

Session Transcript: 28-05-2020 University of Pennsylvania - Breakout #5

Hello everyone and welcome to the breakout session. This is the breakout room number five IEP for student with disabilities. My name is Amy Willow I'm associate professor of literacy education at the University of Pennsylvania and today I am going to be moderating this session. Both monitoring this panelist but also filled in your questions and some of the Q&A discussion towards the end. I wanted to talk for a minute about logistics. Audio is muted but we are monitoring the question box and we will take questions and answers after we've heard initially from the panelists. You can pick your questions and the questions box and I will be monitoring that so all the panelists have access so anything we do not get to session we will take up make sure you get to it. Our close caption link on the screen is incorrect. If you need close captioning it is on the chat bar on the right-hand side. You just heard the close caption are testing the system so that is the correct system in that chat box. For the next and slide it is my delight to introduce the moderators for this session. Doug is the Department of special education and psychology and development. He conducts intervention research for students with reading abilities and then we have Glenn with the department of psychology at Vanderbilt and conducts research and classroom assessment and interventions for children and math disabilities. Linda and Jack I will turn it to you and I will be off camera until later today. Thank you.

>> Thank you Amy and welcome everyone. We hope you are doing well. As Amy mentioned the title of this session is standards, IEP's and a policy first inclusion for students with disabilities. A bit of an event organizer here we will try to accomplish four things in this session. The first is I'm going to elaborate on an important finding from the comparative interactive timeseries design data recorded by locally song on state adoption of college career standards. Then I'm going to introduced the four panelist and then I will ask questions of each of them. After each of them responds we will open it up for you to ask questions if you choose to do so. Let me turn to lovely song and her colleagues longitudinal data pen list. Because I think that findings from this as it relates to student with disabilities can be a productive basis for the discussion we are going to have. Lovely in her colleagues... Found an analysis of that it does not support the idea. That challenging academic standards boost the math performance with and without disabilities. In the next two slides. In the next two slides we are going to show effect sizes. The first side will show the reading performance of students with disabilities across a number of years. The second side the other performance. In both sides effect sizes which is a little complicated so bear with me. The effect sizes you're going to see represent contrast between what we will call a treatment group and what we will call a comparison group. The treatment group was dates adopting college and career ready standards in 2010. The comparison group adopted college and career ready standards earlier. Most of them in 2007. The pivotal hypothesis was that we would see him bump in improved scores for the treatment group in comparison to the comparison group. In contrast to the comparison group. So for each group we were looking at an expected change in performance versus the actual change. We are expecting greater positive change for students with disabilities in states that had adopted college and career ready standards in 2010. The reason being that difference between their earlier presumably less rigorous standards to now more rigorous standards would reveal the kind of positive response that a

lot of people in support challenging standards would expect. With that as background what you see, this bar chart on the Y axis, and the x-axis is number of years post adoption. We have adoption 2010 for the treatment group of states. What these data show pretty quickly and clearly is that there was essentially... There was an absence of expected improved performance for the so-called treatment group for students of disabilities in the treatment group saves as a move from presumably less rigorous standards pre-2010 to more rigorous standards post 2010. By year seven if you look at the x-axis by year seven there was actually a statistically negative effect that the treatment groups with duties with -- students with disabilities improved marginally. Essentially it is the same pattern and that we do not see the hoped-for positive bump of performance among students with disabilities. In the so-called integral group stage. If you look maybe on the green bar as we go from one year posted option 27 years post option there is a nonsignificant but that as the years go on student with disabilities... The effect or the presumed effect of standards might be contributed to poor rather than hope for better performance. Hopefully that is clear that of finding established I would like to introduce our panelists. Let's skip that real quick. I would like to introduce our panelists. The four panelist they were not chosen at random they were chosen because they bring to the table important expertise. Renée Bradley from the office of special education program. Rehabilitation services. Nicole has a multitiered support system specialist at West Bay collaborative Daniel is a Washington DC special education teacher and Mitchell should be there. Who's the teacher education South Carolina College of Education. Welcome to all of you. Start with Renée. CCL findings suggest a disconnect between federal policy practice and students with disabilities. What is your perspective on disconnect and are there strategies on policy for reaching the divide.

>> Thank you for the question and thank you for including me on the panel today. As I said in the opening discussion we have yet to conquer this policy practice. For year I've personally struggled why we failed to implement the evidence based practices for working. I've said many times have an evidence-based practice is one thing and implement enough practice on a larger scale with typical setting and typical teachers in typical funding level is a whole different can of worms. I would say the same thing is true with many large-scale policies. Several examples and education were well intended policies have failed to be realized because implementation is complicated and far from immediate. Great example today as we are all living. We have a couple of these evidence proof practices where we practice social distancing and masks help with that. An actual large-scale limitation of these have been pretty poor. Yes there is a disconnect and as I said earlier I wonder if this disconnect is real and insurmountable or is it remnant of our history. Anna Rose's recent graduation from rowing University and recent graduation from Harvard is been in the news for of late. Most of us would not have predicted that a ashes degree and television film with down syndrome or Harvard and logically with the person with death and blindness. During the last year authorization of ID there were linked discussions of whether or not students with disabilities should or could be assessed by the disabled peers. Take you to the work with the colleagues of NCO there was evidence from districts and states that not only was it possible to hold students with disabilities to standards in the system that it was critical to do that. To mark the growth and achievement of this population. Our standards are a good idea. I would say yes. They have to provide children regardless of their ZIP Codes equal access to equal opportunities. To me making sure students with disabilities are included with standards and assessments is an equity issue. High expectations for

achievement. I believe we have fumbled in the implementation of this policy. We have to have a systemic multitiered system of support as a foundation for instruction that recognizes the individual learning needs and provides individualized support and services to ensure growth and achievement for children with disabilities. The IEP should be the roadmap for children with disabilities for out in T NSF should be individualized and what strategies and supports are needed for them to fully access instruction. Following the decision the Department of Education wrote in the Q&A that each child with a disability must be offered in IEP that is designed to provide access to instructional strategy and curricula aligned to both challenging State academic content standards and ambitious goals based on unique circumstances of the child. Even a small population of students with disabilities who have significant cognitive disability we have examples of successes in literacy and numeracy, standard, in-line and the production of the work through Diane Browder and Karen. Jim Schreiner also has another example through the IEP quality product project and how this product alignment can work. It is an issue that it can be done in the true disconnect or is the disconnect that we have not found a way or maybe lack the will to implement the how on a large enough scale. I would posit that the latter is our greater barrier. In 2016 Elliott did a study for the national assessment and accountability for special ed center. They look at reading comprehension growth trajectories for 99,003rd through seventh grade readers for state reading assessment. Controlling for ASC is not surprising they found a gap between children with disabilities and their nondisabled peers. However what they also found is a gap in third grade it remained fairly stable in subsequent years. Our children with disabilities showing growth. Yes. We may question the rate of that growth which is another discussion. But based on the study how do we lessen the gap? With investing more money and early intervention and early childhood lesson that initial third grade. I would say yes. Especially for students with more significant disabilities. I spoke with intention to standards to children with disabilities these intentions are exasperated because the applications were standard with children with disabilities is a joint endeavor. It is between general and special education. As the majority of our children with special needs it spent a large part of their time in general education. I think that we have not yet figured out how to take advantage of the combined unique and different set of expertise and skills. The need for effective and carved

>> Talkative QED... We would not expect them to have immediate fluency at the end of the day we should not have expecting this of our teachers. Ongoing coaching with effective individual instruction aligned with the IEP, college and career ready standards and focused of high expectations and achievement is an ongoing support needed for both general and special education teachers. In your study there was an obvious disconnect between state and locals and what they say is providing professional development how teachers receive the lack of specificity in the training that they are offered. As commented earlier I believe our best efforts should be a pastor key leverage points. It is hard to change the leaves but we can choose to create a more comprehensive system with tiered instruction and support. We can choose to spend our time on the evidence practices that we know make the biggest difference. And we can choose our teachers who are the ones closest to the outcome we are trying to change. We must do a better job connecting and implementing the policy instruction and practicing outcome. I think we arty have a lot of the pieces that we need to connect and we may need to prioritize and make it smarter and put these pieces together in a way that works better for more teachers and students.

>> Wonderful, thank you Renée. People who are listening and do not forget that you can transmit electronically your questions to us at any time. I am going to move to Mitch. Mitch we have two questions for you. And I'm going to put them both to you at the same time so you can go from there. The first question is what are the legal implications of state standards supplanting individualized goals for students with disabilities. And secondly and light of the spring court ruling wet with districts and teachers be thinking about. What progress for students with disabilities looks like.

>> Thank you Lynn and Doug and thank you so much for asking me to be on this panel before actually get into my slides I just wanted to mention that hopefully these questions really have to do with what the individuals with disabilities education requires and then that is that we all deliver the important public education for youngsters with disabilities. And as was said the IEP is a roadmap which leads to free appropriate public education. The first question I want to address briefly is one of the legal implications of state standard for in supplanting individualized goals and what I would like to do is make a reference to US Department of Education dear colleague letter in November 2015 in which officials wrote that the free appropriate publication to make it available students must be enabled to advance appropriately toward attaining his or her annual goals and allow a student to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum based on state academic content standards for the grading which the student is enrolled. The US Department of Education officials also in this letter said that they expect annual IEP goals to be aligned with state academic content standards for the grading which the child is enrolled. This alignment however misguided but not be placed or replace the undivided individualized decision-making required in the IEP process. I have seen and experienced standards-based missteps which include developing IEP's that include goals for general education curriculum classes, which a class which a student participates for example have social studies or health goals in the IEP. Also substituting estate content standard for individualized goals. What I mean by that is literally doing a case cutting or estate content standard and placing them in the goals section of an IEP. Clearly the IEP that we develop must be standard based that include developing our ambitious and individualized goals that enable students to make progress. Appropriate in his or her circumstances. Address relevant or prioritize skills within the standards. Or in effect the IEP must be what McLaughlin must refer to as a standard reference and we must also include accommodations and modifications to enable the student to be involved in the general education curriculum. Now what are the legal implications of state standards supplanting an individualized goal? Is my job my friend Jim said students of an IEP should me as standards-based but not standards bound. In other words we inform our IEP deliberations using the state standard we do not however replace individualization in that process. The next question I'm going to answer is in light of the Supreme Court ruling in the under draft. How do district administrators and teachers be thinking about what progress for students with disabilities needs to look like. And of course that question refers to the US Supreme Court ruling March 3 second in 2017 with the Douglas County school district. In this case the US Supreme Court unanimously ruled on the issue of fate further defining what faith is. In the opinion which was written by Chief Justice Jon Roberts wrote that a student's IEP must be reasonably calculated to him have the student make progress in light of their circumstances. An interesting comment in the Supreme Court decision Roberts wrote a reviewing court may fairly expect school district quarries to be able to offer a cogent and responsive

explanation for the decision that shows the IEP was reasonably calculated to enable a student to make progress appropriate in light of child circumstances. Two takeaways from that decision in developing a fate number one the Supreme Court focused on the individual needs of the student which is at the core of the idea. Number two the Supreme Court rejected the so-called trivial standard for determining educational benefit. Which is necessary for school district to meet the fate standards and this new standard. This greater standard is the progress appropriate in light of the student circumstances.

>> A quick check for you.

>> The next slide is the burden of proof with respect to student's progress shifted to school personnel. Because usually the burden of proof is a part of the loss. So parent brings a hearing or goes to court. The burden of proof would be on them. However this interesting little sidelight by Chief Justice Roberts in this decision is that the school authorities must be able to offer a cogent and responsive explanation or is this IAAP reasonably calculated to provide benefit. It seems to be shifting somewhat that the burden of proof with respect to student progress towards the school district. Secondly will school district officials begin to settle fake cases more quickly when there is no data collected to show progress or when the students IEP goals are not measured. What does student progress look like in light of Andrew F. First we have to conduct relevant and meaningful assessments to meet all of the students' needs. Those needs must be included with residential and academic statements and those statements can serve as a baseline and monitoring student progress. Secondly we need to develop individual lives goals that enable students to make progress appropriate in the light of the student circumstances. Third adopt and implement research-based specialist in services and programming that make progress more likely. And finally to collect objective data to show that a student is making progress. My last slide that what I wanted to point out is in light of the Supreme Court ruling districts and administrators should be thinking about what progress which look like I think in order to answer that we only have to look at this quote tuition the IEP must enable the student to make progress and the essential function is to set out a plan for presuming pursuing academic function and advancement.

>> Doug you are muted. Sorry.

>> Thank you Mitch for that informative set of answers. Return to Nicole. Nicole your question is based on your experiences working with planned practitioners what you see as promising methods for easing the tension that Renate and Mitch have already alluded to. Tension between the ideal of universal standards and state standards for all versus the principle of individualization as reflected in the individualized education plan. We're asking you because your sense of experience with practitioners to weigh in on this.

>> Thank you and I appreciate the opportunity. I reflect on this both as an educator and someone who now works with in TSS at the state level as well as a parent with two children with special needs. To realize the vision of college and career readiness and a policy of inclusion would be a systems change. It would be a cultural change. We know from 30 years of research with limitations

science that there is a formula to effective systems change. I heard earlier we started this talk will not see the improved outcomes that we are hoping for in this formula would save any one of these pieces is not attacked and we will not see the improved outcomes. If we start here on the left the formula goes very simply. If we do these practices and what research says should work. We do the best we can as compared to research just the next box. Effective implementation. Then we are moving towards effective outcomes. But these two things in and of themselves are not enough. We also have to have the third box here which is enabling context. What that means it is not just the teacher practitioner level that we think about but it is also the building of level. State level. Contacts remove the barriers to this implementation. Let's start with the formula. College and career readiness policy of inclusion. What is that practice. Defining that practice with a level of detail that it can be implemented, measured, and the fidelity checked is really critical. This metaphor helps me and I hope it will help you. Let us talk about swimming. College and career readiness is not said that is not enough to say that all kids can swim in doggy paddle and tread water. We now need high-level swimmers. Competitive swimmers. Skillful swimmers in the policy of inclusion says that the children who aren't driving to learn how to swim are all different levels. It is not a question of the what which is the end goal which is the standard. We want all kids to be high-level swimmers. The question is that how. If we take this kids that cannot swim and just drop them in the pool and drop them in the ocean, will they learn? If we take this kids that cannot swim and give them a life preserver and let them float around in the pool so right about kids who can't swim will they learn? No. Some people define college and career readiness inclusion as just access as in being there. Just exposure. Just being around models. What I put forth is that they will not learn in the situation and a self-fulfilling prophecy. You did not think those kids can learn and now they didn't. So let's take the same goals. Strong swimmers and focus instead not so much on the what but the how. First we set up the environment. Every day is in small class. The pool is low and it goes from low to a little bit higher you can see there are little islands so when they are swimming they have somewhere to go to and the kids who do not need the island they don't have it and there's all these tools. We scaffold set up the environment for success. Step-by-step instruction model and distribute the practice. We need to move from just dropping kids in the pool teaching kids how to be swimmers. And this is just NOT to students with disabilities. Students with disabilities may need more. On the left is my nonverbal. He is a visual schedule and does his swim levels privately and then joins the larger group. We need to focus on the how and we need to implement those practices. I would put forth that most professional development around the standards has been on the wet. The standards themselves. Even looking at curriculum is do they aligned to the standards. If not do they have evidence-based instruction pedagogy Bilton. What we need to focus on the pressure point is tier 1 general education and instruction. If it is truly going to be college and career ready and inclusive it would have to include what works for students with disabilities. We want to move from just sink or swim or learning by Asmus is into it is a real swim class. And if we can do that then on the right-hand side students with IEP's will truly have all of these restrictive environments. The axis will not just be exposure it will be meaningful and that role is the general education teachers. They do not have the skill set yet but that is what needs to live. If that lived there the special educator could truly focused on specialties buried designed instruction in the IEP become live and more dynamic. In my experience what has been happening is a special educator is consumed with being the life preserver. From keeping the top firms sinking rather than being able to do specially designed instruction. You might be saying it is

great as theoretical and thank you but what is it look like. Pearson practices as examples of quality research that came out of special ed that works for all kids because it has evidence-based practices built in. Here are some examples. Here assisted learning strategies in both reading and math. You have inclusion there included with all of their peers and it's a whole group instruction with disabled and nondisabled and his built-in research-based practices for the students. These practices help more than just kids with disabilities. This is across my entire district when I was a district coordinator and this was the percentile growth in all math classes. You can see we have it around a little bit above 10. The panels classroom is on the far left United States at 45 this is all students and not just the ones with disabilities. Another example is teaching academic vocabulary. That is in the standard so people would focus when they turn on the progression from and that you need to do that they do not tell teachers how to do it. What are the routines. So you do this whole group. A lot of our pilot work on academic vocabulary and science had a lot of partner group work. You can see we built in some solids evidence-based practices that help all kids and not to students with disabilities. From our practice data you can see that it was business as usual on the left. The white line is where we implemented academic vocabulary ensues with disabilities are the red and green line. You can see that when it was business as usual students with this lease flatlined. Once we started inputting academic vocabulary routines GROUP because again research my starting special ed but usually works for all kids in the you can see the red line that Was closing for students with disabilities. I do not have time to speak to this but cognitive science advances like schema-based instruction word problems I would put into this category as well. Finally we have to figure out what is the it. I would say his pedagogy that works with students and disabilities and all that we have to implement with coaching. And finally the context has to enable meeting removing barriers. As was mentioned the policy practice feedback loop. Two major barriers. What I described here that role of general education and the general education administrator. We all know they are not prepared to do that. They are not trained. Certification training does not go beyond compliance if at all. They do not know evident Bates practices in special education and they do it only lives in special ed. Special ed journals only go to special educator. We have to D silo that. And finally everybody mentioned use of time. The school schedule limits our ability to do these practices. Why because state policy above that might be unaligned and that becomes a barrier. Does the child get intervention or is our IEP service. We only have one time of day to do both and some of that is also made worse by funding Silas. I tried to go quick and there it is.

>> Thank you Nicole. That is wonderful description to policy practices so far in two standard deviations ahead of everybody including me on graphing. Finally return to Daniel as sweetness who is a wonderful special education teacher in the Washington DC public schools. Daniel two questions for you. First as a special ed teacher what strategies do you use for your students with disabilities to manage the tension between standards-based reforms and the same challenging expectations for all versus special education principle of individualization. Secondly how do you try to ensure the students have meaningful access to standards-based general instruction while you're addressing their individualized learning. This is very much rooting in Mitch's wonderful presentation that attempted to argue that it's not either/or. But somehow a myriad of both.

>> Thank you for the question and including me in this panel. I agree completely that is critically

important that we find ways to merge standards-based in college ready instruction with special education rather than treat them as separate implements. This will need great coordinate efforts on both fronts. A good place to begin is with the individual loveliest education programs. If student IEP's are not aligned to grade level standards you cannot really expect them to move towards college and career readiness. I think the alignment process begins with present level achievement and functional performance for class statements. Class statements should detail student performance within specific educational demands. Quality plus statement should include a minimum quality of data in the area of reading for example have to include data from screening classroom observations, work samples, teacher interviews, etc. As presented through the lens freight based that is I try to answer the question on how students are performing in relation to grade level standards. In fifth grade for example are my students able to craft an opinion piece with a clear topic, logically ordered reasons backed by evidence to make it to transition words. Can my first greater independently count to 20. In considering students ability to being independently access education content such questions are imperative. Too often I'm not really included in student class statements. But also as noted we cannot be bound by the standards. Students have needs to make sense beyond these parameters. Lester is working in pre-k which is not included in any college created standards but certainly have functional needs that need to be addressed. Looking at this to performance instructional facility. Looking at these test scores for example to the force that my student achieve standards to the written content but certainly revealed the difficulty that provided little insight to what her difficulties are. From what instruction should be detailed to her. Granting the student statements with grade level standards I think were better able to identify strengths that need to be cultivated through all of our students as well as specific areas of difficulty that they may require special support with. Discerning makes it easier to make student IEP goals and objectives with student standards in mind. I think in my experience how it has forced me to extend my instruction beyond focus of conditional skills to also the critical thinking and rich college-level experience that make it critical for college readiness. The benefit of standard aligning IAAP are limited of course if not implemented with effective instructional approaches. To this end special educators have much to draw from form of evidence-based and high-level practices. Need to be catalogued and evaluated such as national Center intervention the Council for exceptional children have looked at the conference and have set recommendations for effective special education practices. Looking at these offers viable solutions to close the frustratingly big gaps. It's unfortunately common image special ed that Doctor Bradley discussed. To conclude as I'm thinking you're able to refill it's far from realizing the vision of college ready students. As with policy reforms many college coordinator actions are needed. In my experience students I P standards are important and perhaps easy but separate dissent and paired with evidence-based and high-level practices there is great potential of this approach to potentially help students and improve the instructional experience with educational outcomes with student with disabilities. There are many thoughts that need to be connected but I think with these results will help the challenges ahead as we move forward. Thank you.

>> Thank you Daniel very much. That concludes the texture extemporaneous answers to things we've put to each of the panelists. Ai-Media I turn it over to you now?

>> That would be great we only have a couple of minutes but I have a couple of questions I think we

can get to before we and that might be helpful. One is connecting a couple of presentations. Scooter rights that Renee said that more money is needed. Nicole in your formulation that you offered. Which part in the Triad do you see as needing more money?

SPEAKER:

We should probably invite Renée to comment on that first for his reference in there.

>> I cannot remember her saying that we need more money but I deftly think that that is probably connected for the more professional development which we cannot have without more money. I think that that is a logical step. I would like to try to focus on the things that we can control instead of things out of control I think many schools districts and states especially are really strapped for money. They can reduce tribute have more valuable time in serving their students. I would suggest we look at other ways besides waiting for a windfall of many especially in these circumstances. To address some of the things that we have talked about. Technically Q&A. Nicole.

>> I think the question had to do with the formula. I think and I agreed that I think the funding would come into play for professional development which is the implementation piece. What we find in our state is not only do not have many for training we also do not have money to cover substitutes or have substitutes then to hold trainings during contractor will hours. I think that lives there. But also in the enabling context. I don't know if you remember from the last slide I had funding silos. Sometimes we have the money but we do not think we are permitted to use in certain ways or I find that administrators are doing funding decisions kind of in their own little vacuum as opposed to a more coordinated approach. For example using EIS funds in one way or another. I think in one way that is part of that practice policy feedback... Systematic about how we use her money.

>> Think that may be all the time the questions we have but will answer on the website that will poster a panelist and compose the answers online. So if you would like to wrap up at this point.

>> Yes I would like to we would both like to wrap up by thinking again the panelist. I hope the audience appreciates not just the expertise of each of these individuals but the time they took to come forward with a very informative helpful set of answers to really important questions. Secondly Lynn and I would like to thank you, the audience, for your interest. If you would like to continue this with anyone of us. The panelists have already agreed and Lynn and I are certainly willing to interact with you online. And finally we wish you that you continue to be safe and send our best wishes to you.

>> Thank you everybody.

>> Thank you and before you go I just wanted to remind everyone that our closing Keynote section begins in 15 minutes. So 1:30 PM Eastern. If you've not registered yet you can go to our website 23.work/sessions and get a link to be able to go there. A number of you asked about resources that were available. All the resources will be available including a recording of this webinar on our C-SAIL site but also her answers to questions we to question from Renate making available some of the

cities you mentioned and we will include those on our website so thank you very much and we will leave the screen up and we encourage you to come back in 15 minutes to that other session. They keep analyst.

>> Thank you.