
3. Implementation and Outcomes Information about how the UDL-based practice is implemented and about outcomes related to UDL are provided.		
a) Description of Implementation of Practice/Intervention Authors describe how the UDL-aligned practice or intervention is conducted/implemented. Authors highlight information on the UDL-based aspects of the practice and intervention (the UDL based aspects should align with what is described in 2c)		

b) Outcomes/Findings in relation to UDL In addition to describing the overall outcomes of the intervention, describe UDL components in relation to outcomes for all and for specific learners (*1b*) (as appropriate to the purpose/RQ of the study and the inclusion of the UDL framework)		
c) Implications Authors describe implications of the outcomes/ findings in relation to UDL-based aspects of practice/intervention.		

Recommended citation:
Rao, K., Smith, S.J., Edyburn, D., Grima-Farrell, C., Van Horn, G., Yalom-Chamowitz, S. (2018). *UDL Reporting Criteria*. Developed by a working group of the Universal Design for Learning Implementation and Research (UDL-IRN) Research Committee. Retrieved from https://udl-irn.org/udl-reporting-criteria/