# Conference Program

## Sunday, July 31, 2016

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **3:00 p.m.–7:00 p.m.** | **Registration/Pick Up Conference Materials** | ***Conference Registration*** |

## Monday, August 1, 2016

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **7:00 a.m.–8:30 a.m.** | **Registration/Pick Up Conference Materials** | ***Conference Registration*** |
| **8:15 a.m.–8:45 a.m.** | **First Time Attendees Meeting** | ***Maryland B*** |
| **9:00 a.m.–10:00 a.m.** | **Welcome and Opening Remarks**<br>**Presenters: Ruth Ryder,** Acting Director, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP); **Renee Bradley,** Deputy Director, Research to Practice Division, OSEP | ***Salon I & II*** |
| **10:00 a.m.–10:45 a.m.** | **Keynote Presentation: Building a Culture of Practice for the New Learning Sector**<br>**Presenter: Richard Elmore,** Harvard Graduate School of Education<br>**Session Description:** The rising generation of educators will face a vastly changed learning landscape. There will be a major divergence between what we now know as the education sector—the familiar institutional system of schooling—and the fast-growing learning sector, which will operate not by the rules and conventions of institutional governance, but by the emerging demands of digital culture. At the same time, the knowledge base for learning will undergo a major shift away from more traditional behavioral "black box" research, which treats the learner as an organism producing predictable behaviors in response to various interventions, to the neuroscience of learning, which treats the human organism as a complex system of neurologically based patterns that develop in powerful ways over time. These emerging challenges open the door for a new conversation about learning that rewrites conventional understandings of where and how learning occurs, and more importantly, offers the opportunity to define and deepen a strong culture of clinical practice for the new learning sector. | ***Salon I & II*** |
| **10:45 a.m.–11:15 a.m.** | **Break** | |
| **11:15 a.m.–12:00 p.m.** | **Project Officer Meetings** | ***See Project Officer Meeting Agenda*** |
| **12:00 p.m.–1:00 p.m.** | **Break for Lunch (*On Your Own*)** | |
| **1:00 p.m.–2:00 p.m.** | **Poster Session A** | ***Exhibit Hall B South*** |
| **1:00 p.m.–2:00 p.m.** | **Special Breakout Session: Third Annual Discussions–Speech-Language Pathology**<br>**Presenters: Mary Andrianopoulos,** University of Massachusetts Amherst; **Linda Rosa-Lugo,** University of Central Florida<br>**Session Description:** Two OSEP Project Directors will facilitate continued discussions on pressing themes that were identified by Project Directors in | ***Delaware AB*** |

speech-language pathology programs during the 2013 and 2014 Project Directors' Conference. Themes include: successful recruitment-retention, curriculum-teaching expectations, and challenges and rewards of personnel preparation grants in program improvement.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What issues are faced by Project Directors in the speech-language pathology related services area with respect to retention, recruitment, and successful training, expectations of grant-related curriculum and teaching requirements, and the successful outcomes and benefits of OSEP Research-to-Practice grants to institutions of higher education and in building capacity in a field with chronic and significant shortages?
2. What evidence-based solutions have OSEP Project Director participants found to be beneficial in addressing these challenges?

**Audience:** Speech-language pathology, Personnel development

**2:00 p.m.–2:15 p.m.** **Break**

**2:15 p.m.–3:45 p.m.** **Large Group Panels**

### Updates and Current Issues Related to Multi-Tier Systems of Supports (MTSS) for Academic and Behavioral Difficulties *Maryland ABC*

**Moderator: Joseph Wehby,** Vanderbilt University

**Panelists**: **Rob Horner,** National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS Center); **Carol Quirk,** Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transition (SWIFT) Center; **Allison Gandhi,** National Center on Intensive Interventions (NCII); **Chris Lemons,** NCLII; **Brian Megert,** Springfield Public Schools, Springfield, OR

The purpose of this session is to provide an overview of the current status regarding the implementation of MTSS in schools today. Issues related to the integration of tiered academic and behavior systems, fidelity of implementation within schools, and impact on student performance will be addressed. Focus will be placed on students with disabilities and students receiving services at Tiers II and III. Specifically, presenters will provide updates regarding current and ongoing research, training, and practice within the field of MTSS. Implications for the incorporation of MTSS with OSEP training programs will be discussed.

### Family Engagement: Making Federal Policy Real *Delaware AB*

**Moderator: Carmen Sánchez,** OSEP

**Panelists: Harriet Able,** University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; **Barbara Boone,** Ohio State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG); **Micheline Lavalle,** Fairfax County Public Schools, Virginia; **Courtney Salzer,** Region 4 Parent Technical Assistance Center at Wisconsin FACETS

The U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services recently released a joint Policy Statement on Family Engagement: *From the Early Years to the Early Grades.* This joint policy statement provides recommendations for States and local programs on the systematic engagement of families in their children's programs, in order to improve children's development and learning from early childhood through the elementary grades, family well-being, and the programs and systems themselves. In this session, participants will learn about the core components of this policy statement and hear examples of how States, university personnel development programs, parent training and information centers, and localities are systemically embedding family engagement across learning environments to improve outcomes for children with disabilities and their families.

### Preparing Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Educators: Rethinking Our Approach to Personnel Development

*Virginia ABC*

**Moderator: Cathy Kea,** North Carolina A&T State University

**Panelists: Edwin Achola,** California State University, Long Beach; **Vivian I. Correa,** University of North Carolina at Charlotte; **Tonika Duren Green,** San Diego State University; **Kent McIntosh,** University of Oregon

This panel will examine how personnel development programs in special education, early intervention, and related services address issues of educator diversity and equity for students, and incorporate culturally and linguistically responsive practices in their efforts to prepare practitioners who are effective at supporting children with disabilities from historically marginalized families and diverse backgrounds. The panel will focus on evidence-based approaches to personnel development; feature personnel development programs using those strategies and practices and their results; and discuss how we might rethink our approach to personnel development of educators as a field.

### RTI Reaches Adolescence: Will It Make It to Adulthood? An Argument for Cautious Optimism

*Washington 1 & 2*

**Moderator: Renee Bradley,** Deputy Director, Research to Practice Division, OSEP

**Panelists: Douglas Fuchs,** Vanderbilt University; **Lynn Fuchs,** Vanderbilt University; **Rekha Balu,** MDRC

For nearly two decades, many teachers, administrators, researchers, and advocates have viewed Response to Intervention (RTI) as a valid method of disability identification, a reliable system of service delivery, or both. A recent U.S. Department of Education-funded multi-State evaluation examined RTI practices implemented in more than 140 schools—the largest study of its kind ever conducted in the U.S. The study found that students in Grades 2 and 3 identified for intervention services, who fell just below the cut score for Tier 1, performed no better on reading tests than students who were not designated for intervention. In Grade 1, students just below the cut score who were identified for intervention performed worse. Three panel members—the lead author of the RTI evaluation and two RTI researchers not connected to the evaluation—will explain the evaluation's methods and results and discuss its implications.

### Impactful Low-Incidence Professional Development: Innovative Solutions & Future Directions

*Washington 4*

**Moderator**: **Celia Rosenquist,** OSEP

**Panelists: Deborah Hatton,** Vanderbilt University**; Marcie Rock,** University of North Carolina at Greensboro**; Michael Abell,** Kentucky SPDG; **Lisa Dieker,** University of Central Florida**; Fred Spooner,** University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Over the past decade, there has been increased emphasis on ensuring that students with disabilities receive instruction aligned to State-adopted college- and career-ready standards. Further, in 2014, the Department implemented a revised accountability system known as Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) that has shifted the focus from compliance to improved results for students with disabilities, including those with low-incidence disabilities. In this session, expert panelists discuss effective professional development approaches, by spotlighting unique challenges, offering innovative solutions, exploring holistic teacher- and student-centered evaluation, and raising important questions, to transform existing approaches into those that not only address college- and career-ready standards but also improve college and employment access for students with low-incidence disabilities.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **3:45 p.m.–4:00 p.m.** | **Break** | |
| **4:00 p.m.–6:00 p.m.** | **Program Area Meetings** | |
| | **State Personnel Development Grants** | ***Maryland ABC*** |
| | **Education Technology, Media, and Materials** | ***Virginia ABC*** |
| | **Technical Assistance and Dissemination** | ***Delaware AB*** |
| | **Parent Training and Information Centers Program** | ***Hoover*** |
| | **PROMISE** | ***McKinley*** |
| **4:00 p.m.–4:45 p.m.** | **Personnel Development Programs Program Area Meeting** | ***Salon I & II*** |
| **4:50 p.m.–6:00 p.m.** | **Personnel Development Programs Discussion Sessions** | |
| | **Early Intervention / Early Childhood: Preparing Scholars in the Principles of Assistive Technology to Improve Inclusive Practices** | ***Washington 1 & 2*** |
| | **Crafting High-Quality Practice-Based Opportunities: A Closer Look at Practice-Based Approaches to Personnel Development** | ***Washington 3*** |
| | **Using Program Evaluation to Improve Personnel Development Program Outcomes, Demonstrate Impact, and Leverage Resources** | ***Washington 4*** |
| | **Rethinking Educator Preparation: Embedding Technology in Personnel Development Programs** | ***Washington 5*** |
| | **It's Time to Get Involved: Aligning State Initiatives–Linking Research, Policy, and Practice with Personnel Development** | ***Washington 6*** |
| | **Supporting Students with Low Incidence / Significant Cognitive Disabilities: Preparing Scholars in Provision of Access to the General Education Curriculum** | ***Balcony A*** |
| | **Minority Serving Institutions: Lessons Learned from Program Development and Improvement** | ***Balcony B*** |

## Tuesday, August 2, 2016

**7:15 a.m.–8:15 a.m.** **Early Bird Session: Effective Initiative Alignment at the District Level** ***Maryland A***

**Presenters: Steve Goodman,** Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi); **Rob Horner,** University of Oregon

**Session Description:** Alignment of district initiatives improves the effectiveness and efficiency of the educational organization in order to produce measured results for students. A team with knowledge and decision-making authority regarding key district initiatives leads the alignment process. Core features of initiatives are aligned and supported through sustainable systems and data-based decision making. During this session, participants will discuss the importance of alignment, as well as steps for aligning initiatives and supporting systems.

**Audience:** SPDG

**8:30 a.m.–9:00 a.m.** **Welcome and Remarks From OSEP/Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS)** ***Salon I & II***

**Presenter: Sue Swenson,** Acting Assistant Secretary, OSERS

**9:00 a.m.–10:15 a.m.** **Keynote Presentation** ***Salon I & II***

**Presenter: Phil Strain,** University of Colorado Denver

This presentation will provide an overview of specific research and development efforts conducted by Dr. Strain and colleagues to: a) ameliorate severe challenging behavior in young children via parent-mediated intervention and b) improve the overall developmental outcomes for young children with autism and their families. Service delivery, professional development and research lessons learned will be shared. Finally, the suggestion will be made that Special Education research and the field in general is best served when there is direct and reciprocal influence between research, service delivery, training and technical assistance and model development.

**10:15 a.m.–10:30 a.m.** **Break**

**10:30 a.m.–12:00 p.m.** **Large Group Panel Sessions**

**Capacity Building: Drafting an Evaluation Blueprint** ***Maryland ABC***

**Moderator: Jennifer Gonzales,** Arkansas Department of Education

**Panelists: Sarah Heinemeier,** Compass Evaluation and Research**; Gretta Hylton,** Kentucky Department of Education**; Rob Horner**, PBIS Center**; Brian Megert,** Springfield Public Schools, Springfield, OR

In this session, staff from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) and the National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) will describe their work in building capacity for and assessing State and district implementation of early intervention and special education practices. They will also discuss how they have gone about evaluating the work of building capacity in selected sites. Their presentation will provide perspectives on questions such as: What does it mean to build capacity? What does it mean to evaluate capacity? In what ways can the evaluation data be used to inform or improve both the project and services to infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities? Each project presentation will be followed by a State or district professional from a selected site discussing the opportunities and challenges experienced in building and evaluating capacity and the valuable lessons learned.

### Complex and Multifaceted: Pursuing Equity in Education *Delaware AB*

**Moderator**: **Cathy Kea,** North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University

**Panelists**: **Wanda Blanchett,** Rutgers University; **Jody Fields,** University of Arkansas-Little Rock; **Donna Ford,** Vanderbilt University; **Kent McIntosh,** University of Oregon; **Alba Ortiz,** The University of Texas at Austin

This panel will examine issues of inequitable access and the impact of racism and bias in the current American educational system on racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse students. Equity in education solutions will be shared through model programs, policies, and practices that seek to close instructional and achievement gaps in diverse schools and districts. Implications for educational practice, research and effective policies will be discussed.

### Supporting SEAs and LEAs in Leveraging the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to Improve Outcomes for Children With Disabilities *Virginia ABC*

**Moderator: Johnny Collett,** Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)

**Panelists: Ruth Ryder,** OSEP; **Rorie Fitzpatrick**, National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI); **Peter Zamora,** CCSSO; **Tie Hodak,** Tennessee Department of Education

This session will include a general overview and context of ESSA, specifically focusing on some of the major provisions and their implications for children with disabilities. The session will also highlight how the CCSSO and the OSEP-funded NCSI are supporting States in transitioning to ESSA. Finally, the session will feature Tennessee and how the State is positioning its work in improving outcomes for children with disabilities within its broader State improvement efforts.

### Lessons Learned From PROMISE: A National Research Effort to Improve Education and Employment Outcomes for Youth With Disabilities Living in Poverty *Washington 1 & 2*

**Moderator: Jade Gingerich,** Maryland PROMISE

**Panelists: Carol Ruddell,** ASPIRE/PROMISE; **Candy Deal,** Maryland PROMISE; **Natalie McQueen,** New York State PROMISE; **Brent Williams,** Arkansas PROMISE; **Meredith Dressel,** Wisconsin PROMISE

The Promoting the Readiness of Minors in Supplemental Security Income (PROMISE) Model Demonstration Projects (MDPs) will highlight evidence-based interventions designed to improve education and post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities. Tools and lessons learned that can be used by a broad cross section of OSEP grantees will be shared on core topics such as systems coordination, parent engagement, direct services, employer perceptions, and transition planning. The diverse panel is composed of a parent, a direct service provider, an employer, and a State agency representative. The discussion will cover the interventions' potential to facilitate systems change in regions and/or States.

### Social Marketing in the Digital Age *Washington 5*

**Moderator: Charlotte Stein, OSEP**

**Panelists**: **Alicia Eberl-Lefko,** American Institutes for Research (AIR); **Clem Coulston,** National Association of School Psychologists; **Brad Turner,** Benetech; **Mary Schuh,** SWIFT Center

In this session, staff from several OSEP-funded projects will describe how they are using digital and social media to support the social marketing of project

activities and outcomes. These projects will highlight strategies for tailoring messages to audiences, identifying appropriate tools for reaching particular audiences, using social media to improve services and outreach, and measuring success using analytic tools. Each project will highlight the data collection process they have created to measure success. The session will focus on additional strategies that go beyond the basics of everyday social media use, as well as solutions to challenges such as accessibility and limited resources, in the ever-changing realm of technology.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **12:00 p.m.–1:00 p.m.** | **Break for Lunch (*On Your Own)*** | |
| **1:00 p.m.–2:00 p.m.** | **Poster Session B** | ***Salon I & II*** |
| **1:00 p.m.–2:00 p.m.** | **Technical Assistance on State Data Collection Program Area Meeting** | ***Maryland A*** |
| **2:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m.** | **Small Breakout Sessions** | |

**Diversifying Doctoral-Level Cohorts** ***Maryland A***

**Presenters: Joy Banks,** Bowie State University; **Tonika Duran Green,** San Diego State University

**Session Description:** The need for highly competent leadership personnel with doctoral-level qualifications to fill special education leadership positions has reached an "imbalance of historic proportion." Moreover, there is a need for doctoral-level personnel who can generate new knowledge, implement evidence-based instruction, and lead teachers, who in turn can meet the needs of a culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) student population and their families. To accomplish these objectives, it is critical to identify and admit diverse, high-quality applicants into rigorous doctoral-level programs. This session will discuss non-traditional routes to identifying and admitting diverse doctoral applicants who are committed to advancing the educational outcomes for CLD students with exceptional learning needs.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How can the interview process be expanded to assess applicants' multiple strengths?
2. How can an expanded application process be used to diversify personnel in the special education profession?

**Audience: Personnel Development**

### A Success Gaps Tool Kit for Schools and Districts *Maryland B*

**Presenters: Tom Munk,** IDEA Data Center; **Julie Bollmer,** IDEA Data Center (IDC); **Nancy O'Hara,** University of Kentucky

**Session Description:** Many schools and districts have been identified as low performing or disproportionate because of disparities between subgroups on a variety of success measures. Others are proactively trying to address identified success gaps. Presenters will demonstrate a success gaps tool kit that can help schools and districts (1) prepare all of their students for success in college and careers by addressing success gaps, (2) collect and use quantitative and qualitative data for the purpose of root-cause analysis of those success gaps, and (3) focus attention on those root causes for the benefit of children in the lowest performing subgroups.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What have you found to be effective in addressing success gaps, finding root causes, and developing data-based improvement plans?
2. How would these materials need to be adapted to fit the context of your State or locality?

**Audiences:** TA&D, Data

### Building Capacity and Sustainability for the Implementation of a Statewide, Student-Led IEP Initiative *Maryland C*

**Presenters: K. Elise James,** Georgia Department of Education; **Julia Causey,** Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education; **Debbie Currere,** Georgia Department of Education; **Pam Kirkpatrick,** North Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS); **Jenny McClintic,** Houston County School District, Georgia

**Session Description:** This session will focus on how the Georgia Department of Education built capacity and sustainability for the implementation of its statewide, student-led individualized education program (IEP) initiative in order to prepare students with disabilities for success in college and career. Over the past six years, the State has expanded implementation by harnessing resources around the State through the 17 GLRSs and the accompanying psychoeducational centers. Presenters will discuss the State, regional, and district-level efforts to build capacity, and the mechanisms put in place for data collection, monitoring fidelity, and evaluation.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What constructs are necessary to build capacity and sustainability for the implementation of a statewide, student-led IEP initiative?
2. How are data collection, fidelity monitoring tools, and evaluation used to design professional learning and provide tiered technical assistance (TA) at regional and district levels?
3. How is technology used to provide statewide TA and training?

**Audience:** SPDG

### Collecting Meaningful Outcome Data on Graduates *Virginia A*

**Presenters: Laura Hall,** San Diego State University (SDSU); **Cynthia E. Pearl,** University of Central Florida (UCF)

**Session Description:** This session aims to stimulate discussion around the identification of meaningful and practical methods and measures for obtaining information from program graduates. Outcome data collected post-graduation

from two university programs (SDSU and UCF) that focus on preparing educators working with individuals with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) will be shared.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What strategies have been implemented successfully to maintain contact with graduates and collect follow-up data?
2. What designs and measures are practical for university programs to implement and yield data that are of interest to the field?
3. What creative methods have been used by Project Directors to identify resources to support the collection of follow-up data (a) as part of the grant budget, and (b) after grant funding ends?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

### Implementing Multi-Level Evaluation to Improve Intensive Intervention: What Did We Learn? *Virginia B*

**Presenters: Allison Gandhi,** American Institutes for Research (AIR); **Teri Marx,** AIR; **Laura Kuchle,** AIR; **Chris Lemons,** Vanderbilt University; **Joe Wehby,** Vanderbilt University

**Session Description:** During this session, panelists from the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII) will discuss the Center's multi-pronged approach to evaluating its technical assistance (TA) and implementation of intensive intervention. Panelists will summarize the Center's approach to TA and intervention, and they will discuss learning from various components of the evaluation, including formative and summative efforts. They will also discuss themes observed from a series of interviews with teams from intensive TA sites.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What critical outcomes should TA Centers evaluate? How do we create feasible methods to collect these data?
2. How should TA Center staff think about integrating formative and summative evaluation efforts into their planning? What are the implications for TA?

**Audience:** TA&D

### Equity Matters: Students With Disabilities Online *Virginia C*

**Presenters: Skip Stahl,** CAST; **Jamie Basham,** University of Kansas; **Tracey Hall,** CAST; **Sean Smith,** University of Kansas

**Session Description:** The Center on Online Learning and Students with Disabilities will review the benefits and challenges facing educators, parents, students, and vendors in full-time virtual, blended, and supplemental online courses, relative to the six principles of the IDEA. Stakeholder forums, site research, and a State scan will provide a national overview of emerging practices.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Should States offer or require certification or endorsements in online teaching, since all stakeholders generally agree that the knowledge and skills—both technological and pedagogical—necessary for success differ dramatically from the skills and knowledge required in brick-and-mortar settings?
2. Should individualized education programs (IEPs) and Section 504 plans developed for brick-and-mortar settings be revisited (and likely revised) once a student enrolls in online learning?

3. Parents of students with disabilities who are being educated in full-time virtual settings spend more time supporting their students in day-to-day online learning than parents of students with disabilities in blended or supplemental settings. What provisions are necessary for these parents, given that few report having expertise in providing special education services?

**Audience:** TA&D

### Graduation Policies for Students With Disabilities

***Delaware A***

**Presenters: Sheryl Lazarus,** National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO); **Martha Thurlow,** NCEO

**Session Description:** This session will present the findings of national policy analyses focused on State graduation requirements and options for students with disabilities, including students who participate in general assessments and those who participate in alternate assessments. It will include an overview of what the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) says about alternate diplomas.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How can States ensure that students with disabilities are appropriately included in graduation policies?
2. How can States work with districts when district policies seem to contradict State policies to some degree?
3. What else needs to happen to successfully include students with disabilities in graduation policies?

**Audience:** TA&D

### Maximizing Collaboration for Deaf-Blind Learners

***Delaware B***

**Presenters: Nancy Steele,** National Center on Deaf-Blindness (NCDB); **Rose Moehring,** University of South Dakota; **Sheri Nelson,** North Dakota Dual Sensory Project; **Linda McDowell,** NCDB

**Session Description:** The Open Hands, Open Access modules are a participatory, multi-media product created by and for the community with OSEP's support. Through intensive collaboration and planning, State project partners (with input from the NCDB) have been contextualizing this product to support personnel development needs.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Meeting the needs of learners who live in rural settings can be an enormous challenge for technical assistance (TA) providers. In what ways can TA projects use technology to connect families to needed support and training?
2. In what ways can TA projects use technology to connect service providers to needed support and training?

**Audiences:** TA&D, Deaf-blind

### How to Talk to Children: Inadvertent Impairments

***Washington 1 & 2***

**Presenter: Ray Hull,** Wichita State University

**Session Description:** A lack of understanding of the neurologic/language-processing capacity and limitations of young school-age children's central nervous systems can inadvertently lead teachers and parents to assume children have auditory language processing impairments, when in fact, they do not. The reason? The child's central auditory system may be expected to perform beyond what can realistically be expected.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What can teachers and parents do to enhance young children's ability to understand adult speech in the classroom and at home, and thus enhance their potential for learning?
2. How can normal adult speech (speed and clarity of utterance of a typical teacher and/or parent) enhance and/or impede a young child's ability to process and interpret what teachers and parents say?

**Audience:** Early Childhood

### Training Personnel Using Autism Online Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) Modules *Washington 3*

**Presenters: Samuel Odom,** Frank Porter Graham (FPG) Child Development Institute; **Ann Sam,** FPG Child Development Institute; **Ann Cox,** FPG Child Development Institute

**Session Description:** The increased prevalence of autism spectrum disorder (ASD) has created a national need for preparing current and future teachers to implement EBPs that support the learning of students with ASD. Teachers struggle with implementing EBPs for students with ASD with fidelity. This presentation will describe the development of Autism Focused Intervention Resources and Modules (AFIRM) and discuss how they are being used by personnel development and professional development programs. AFIRM bridges the research-to-practice gap by providing detailed information on how to plan for, use, and monitor the use of focused interventions supported by research.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How does the AFIRM framework and integration of content and learning activities support practitioners' knowledge and use of EBPs?
2. How can personnel development and professional development programs use AFIRM to support the development of effective teachers?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

### Differentiated Pathways for the Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic Development (READ) Act *Washington 4*

**Presenters: Tanni Anthony,** Colorado Department of Education; **Gina Herrera,** Colorado Department of Human Services

**Session Description:** Over 35 States have "Read By Third Grade" legislation that requires schools to identify struggling readers. Most K–3 students with disabilities (but not all) can be screened with allowable accommodations on identified screening tools. Students with blindness, deafness, and/or significant cognitive challenges require different measures to understand their literacy abilities and instructional needs. Colorado has defined three differentiated pathways to meet this State requirement and ensure that instructional literacy opportunities are truly accessible for every K–3 child. Information will be shared about the process and products of the three differentiated pathways, which now include a screening framework specifically for children with significant cognitive disabilities.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Does your State have "Read By Third Grade" legislation or a similar State initiative?
2. Are all K–3 students with disabilities in your State screened to determine their reading abilities and need for specially designed literacy instruction?

3. What does your State need to ensure that all students with disabilities can be screened accurately for reading challenges, including learners with significant cognitive disabilities?

**Audiences:** TA&D, Low Incidence

### Pathways to Leadership for Administrators of Special Education *Washington 5*

**Presenters: Mary Lynn Boscardin,** University of Massachusetts, Amherst; **David Messing,** University of Massachusetts, Amherst

**Session Description:** This session presents a retrospective analysis of four OSEP leadership personnel development grants: (1) Linkages, (2) Crossroads, (3) EXCELSIOR, and (4) Pathways. Over a period of 18 years, these four grants have had a significant impact on the supply of highly effective administrators and leaders in special education, who fill positions in institutions of higher education (IHEs) and local, State, and Federal education and government agency positions. Using the information gathered, project elements that have withstood the test of time will be examined in light of changes in national policy and advances in research. Recommendations will be made for future directions.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How has the research focus on the field of special education administration and leadership shifted over the past two decades?
2. How have changes in State and Federal policies influenced the research and training of special education administrators and leaders?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

### Virtual Reality for Teacher Preparation: Demo *Balcony A*

**Presenters: Lisa Dieker,** University of Central Florida; **Taylor Bousfield,** University of Central Florida

**Session Description:** The number of students with disabilities included in general education classrooms for more than 80 percent of the day has increased from 33 percent to 61 percent. Teacher preparation programs are not adequately preparing general education teachers to teach students with disabilities; the programs need to be updated to reflect this shift. In this session we will demonstration TeachLivE, an auxiliary support that enhances preservice training through a mixed-reality, avatar-based simulation environment. This program lets users engage in virtual rehearsal of a targeted skill or domain without placing "real" students or peers at risk during the learning process. Research has shown that four 10-minute sessions in TeachLivE can begin to change one behavior of teachers, and that this change is taken back to the classroom.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How do you see use of avatar, game-based, or computer simulations being used in your training program?
2. What skills do teachers need that might be appropriate for simulation?
3. What do you see as the future of technology in teacher preparation?

**Audiences:** Personnel Development, Education Technology, Media, & Materials

**Decision-Making of Response to Intervention (RTI) Teams** *Balcony B*

**Presenters: Kathleen Marshall,** University of South Carolina; **Scott Thur,** University of South Carolina

**Session Description:** This session will highlight the results from a study measuring decision making in RTI teams through the RTI Team Decision-Making Questionnaire. This questionnaire, which was developed to measure factors that influence RTI school and district personnel, will be summarized to highlight the perceptions, involvement, and roles in RTI decision making.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. In what ways do the data presented in this breakout session help to explain how and why the decisions that are made impact a school and district's RTI model?
2. How are certain types of RTI decisions related to a team member's position and school level, and what are some targeted and constructive practices schools and districts can implement as a result?
3. Does an RTI team member's role on their team influence their decision making, and how does that affect the purpose and effectiveness of the RTI process?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

**3:00 p.m.–3:30 p.m.** **Break**

**3:30 p.m.–5:00 p.m.** **Large Group Panel Sessions**

**From Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to UDIO: New policies, technologies, and practices for literacy learning in the era of ESSA** *Maryland ABC*

**Moderator: David Rose,** CAST

**Panelists: Samantha Daley,** Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST); **Helen Moskowitz,** TechBoston Academy

The recently passed Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) recommends the adoption of UDL principles and practices within six sections of the legislation. In this session we will focus on examining the implications of one section of ESSA in particular—the recommendation to apply UDL principles in literacy instruction. We will use this focus to explore the promise and challenges of applying UDL principles, and will demonstrate a new UDL-inspired literacy platform called UDIO. UDIO has been developed (and is now in large-scale efficacy trials) for use in middle schools by the Center on Emerging Technologies, supported by OSEP. Through this example, we hope to examine the changing roles of technology, disability, and UDL in regular education policies and practices.

**What's Coming Down the Pike: A Policy, Funding, and Futures Discussion** *Delaware AB*

**Moderator**: **Renee Bradley,** OSEP

**Panelists**: **Deborah Ziegler,** Council for Exceptional Children; **Sharon Walsh,** IDEA Infant and Toddler Coordinators Association and Division for Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children (DEC); **Jane West,** Education Policy Consultant; **Lindsay Jones**, National Center for Learning Disabilities NCLD)

This session will feature four of the most knowledgeable experts on special education policy. The panelists will share their organizations' and their own perspectives about the current policy decisions being debated and made on Capitol Hill that affect children with disabilities. They will also share their insights about future funding and reauthorization issues.

### Life Lessons Learned: Young Adults Reflect on Their Educational and Life Experiences

*Virginia ABC*

**Moderator: Greg Knollman,** OSEP

**Panelists: Patrick Young,** East Carolina University; **George Stern,** Texas Tech University; **Madison Essig,** Washington, D.C.; **Kamal Williams,** Baltimore, M.D.

Featuring young adults, this session will be an excellent resource for professionals preparing preservice teachers and doctoral scholars as well as Federal, State, and local leaders who are passionate about orienting educational systems toward the needs of youth and families getting ready for the transition to post-school life. Attendees will have an opportunity to hear from a diverse panel of self-advocates who will talk about the successes and the challenges they have experienced in navigating school, employment, and community life. Additional topics for discussion include self-determination, preparing for postsecondary education and employment, access to housing and transportation, and community living.

### Moving From Initiative Overload to Maximum Impact: Supporting and Advancing a Shared Vision Across Improvement Efforts

*Washington 1 & 2*

**Moderator: Lynn Holdheide,** American Institutes for Research

**Panelists: Kerry Haag,** Kansas Department of Education; **Amy Gaumer Erickson,** University of Kansas; **Jana Roborough,** National Center on Systemic Improvement (NCSI); **Johnny Collett,** CCSSO

Lack of alignment has led to initiative overload and marginal impact, resulting in initiatives falling into the black hole of the tried and forgotten. Aligning initiatives through the opportunities created within the ESSA creates the potential for broader reach, efficiency, and movement toward improved student outcomes. Through explicit examples, this session will leave participants with potential action steps they can take to facilitate alignment across State improvement efforts (e.g., State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIPs), equity plans, State Personnel Development Grants (SPDGs), School Improvement Plans). Participants will learn about strategies to engage in a collaborative process that fully engages partners and identifies roles, responsibilities, and activities that mutually support a shared vision and that increase trust, teamwork, and coordination among partners.

### Federal Policy Statement on Inclusion of Children With Disabilities in Early Childhood Programs: Implications for Personnel Development

*Washington 5*

**Moderator: Tracie Dickson,** OSEP

**Panelists: Mary Beth Bruder,** University of Connecticut; **Mary McLean,** University of Florida; **Megan Vinh,** Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center; **Laurie Dinnebeil,** University of Toledo

In 2015, the U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services jointly released the Policy Statement on Inclusion of Children With Disabilities in Early Childhood Programs. The policy provides recommendations to States, local educational agencies, schools, and public and private early childhood programs for increasing the inclusion of infants, toddlers, and preschool children with disabilities in high-quality early childhood programs. The purpose of this session is to discuss how to prepare scholars to work in high-quality inclusive programs by following the recommendations in the policy statement, aligning curriculum to national professional organization standards, and teaching Division of Early Childhood Recommended Practices.

# Wednesday, August 3, 2016

**8:30 a.m.–9:30 a.m.** **Small Breakout Sessions and Discussion Roundtables**

**Discussion Roundtables** ***Salon I & II***

### Table 1: 21st-Century Assessment in Teacher Preparation

**Presenters: Rhonda Bondie,** Fordham University; **Su-Je Cho,** Fordham University

**Session Description:** Free digital tools can create assessments that prepare teachers to use evidence-based practices (EBPs) while providing program improvement data for faculty. Twenty-first century assessments differ from past practices, which focused on individual progress achieved in isolation, to now focus on progress involving new norms for social interaction. Job-embedded digital tools support the effective completion of daily classroom tasks, while also providing continuous data on the use of EBPs. Using digital tools for key assessments can also help with evaluating how teacher preparation programs mirror the technologies, media use, and likely learning process of the 21st-century learners that teachers are preparing to instruct. In this session, we will explore the following questions: (1) How can 21st-century assessments provide necessary data on teacher–candidate use of EBPs and measure instructional competencies, while also promoting 21st-century skills such as creative problem solving and collaboration? (2) What digital tools enhance the possibilities for assessment, data collection, and analysis, and how can their use be evaluated? (3) How can these assessments be used to nurture graduates and mentor new teachers in their first years of teaching?

### Table 2: Future-Ready Assistive Technology

**Presenters: Tracy Gray,** American Institutes for Research (AIR)

**Session Description:** Rapid changes in technology will shape the future of special education and assistive technology. This discussion session will focus on building an understanding of shifts in the technology landscape and future directions for the field as they relate to developing policies and procedures to support future-ready special education programs and initiatives. This discussion group is intended for State and local education leaders, school and district technology coordinators, assistive technology professionals, and others involved in purchasing, policy, and training decision making for educational and assistive technology tools and infrastructure.

### Table 3: Increasing Engagement in Online Environments

**Presenter: Arlene King-Berry,** University of the District of Columbia

**Session Description:** This discussion session will focus on improvements for enhancing learner interaction in Pre-K–12 and higher education online learning environments. Innovative pedagogies and technologies are available to enhance learner interaction, regardless of cultural, linguistic, or ability diversity. Factors that affect engagement include students' motivation, interest, self-regulation, and ability to access the course. Discussion topics include: (1) How can learner interaction be enhanced in online environments? (2) Describe evidence-based practices that increase online learner engagement.

### Table 4: Leading Ph.D. Students Into the "Unknown" Future

**Presenters: Lisa Dieker,** University of Central Florida (UCF); **Faith Ezekiel-Wilder,** Doctoral Student, UCF; **Angelica Fulchini,** Doctoral Student, UCF; **Celestial Wills-Jackson,** Doctoral Student, UCF; **Rebecca Hopkins,** Doctoral Student, UCF

**Session Description:** This discussion session will focus on the following question: Are we preparing doctoral scholars to address the needs of students entering higher education in the United States? At UCF, doctoral scholars are introduced to a leadership preparation model that includes innovative and futuristic ideas (grounded in our field) in teaching, research, service, technology, and history to prepare them for a role in the higher education community. Students from UCF will lead this discussion and share their experiences.

### Table 5: Mentoring and Induction to Support the Development and Retention of Effective Early Childhood Personnel

**Presenters: Margaret C. Gillis,** University of North Carolina, Greensboro; **Jean Kang,** University of North Carolina, Greensboro

**Session Description:** This discussion session will focus on mentoring and induction to support the development and retention of high-quality, effective early childhood personnel during professional programs and after graduation. Although the focus will be on early childhood, individuals from other areas are welcome and encouraged to join. Participants will have the opportunity to discuss current efforts to provide mentoring and induction, effective strategies, and challenges. Participants will also be encouraged to consider future directions for providing mentoring and induction through a brainstorming session.

### Table 6: The Development of Special Education Leaders

**Presenters: Kelley Reagan,** George Mason University; **Shalu Rana,** Doctoral Student, George Mason University; **Soo Ahn,** Doctoral Student, George Mason University

**Session Description:** During this session, two Ph.D. candidates of an OSEP-funded leadership grant will share their experiences in a program aimed to develop leaders in special education. New Ph.D.s and current doctoral students should attend. Dialogue will include a sharing of program activities, experiences, and coursework as they relate to teaching, research, and service, as well as a discussion of how these experiences, activities, and courses enhance one's professional development as a special education leader in higher education.

### Table 7: Preparing Collaborative Teachers of the Deaf

**Presenter: Mariette Paterson,** University of Southern Mississippi

**Session Description:** Newborn hearing screening, early intervention, and advanced hearing technologies have led to two trends in the education of children who are deaf and hard of hearing: (1) an emphasis on early intervention that maximizes hearing to develop spoken language; and (2) greater numbers of children with hearing loss being educated in mainstream education settings. The models for training teachers of the deaf need to adapt due to these new roles for teachers of the deaf as collaborators in birth–three or mainstream school settings. In this session, the following questions will be discussed: (1) What is the role of the teacher of the deaf in birth–three early intervention? (2) What is the role of the teacher of the deaf in inclusive/mainstream school settings? (3) How does the teacher of the deaf maximize his or her collaborative role with audiologists, speech-language pathologists, classroom teachers, and other providers?

### Table 8: Recruiting and Retaining African-American Students

**Presenter: Mary-alayne Hughes,** University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

**Session Description:** To prepare a more diversified and representative education workforce, there is a critical need to recruit and retain a diverse group of students in higher education preparation programs. This discussion session

will identify challenges and review strategies for recruiting and retaining African-American students in higher education.

### Table 9: School Climate Forecast: Chilly to Sunny

**Presenters: Regina Pierce,** Virginia Department of Education; **Sophia Farmer,** Virginia Commonwealth University

**Session Description:** This discussion session will offer the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) circle logic as an anchor to understanding the integration of data, practices, and systems needed to impact school climate. Examples of surveys, partner agencies, and supports will be explored.

### Table 10: Sustaining 325T Activities: Life After Funding

**Presenters: Barbara Fink Chorzempa,** State University of New York (SUNY), New Paltz; **Roberta M. Wiener,** Pace University; **Leslie Carol Soodak,** Pace University

**Session Description:** As recipients of the 325T grants near the end of their award period, ways to continue the work need to be considered. In this discussion session, faculty from two institutions will share plans to sustain their work. To start the conversation, a faculty member from one of the institutions will describe how the goals of her institution's 325T grant will be sustained following the retirement of three faculty and the hiring of three new faculty. The conversation will continue as two faculty from the second institution describe the benefits and challenges of sustaining and expanding a merged teacher preparation program.

### Table 11: Testers Needed for Web-Based Modules on Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Recommended Practices

**Presenters: Megan Vinh,** Frank Porter Graham (FPG) Child Development Institute; **Chih-Ing Lim,** FPG Child Development Institute

**Session Description:** Participants will get hands-on experience exploring an interactive, web-based module focused on DEC recommended practices. Participants will spend the first half of the session exploring the resources, guided by a set of instructions. They will then participate in a discussion about their experience.

### Table 12: Transforming Practitioners Into Researchers

**Presenters: Stacy Dymond,** University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign; **Hedda Meadan,** University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

**Session Description:** Educators who enter doctoral programs often struggle to transition from the role of practitioner to researcher. What can we do to mentor scholars through this transformation? This session will focus on discussing activities and strategies for assisting scholars to develop the skills needed to become effective researchers and leaders.

### Table 13: Building Blocks and Pitfalls of Preparation Reform

**Presenter: Paul Sindelar,** Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR) Center

**Session Description:** CEEDAR provides technical assistance to 20 States engaged in preparation and policy reform. Using the Center's framework, participants will discuss the types of skills that teachers need to provide high-quality instruction, the resources that need to be established at an institutional level, and how to overcome barriers to collaboration and reform.

### Table 14: Using Formative Assessment Methods to Prepare Reflective and Effective Early Intervention (EI)/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Personnel

**Presenters: Yaoying Xu,** Virginia Commonwealth University; **Serra De Arment,** Virginia Commonwealth University

**Session Description:** This discussion session will focus on the process and outcomes of using formative assessment methods for recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining reflective and effective personnel through a personnel development program in Early Intervention (EI)/Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE). Discussion questions include: (1) How do teacher educators enhance teacher candidates' learning and development through both individualization and standardization? (2) What role does teacher educators' emotional involvement play in creating a positive, supportive, and interactive learning environment for teacher candidates? (3) How do we distinguish between an amazing person who does an average job and an average person who does an amazing job in a teacher education program?

### Table 15: Building Personnel Capacity in Early Childhood

**Presenters: Mary Beth Bruder,** Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC); **Annie George-Puskar,** OSEP Leadership Doctoral Fellow in Early Childhood Intervention; **Carlene Reid,** Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), Washington, DC; **Julie Wennekes,** OSSE, Washington, DC; **Kerda DeHaan,** OSSE, Washington, DC; **Deana Buck,** Partnership for People with Disabilities

**Session Description:** The Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC) provides training for Part C and section 619 coordinators to assist them in integrating their programs and personnel into their State early childhood initiatives. This discussion session will focus on the activities and implementation of action plans in the 20 participating States.

### Table 16: What Counts as Evidence?

**Presenters: Allison Gandhi,** American Institutes for Research (AIR); **Lynn Holdheide,** AIR; **Jill Pentimonti,** AIR

**Session Description:** In this discussion session, we will discuss the use of multi-tier system of supports (MTSS) to make the case that standards of evidence for evidence-based practices (EBPs) need to vary by tier. We will also present a more flexible, nuanced approach to identifying EBPs that allows practitioners to make better decisions about educational interventions and strategies.

### Table 17: The Nexus of Special Education Policy, Practice, and Scholarship

**Presenters: Laurie deBettencourt,** Johns Hopkins University; **Katharine Shepherd,** Higher Education Consortium for Special Education (HECSE); **Jane West,** HECSE

**Session Description:** The 40th anniversary of IDEA's passage and HECSE's establishment occurred this year. It is a critical time to reflect on current challenges and opportunities surrounding the roles of special educators, the programs that prepare teachers and leaders, and HECSE's role in advocating for policies supporting the preparation of special education leaders.

## Small Breakout Sessions

### Baltimore City Public Schools and the Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) Center: Creating a Coherent Multi-tier System of Supports (MTSS) for All Students Through a Technical Assistance Partnership

*Maryland A*

**Presenters: Amy McCart,** SWIFT Center; **Alisia Moutry,** University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; **Lara Ohanian,** Baltimore City Public Schools; **Wendy Barnes,** Baltimore City Public Schools

**Session Description:** When Baltimore City Public Schools established its districtwide school reform priority to install a multi-tier system of supports (MTSS) for all students, including those with disabilities, it engaged in a partnership with the national SWIFT Center to transform schools. In this session, city schools' and SWIFT representatives will discuss how their partnership supports the reform effort to build district capacity to include students with disabilities and increase their academic proficiency.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What actions can a large district undertake to help its schools include academic and behavioral supports that allow all students to achieve in the general education curriculum?
2. How can an MTSS for all students prevent or reduce disproportional representation in special education among traditionally marginalized student subgroups?
3. How does a technical assistance (TA) partnership that leverages the current strengths and resources of a district produce sustainable positive results for all students?

**Audiences:** TA&D

### Creating a Path Toward Inclusion for Early Childhood Educators

*Maryland B*

**Presenters: Patricia Blasco,** The Research Institute (TRI) at Western Oregon University; **Ritu Chopra,** University of Colorado, Denver; **Serra Acar,** TRI at Western Oregon University

**Session Description:** This session will present the efforts of university and community college partnerships in Colorado and Oregon to improve the knowledge, skills, and implementation of inclusive and recommended practices among early childhood educators. One outcome is the sustainability of these projects within the States. Online resources and products will be shared.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How can we build collaborative relationships across disciplines that may be guided by different beliefs and/or practices to ensure that all children are included in early childhood education?
2. How can we sustain the effort of five years of relationship building and web resource sharing to ensure that community college partners continue to have access, supports, and partnerships within our States?

**Audience:** Early Childhood

### How High-Quality IDEA Data Supports Systemic Change

*Maryland C*

**Presenters: Donna Spiker,** Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy); **Dave Phillips,** IDEA Data Center (IDC); **Bill Huennekens,** Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID); **Joy Markowitz,** IDC

**Session Description:** Collecting, reporting, analyzing, and using high-quality IDEA data plays a critical role in improving results for students with disabilities. Four

technical assistance (TA) centers—the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), CIID, DaSy, and IDC—will share examples of how their work supports systemic change in States and ultimately improves outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How can States use IDEA data to improve State systems and child outcomes?
2. What are the barriers to creating a culture of data-informed decision making at the State and local levels?
3. How can OSEP's TA centers help address challenges in collecting and reporting high-quality IDEA data?

**Audience:** TA&D

### Personnel Development Program (PDP) Grantee Reporting Using the Data Collection System (DCS), Session One *Virginia A*

**Presenters: Bonnie Jones,** OSEP; **Shedeh Hajghassemali,** OSEP; **Karen Schroll,** PDP Data Collection Center (DCC), Westat, Inc.; **Amy Bitterman,** Westat, Inc.; **Mitchell Yell,** University of South Carolina, **Kim Paulsen,** Vanderbilt University

**Session Description:** The PDP DCS has improved data collection efficiencies for grantees, scholars, and employers, collecting scholar data from point of entry through completion of service obligation. During this session, presenters will summarize scholar data from the past five years and highlight rates of completion, scholar funding, and areas of employment. This session will include an overview of reporting requirements, such as program performance measures, pre-scholarship agreements and exit certifications, and strategies that grantees use to manage their projects and ensure that their scholars are advised of the service obligation requirements.

**Discussion Questions**:

1. How does my grant's performance compare with the average performance of the program as a whole?
2. How can I obtain a copy of my performance on program measures to use in writing my annual performance report?
3. What are the Department's requirements for pre-scholarship agreements and exit certifications? What is my role as Project Director in meeting these requirements?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

### Scaling up College- and Career-Readiness (CCR) Interventions With Technology *Virginia B*

**Presenters: Allison Lombardi,** University of Connecticut

**Session Description:** This session will describe quantitative findings and lessons learned across four years of implementing CCR interventions across three States. Intervention students improved their information literacy, transition, and reading skills, compared to comparison students. Implications for embedding transition services into the core courses are discussed.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. After an empirical demonstration of an intervention's effectiveness within schools, how can researchers in higher education partner with State department personnel to advance the adoption of these evidence-based practices?
2. Which specific research or teaching techniques have you observed in your setting that improved the climate, attitude, and response of teachers when asked to integrate CCR and transition skills into the core course of study in low-performing schools?

3. The gap between the reading skills of students with and without disabilities continues to widen as students advance through high school. How can schools integrate reading instruction in high schools where content courses are taught by teachers who are highly qualified in their content area, but not in reading instruction?

**Audience:** Education Technology, Media, and Materials

### Technical Assistance (TA) Partnerships: Lessons Learned From Evaluation *Virginia C*

**Presenters: Patricia Mueller,** Evergreen Evaluation & Consulting, Inc.; **David Merves,** Evergreen Evaluation & Consulting, Inc.; **Vitaliy Shyyan,** National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO)

**Session Description:** For the past four years, the NCEO has evaluated its collaborative partnerships with TA providers. Panelists will describe the evaluation design, including: 1) creating a collaboration logic model, 2) survey and interview items linked to the logic model, 3) case studies, and 4) examples of reporting formats.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What methods do centers employ to evaluate their collaboration efforts, outcomes, and impacts?
2. What types of collaboration assist centers in developing high-quality products, tools, and services?
3. What types of reporting formats do centers use to communicate the efforts and effects of their work?

**Audience:** TA&D

### Students With Complex Needs and Pennsylvania Core Standards *Delaware A*

**Presenters: Shatarupa Podder,** Pennsylvania Department of Education; **Ann Hinkson-Herrmann,** Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN); **Natalie Sokol,** PaTTAN

**Session Description:** This session will provide an overview of Project MAX—a grant designed to increase the capacity of Pennsylvania schools to provide all students with access to the Pennsylvania Core Standards, including those with complex instructional needs. It will describe how coaching can be utilized as a strategy to produce sustainable systems change.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Given what you have learned about the practices we use to build capacity, how might you incorporate these ideas into your work?
2. What potential barriers do you foresee in the implementation of these capacity-building practices in your work? How might you overcome these barriers?
3. How might implementation of these capacity-building practices improve your outcomes?

**Audiences:** SPDG, Personnel Development

### Invited Breakout Session: Students With Disabilities' (SWDs') Achievement Growth and Gaps *Delaware B*

**Presenters: Gerald Tindal,** University of Oregon; **Ann Schulte,** Arizona State University; **Steve Elliott,** Arizona State University; **David Egnor,** OSEP

**Session Description:** The National Center on Assessment and Accountability for Special Education (NCAASE) is funded by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES). Researchers will present the results of an investigation into

various approaches for understanding and measuring achievement growth and gaps for students with and without disabilities.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What are the implications of steady achievement growth and the apparent intractability of closing the gaps?
2. How should we concurrently consider across-year and within-year growth and gaps?

**Audience:** Research

### Youth Transition in Juvenile Justice: What We Know, What We Learned, and What Is Emerging

***Washington 1 & 2***

**Presenters: Leslie LaCroix**, Arizona State University; **David Johnson,** University of Minnesota; **Deanne Unruh,** University of Oregon; **Adam Henning,** Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections; **David Emenheiser,** OSEP

**Session Description:** In this session, each of the three cohorts of model demonstration projects will describe how they provide services to delinquent youth in transition. The cohorts consist of model demonstration projects in Minnesota, Oregon, and Arizona. The presenters will share strategies, resources, and outcomes that enhance the effectiveness of transition programming and services.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What is the recommendation for those who want to replicate the projects?
2. What is the importance of sustainable community supports in reducing recidivism?
3. What is the next emerging trend to impact recidivism in the juvenile delinquent population?

**Audiences:** Transition, Research, Model Demonstration

### University Mentoring Models: Supporting Doctoral Scholars and Novice Special Education Teachers

***Washington 3***

**Presenters: Suzanne Martin,** University of Central Florida; **Sheila Conway,** University of Pittsburgh; **Jillian Gourwitz,** University of Central Florida; **Dena Slanda,** Doctoral Scholar, University of Central Florida

**Session Description:** Redefining roles, strengthening competence, and providing adequate support for school leaders and novice teachers is challenging, but it remains especially critical in the area of special education. Current literature indicates that a major gap exists in the acquisition of special education knowledge and skills in personnel development. Unfortunately, many personnel development programs do not prepare school leaders and teachers to problem solve real issues that they will most likely encounter, such as how to effectively collaborate in a cooperative process to create and sustain change. The focus of this presentation is the incorporation of a mentoring model as a key component of two federally funded leadership preparation models. The impact of these university mentoring models will be presented, as well as the steps necessary to create a similar model in other educational settings.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How would you define, create, and support a successful mentor model in personnel development programs to sustain support for their graduates?
2. How do you measure successful outcomes when using a mentorship model, in terms of data collection that leads to meaningful improvement in personnel development programs?

3. What are the salient features of a successful mentorship model that addresses not only the academic/knowledge components but also the social/emotional toll of being part of a special education school team?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

### Practice-Based Approaches to Improving Teacher Education *Washington 4*

**Presenters: Mary Brownell,** Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR) Center; **James McLeskey,** CEEDAR Center; **Brian Barber,** Kent State University; **Louise Spear-Swerling,** Southern Connecticut State University; **Amber Benedict,** CEEDAR Center

**Session Description:** Prominent teacher educators have voiced concerns about educator preparation programs' overemphasis on knowledge acquisition and insufficient emphasis on practice. In response, teacher education scholars have proposed a practice-based approach to teacher education, focused on high-leverage practices (HLPs) that are essential to effective teaching and continuous deliberate practice (Grossman & McDonald, 2008). In this session, presenters will describe components of a practice-based approach to teacher education and showcase deliberate practice opportunities that CEEDAR Center technical assistance (TA) recipients have developed to ensure that general and special education teacher candidates can provide effective multi-tiered instruction.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What supports do teacher preparation programs need as they develop programs that prepare candidates to use HLPs in classrooms?
2. How can CEEDAR support, through universal TA, and deepen teacher educators' knowledge and skill in practice-based approaches to teaching effective multi-tiered instruction?
3. What sorts of infrastructure are necessary for campus-based and non-campus-based programs to ensure that all teacher candidates engage in deliberate practice with feedback?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

### Designing Effective Coaching Service Delivery Plans *Washington 5*

**Presenters: Kimberly St. Martin,** Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi); **Caryn Ward,** Frank Porter Graham (FPG) Child Development Institute

**Session Description:** Coaching is a necessary component for promoting teacher confidence and competence. A coaching service delivery plan is necessary to ensure high-quality and consistent coaching. This session will review the elements of a coaching service delivery plan, as well as a process for developing them. Examples from work at different levels of the education system will be shared to foster learning of the process and help participants contextualize the usefulness of coaching service delivery plans within their settings.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What are some barriers to and facilitators for developing coaching service delivery plans?
2. How do you use data to contextualize a differentiated coaching service delivery plan?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

### Acquiring and Using Accessible Materials and Technology *Washington 6*

**Presenters: Joy Zabala,** CAST

**Session Description:** The National Center on Accessible Educational Materials (AEM) for Learning increases the availability and accelerates the use of AEM and accessible technologies. Center staff and cooperating State leaders will discuss innovative ways to build collaboration and share resources that increase the seamless use of AEM and accessible technologies across educational settings.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How can collaboration between special education and general education foster increases in the acquisition and use of accessible materials and accessible technologies?
2. How can the selection and procurement process for curricular materials be improved? Who needs to be involved?
3. In what ways does collaboration across early childhood, grades K–12, higher education, and workplace preparation increase expectations in ways that can improve the availability and use of accessible materials and technologies across the lifespan?

**Audience:** Education Technology, Media, and Materials

**9:30 a.m.–9:45 a.m.** **Break**

**9:45 a.m.–10:45 a.m.** **Small Breakout Sessions**

**Building System Capacity to Implement Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs)** ***Maryland A***

**Presenters: Christina Kasprzak,** Frank Porter Graham (FPG) Child Development Institute; **Kathleen Hebbeler,** SRI International; **Donna Spiker,** SRI International; **Megan Vinh,** FPG Child Development Institute

**Session Description:** Building and sustaining high-quality statewide systems is a complex and ongoing process for State agencies. This session will describe a systems framework and self-assessment used to assist early intervention/early childhood special education programs in assessing current systems, planning for improvement, and measuring change over time. State examples will illustrate use and increased system capacity.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What is the role of State systems in supporting practice at the local level?
2. How can technical assistance (TA) centers and others use the system framework to support States in improving their State system?

**Audience:** Early childhood

**Division for Early Childhood (DEC), Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC): Standards Alignment for Higher Education Curriculum** ***Maryland B***

**Presenter: Mary Beth Bruder,** University of Connecticut

**Session Description:** The Early Childhood Personnel Center has supported an alignment of the CEC and DEC personnel standards with NAEYC's personnel standards. This session will include a description of the process used to develop this alignment and a tool for higher education programs to utilize in their curriculum development.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What is the importance of standards alignment in the development of a comprehensive system of personnel development?
2. What resources are needed to apply these alignments to higher education curriculum development?

3. How do multiple sets of personnel standards impact higher education curriculum development?

**Audiences:** Personnel Development, Early Childhood

### Developing Effective Special Educators in Maine *Maryland C*

**Presenters: Debrajean Scheibel,** Maine Department of Education; **Deborah Rooks-Ellis,** The University of Maine; **Beth Lorigan,** Maine Virtual Academy

**Session Description:** Using the principles of implementation science, a statewide model of professional development informed by evidence-based practices (EBPs) was adopted to develop effective special educators. Participants will discuss the importance of sustainability factors in statewide initiatives and generate potential retention strategies. Participants will also deliberate steps to examine statewide systems change in their own States.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Why would a State need to address sustainability factors when providing evidence-based professional development?
2. How would you address retention of special educators in your State?
3. How do you address barriers to providing equitable and effective professional development informed by EBPs in your State?

**Audiences:** SPDG, Personnel Development

### Personnel Development Program (PDP) Grantee Reporting Using the Data Collection System (DCS), Session 2 *Virginia A*

**Presenters: Bonnie Jones,** OSEP; **Shedeh Hajghassemali,** OSEP; **Karen Schroll,** PDP Data Collection Center (DCC), Westat, Inc.; **Amy Bitterman,** Westat, Inc.; **Mitchell Yell,** University of South Carolina, **Kim Paulsen,** Vanderbilt University

**Session Description:** The PDP DCS has improved data collection efficiencies for grantees, scholars, and employers, collecting scholar data from point of entry through completion of service obligation. During this session, presenters will summarize scholar data from the past five years and highlight rates of completion, scholar funding, and areas of employment. This session will include an overview of reporting requirements, such as program performance measures, pre-scholarship agreements and exit certifications, and strategies that grantees use to manage their projects and ensure that their scholars are advised of the service obligation requirements.

**Discussion Questions**:

1. How does my grant's performance compare with the average performance of the program as a whole?
2. How can I obtain a copy of my performance on program measures to use in writing my annual performance report?
3. What are the Department's requirements for pre-scholarship agreements and exit certifications? What is my role as Project Director in meeting these requirements?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

### Future Quest Island (FQI): A College and Career Adventure *Virginia B*

**Presenter: Lori Cooney,** University of Massachusetts, Boston

**Session Description:** FQI is an online tool for middle school youth with and without disabilities that aligns 21st-century technology skills with college- and career-readiness goals. In this session, the presenter will share key challenges

and applied strategies for engaging middle school youth to set and achieve college and career goals.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What are some of the challenges and/or barriers educators face when developing transition plans with middle school students?
2. What are some of the ways middle school students use technology to explore college and career options?
3. What challenges and/or barriers do middle school students and educators experience with access to technology?

**Audience:** Education Technology, Media, and Materials

### Multi-tier System of Supports (MTSS) for English Language Learners (ELLs): Findings and Recommendations *Virginia C*

**Presenters: John J. Hoover,** University of Colorado, Boulder; **Lucinda Soltero-Gonzalez,** University of Colorado, Boulder; **Sylvia Linan-Thompson,** University of Oregon; **Leticia Grimaldo,** The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk

**Session Description:** This breakout session will engage attendees in the presentation and discussion of findings from three contemporary MTSS models for ELLs. Implemented in three school districts in two States, these models are designed to improve literacy achievement and reduce inappropriate special education referrals. Programmatic and teaching recommendations are discussed, based on findings.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. In what ways does MTSS for ELLs contribute to improved literacy instruction and reduced inappropriate referrals?
2. Which literacy methods and instructional practices contribute to improved teacher instructional behaviors and student achievement?
3. What practices are recommended for developing and implementing MTSS for ELLs in elementary schools?

**Audience:** Research

### National Competency-Based Intervener E-Portfolios *Delaware A*

**Presenters: Amy Parker,** National Center on Deaf-Blindness (NCDB); **Leanne Cook,** Western Oregon University; **Ritu Chopra,** University of Colorado, Denver; **Alana Zambone,** East Carolina University

**Session Description:** Interveners are unique paraprofessionals with nationally recognized competencies. This presentation will provide an overview of a participatory effort to design a competency-based e-portfolio platform and development and scoring process that will support the growth and quality of the practice. The project has application for other types of skilled paraprofessionals nationally.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How can networks of low-incidence teachers become effective coaches or supporters for interveners and other paraprofessionals?
2. How can a competency-based e-portfolio system support administrator awareness and engagement in personnel development?
3. How does the e-portfolio platform support scaling, mobile use, and access for users with limited technology skills?
4. How will we continue to evaluate the reliability and validity of the e-portfolio assessment process?

**Audience:** TA&D

### The Future of Accessible Educational Materials

*Delaware B*

**Presenters: Brad Turner,** Benetech; **Lisa Wadors Verne,** Benetech

**Session Description:** This session will address the future of educational materials, and how accessible content needs to be created to eliminate barriers for people with disabilities. Two OSEP-funded programs—the DIAGRAM CENTER + and Bookshare Innovation for Education (BI4E)—are providing accessible materials to increase access to learning materials.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Why is it important for educators to understand how content is created?
2. What tools are available to educators to support the development of accessible content?
3. How can science, technology, engineering, art, and mathematics (STEAM) materials be made accessible to address the needs of students with disabilities?

**Audience:** Education Technology, Media, and Materials

### Promoting Higher Levels of Youth Engagement

*Washington 1 & 2*

**Presenters: Joan Kester,** The George Washington University; **Everett Deibler,** Lehigh Valley Center for Independent Living; **Christopher Nace,** District of Columbia Public Schools

**Session Description:** This session highlights an important paradigm shift that is needed in the education system to more effectively engage youth with disabilities as they transition from school to adult life. Learn how evidence-based practices are being infused into a personnel development program, utilizing a social justice lens. A professor and two graduates of a secondary transition master's program will discuss how they contributed to a national movement to shift the paradigm and engage youth with disabilities through a shift of power. These young professionals will share their experience in applying research to practice.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How do you infuse social justice into your research and practice?
2. On the spectrum of youth engagement, how do you advance the engagement of youth with disabilities to promote positive post-school outcomes?
3. How can your personnel development and technical assistance (TA) work shift from a service delivery approach to a youth engagement framework?

**Audiences:** Personnel Development, Transition

### Training, Developing, and Sustaining Effective Personnel to Work With Children With Disabilities in Remote Areas

*Washington 3*

**Presenters: Heidi San Nicolas,** Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (CEDDERS); **Glinda Hill,** OSEP; **June De Leon**, Guam CEDDERS; **Robert McCulley,** University of Massachusetts, Boston; **Laura Bozeman,** University of Massachusetts, Boston

**Session Description:** This session will offer lessons learned from implementing the Pacific Vision Instruction Project (Pacific VIP)—a regional training program for teaching students with low-incidence disabilities. This program enabled local scholars to become certified teachers of students with visual impairments (TVIs), with orientation and mobility (O&M) credentials, in order to meet the needs of children with visual disabilities who live in remote island communities. The majority of scholars completed both TVI and O&M training. Reflections will include considerations for recruitment and retention activities when

developing training programs for rural/remote communities in order to ensure applicability and sustainability.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How effectively would the training needs of professionals in remote areas be addressed through distance education delivery?
2. How might the regional approach to the delivery of training programs maximize resources to effectively address the needs of rural and remote communities?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

### Helping Families Partner for Education and Employment Success *Washington 4*

**Presenters: Linda McDowell,** National Center on Deaf-Blindness (NCDB); **Megan Cote,** NCDB; **Sean Roy,** National Parent Center on Transition and Employment (PACER); **Monica Ballay,** Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant (LaSPDG); **Pamdora Williams,** LaSPDG

**Session Description:** In this session, three organizations (the NCDB, PACER, and the Louisiana SPDG) will share their strategies for helping families partner with education and workforce systems to better educate children and prepare them for employment success. In this session, you will learn about practical cross-agency collaborative strategies that empower and educate families of children with significant disabilities from the NCDB. PACER will share promising strategies that educators and workforce professionals can use to engage families of youth with disabilities in the career-readiness process. Louisiana SPDG will focus on high-impact family partnership practices and the integration of technology to deliver effective professional development to educators.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Collaboration is vital for agencies involved in complementary grant program activities. What strategies can agencies use to maximize efficiency and effectiveness in areas where their missions converge?
2. What strategies can educators and other professionals use to make sure parents are informed about community resources that support employment? How can educators and other professionals better frame the purpose of transition so that parents feel invested in the process?
3. High-impact family partnership practices and the integration of technology will support the delivery of effective professional development to educators. What high-impact family partnership practices does research support to increase academic outcomes for students?

**Audiences: TA&D, Parent Centers, SPDG**

### Get Started–Get Better: Using Improvement Cycles Within a Transformation Zone *Washington 5*

**Presenters: Caryn Ward,** Frank Porter Graham (FPG) Child Development Institute; **Dean Fixsen,** State Implementation and Scaling Up of Evidence-Based Practices (SISEP) Center

**Session Description:** This session will describe and discuss how the SISEP Center makes use of improvement cycles within a transformation zone to get started, manage the change, get better, and ultimately produce more effective and efficient ways to achieve State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What are the barriers to and facilitators for using improvement cycles to change on purpose?

2. How is a transformation zone different from a demonstration site or pilot?

**Audiences:** TA&D, Personnel Development

### No Teacher Left Behind: A Culturally Responsive Lens on the Necessary Strands for Teacher Preparation *Washington 6*

**Presenters: Jeannie Kleinhammer-Trammil,** University of South Florida; **Joy Broughton,** University of South Florida; **Ashley White,** University of South Florida; **Nicholas Catannia,** University of South Florida; **Adhwaa Alahmari,** University of South Florida

**Session Description:** The presenters in this session will share the efforts of one program that is preparing leaders while addressing the knowledge and skills that special education teachers need to meet students' cultural and linguistic needs. Presenters will share innovative ideas to address the persistent issue of the cultural and linguistic mismatch between special education teachers and their diverse students. Furthermore, the presentation will elaborate on teacher education methods used to develop teacher competency in the cultural and language needs of students with disabilities and dual exceptionalities.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What common themes arise across each doctoral student's study of how to prepare preservice teachers to engage in culturally responsive practices that acknowledge the intersection of disability and other markers of diversity?
2. How can these common themes be incorporated to effectively prepare special education leaders and teachers for addressing the needs of ALL students?

**Audience: Personnel Development**

### Two Models of Statewide Preparation of Paraprofessionals for Inclusive Settings *Balcony A*

**Presenters: Donna Gilles,** Partnership for People with Disabilities at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU); **Allison Glasgow,** University of Dayton; **Deana Buck,** Partnership for People with Disabilities at VCU; **Kathleen Lynch,** VCU; **Monica Uhl,** Partnership for People with Disabilities at VCU

**Session Description:** The presenters in this session will describe the development and implementation of two OSEP-funded paraprofessional preservice program improvement projects that involved university and community college partnerships. One model features a collaborative initiative between a major urban research university and the State community college system, focused on preparation to work with young children with disabilities and their families through curriculum enhancement across multiple community colleges. The other model centers on a four-year institution's partnership with two community colleges in the redesign of their K–12 preparation programs and the ultimate development of a corresponding training system for in-service paraprofessionals. Session participants will examine innovations and systemic improvements across the continuum of professional preparation, development, and ongoing support, and will engage in discussion around practices that support adoption, implementation with fidelity, and sustainability of innovations within their own professional contexts.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. How do the systems in your own State compare to those presented today?
2. How can we strategize with you around programmatic improvements and the development of statewide training and support mechanisms for the paraprofessionals working in your State?

**Audience:** Personnel Development

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **10:45 a.m.–11:00 a.m.** | **Break** | |
| **11:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m.** | **OSEP Research to Practice Director's Address & Update**<br>**Presenter: Larry Wexler,** Director, Research to Practice Division, OSEP | ***Salon I & II*** |
| **12:00 p.m.** | **Adjourn** | |