AEM for ALL Learners

2018 Special Education Symposium
#iassymposium18
June 11, 2018
Lindsay Spears
K-12 Curriculum Lead for Special Education
lspears@CRprairie.org
@LindsaySpears77

Cheryl Kiburz
Director of Student Services
ckiburz@CRprairie.org
@CherylKiburz

Megan Sova-Tower
5th & 6th Grade Special Education Teacher
msovatower@CRprairie.org
@MESova_Tower

SERENDIPITY Alert!
Link to our Tech Director’s Podcast that actually aligns with today’s discussion!!!
WE are PRAIRIE
Mission and Vision

Vision: Success for All

Personalized Learning

ALL means ALL
Our AIM/AEM Journey: 2016-2018

2015-2016

- **January 2016**: [AIM Simply Said](#) & [What is AIM - Part 1](#) (required screencast for all PK-12 special education staff)
- **March 2016**: [What is AIM - Part 2](#) (required screencast for all PK-12 special education staff)
- **April 11, 2016**: On-site professional learning on AIM, primarily use of the [SETT form](#) (for all PK-12 Special Education teachers)
- **June 2016**: AIM Usability Study Kickoff in Des Moines & Canvas Course on AIM

2016-2017

- **October 2016**: Acquired [uPAR](#) for 7-12 buildings, SE teachers are trained/administer [uPAR](#)
- **November 2016**: Read & Write for Google rolled out DISTRICT-WIDE & [Read & Write for Google Training](#) for PK-12 Special Education Teachers
- **January 2017**: Acquired [uPAR](#) for 7-12 buildings, provided training to the teachers, students participate
- **February-April 2017**: [AIM (SE-Focused) Presentation](#) given to District Leadership Team & certified staff in all buildings
- **April 2017**: Developed a district-wide GE/SE team, the “CCSD AEM Steering Committee”
- **May 2017**: Updated [CCSD Accommodations Guidance](#) to better support inclusivity/accessibility

2017-2018:

- SE Lead presented on [Access / Universal Design for Learning (UDL)](#) & implications on GE (SE Lead),
- “AEM Steering Committee” developed 3 major goals to support access for all
### AEM Steering Committee: 2017-2018

**District-wide** → general education initiative  
**Time allocation was critical** → met monthly (half-days)  

**Key members:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Role</th>
<th>Position/Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Curriculum Lead &amp; Coach for Special Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Curriculum Lead for Literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK-12 Curriculum Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Coach (K-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Coach (5-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Coach (10-12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Principal (5-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Principal (7-9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher (5-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher (7-9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher (7-9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 General Education Teacher (10-12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Teacher Librarian (7-9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWAEA Supports (AT, Literacy, School Improvement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AEM Steering Committee

Three major goals to support our mission

- Development of District Purchasing Standards for all Curriculum Materials purchased by CCSD
- Ongoing PL Design/Implementation for all certified staff (AEM)
- Processes/structures for Accessibility Stations at each CCSD Building
  Revised: Google Drive’s Built-in OCR/Text Converter
Systems Thinking is Critical to Success

*Connections we’ve made:
- Oversight
- Joint Cadre
- Personalized Learning Task Force
- Early Literacy Leadership Team
- District Assessment Team
- PL for Instructional Coaches
- Whole-staff PL at each building
- SE Lead scheduling into PLCs & classrooms

*We have a number of structures put in place by our leadership that supports repeated opportunities of learning for various groups district-wide

Connections we’d like to make more clear going forward:
- SIAC
- PBIS
- Use of uPAR in problem solving

Continue to connect/reinforce:
- Behavior & academics are often connected!
- All means ALL
WHY do we need to provide Accessible Materials?

**Reading Example**

- Discrepancies **grow** as students stop learning to read and begin reading to learn (~grades 4+)

- AEM enables students who benefit from AT to gain the information they need to:
  - Access the general curriculum
  - Access extracurriculars
  - Complete tasks
  - Meet IEP goals

Conside... Task & Purpose ➔ Where do you want the cognitive load?

**Remediation**
- Explicit Instruction focused on improving skill deficits
- May take weeks, months to close gap
- *i.e.* re-teaching, pre-teaching, extension time, SDI on IEP goals, etc.

**Compensation**
- Legally required to do both
- Both allow for access
- Both provided by GE and SE teachers

- Strategies/Tools that allow student to **access** the content in real-time
- **Immediately increase participation:** engage with, & respond to content
- Allows for **deeper** learning with **higher-level** material
- Access **grade-level standards**
- *i.e.* text to speech
uPAR Results/Read Aloud Tools

Shifts in Mindset

= Change in Practice &

Improved Access for ALL
uPAR: Implementation / Roll-out

**Fall 2016: Special Education - AIM**
- All students with reading goals at Creek (5-6), Point (7-9), HS (10-12), including our off-site programs at Delta & Edge
- 4th grade students with reading goals across all 5 elementaries [only the K-4 special education teachers who reached out]

**Spring 2018: General Education - Personalized Learning/UDL**
- Added English 10
- Added 4th grade class at Hill Elementary

**Upcoming Fall 2018: General Education - Personalized Learning/UDL**
- Add High School US History
Shifts in Mindset & Shifts in Practice
Is this “cheating?”

“They aren’t really reading, they’re listening...”

- **Reading with Your Ears** from buildingonthebest.org
- Table of research on read-aloud accommodations
- More research on text-to-speech

Iowa Core Standards:

“The Standards should also be read as allowing for the widest possible range of students to participate fully from the outset, and as permitting appropriate accommodations to ensure maximum participation of students with special education needs.

For example, for students with disabilities, **reading** should allow for the use of Braille, screen-reader technology, or other assistive devices, while **writing** should include the use of a scribe, computer, or speech-to-text technology. In a similar vein, **speaking and listening** should be interpreted broadly to include sign language.”

**Text Complexity (Appendix A)**

More than **quantitative/readability**
Limitations of Current Guidance on District-Wide Assessments

- Iowa’s test administration guidance does not allow for students to receive their read-aloud accommodation on AYP district-wide reading assessments.
- This is based on a historical, widely accepted definition of reading and may change in the near future.
- In the meantime, CCSD guidance must align with the state’s read-aloud guidance.

**AEA Procedures Manual and Documentation Guide (page 143)**

“Accommodations are to be made as long as they do not negate the intent of the assessment. For example, if reading is required in order for a student to understand math problems, then a reader is a reasonable and needed accommodation. **If, on the other hand, the test were for reading comprehension, then having a reader would negate the intent of the reading comprehension assessment and would therefore be inappropriate.**”

Administrator/teacher/paraprofessional mindsets & beliefs around the definition of reading may be influenced by this guidance.
Teachers and teams are experiencing the benefits of accessibility tools and are designing accessible instruction [engagement, interaction with, & participation in the Core]

This has impacted our thinking in the design of curriculum, instruction, & assessment

WONDERING:

- Should learners have these same tools available on our formal assessments? (i.e. DCA protocols)

- When does use of an accessibility tool become a matter of:
  - A learner preference?
  - A compensatory strategy?
  - A formal accommodation that needs to be documented

- When it is acceptable to use and when is it not?
  - When does a tool become something that invalidates our attempt to assess a student’s independent reading skills?
CCSD’s Universal Design of Assessments: DRAFT Guidance

**PURPOSE:** to provide guidance in development of universal assessment protocols that are accessible for ALL learners:

- ★ Universal tools offer learners various avenues for demonstrating their proficiency on an assessment.
- ★ Helps to avoid unintentionally creating barriers in assessment design/protocols.

**NOTE:** Important to consider **intention** of each standard

- **If decoding or conventions:**
  - *some tools* would hinder teacher’s ability to fully assess the student’s independence in demonstrating these skills

- **If metacognitive skills:**
  - the concept of “reading” a text can be taken *more broadly than decoding* to include reading aloud, silent reading, listening to reading, etc.
  - the concept of “writing” can be taken more broadly to include speech-to-text or other tools that support the writing process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>Text to Speech (TTS) or Human Reader</th>
<th>Speech to Text or Scribe</th>
<th>Typing/Word Processor</th>
<th>Predictive Text</th>
<th>Visual/Graphic Organizers</th>
<th>Dictionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RL.1 RI.1: Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL.2 RI.2: Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL.3 RI.3: Analyze how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and interact over the course of a text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL.4 RI.4: Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL.5 RI.5: Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text (e.g., a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>section, chapter, scene, or stanza) relate to each other and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL.6 RI.6: Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style of a text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL.7 RI.7: Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL.8: Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficiency of the evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL.9 RI.9: Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authors take.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL.10: Read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts</td>
<td>K-5=Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independently and proficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A few notes...

- Each teacher’s personal understandings, assumptions, & beliefs could impact how broadly he/she is willing to interpret a standard or allow all students the option of using accessibility tools.

- Currently, our goal is just to begin to surface these conversations.... ...while keeping in mind the ultimate goal of providing all students equitable opportunity to develop the skills outlined in Core.

- CCSD’s emphasis as a system is focused on looking at the intention of the standards and then crafting learning experiences/assessments that provide students the widest range of contexts allowable to participate fully in the learning.

Success for All
# Implications / Our Takeaways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caution</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Instead...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Starting with:**  
➢ protocols  
➢ guidance | - Potential for inequity  
- Guidance runs the risk of:  
  ○ people ignoring,  
  ○ actively opposing,  
  ○ not implementing with fidelity  
- Policy doesn’t make it true! | - Start with a common purpose and shared vision behind the *why*  
- Teachers must own this through a collaborative, discussion-based process to make meaning & discuss with colleagues  
- Provide the *time & space* to do this! |
| **Defining the word “READING”** | - Putting this in writing takes away the conversation and ability to develop a shared conceptual understanding.  
- There is **no correct definition of reading.** | - Provide time for staff to have discussions around interpretation of the word  
- Emphasis on cognitive load, interpretation of the standard, task+purpose |
And Here is Some Time & Space!

Take a minute to reflect INDIVIDUALLY:

“You are a reader IF...”
Stand & Share with someone near you....

1) A talks, B listens (1 minute)
2) B talks, A listens (1 minute)

When it’s your turn to talk:

You are a reader IF ...

2:00
uPAR Results: Implications for Teaching & Learning
Personalized Learning Connections

- **Great illustration of learner variability** [Lesson planning]
- **Entry point for developing learner agency** [Here's how I learn best]
- **Prompts teacher reflection**
  [If different students perform differently given different tools for reading -- what else am I missing? Am I providing everyone with equal access to grade-level content….or opportunities to extend beyond grade level?]

Possible Next Steps?

→ Exploring the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Framework…
uPAR Results: Classroom Implications

● **Staff understanding** of the intention of the standards:
  ○ What type of access should be provided for instruction?
  ○ Should that same access be provided on assessment of the standard?

● **Relationship** has been identified between students *reading below grade level* & needing ongoing core interventions to address *behavior concerns*.

● **Students reading below grade level who didn’t benefit from audio access:**
  ○ Do they need other supports/academic interventions?
uPAR Results: Classroom Implications

PLC Level; Instructional Planning Stage

How do we guarantee that materials are accessible from the outset?

Explicit instruction & normalization of the accessibility tools
(required for some, beneficial for many)

Embed in lessons, Use Read & Write for Google tool/feature that aligns with the standard/instruction

Consider where you want the cognitive load and intention of the standard

By giving access, students can engage in higher level thinking skills (beyond basic comprehension)
Impact on Students
Brayden: 6th grade student (May 2018)

“I like listening to harder books. I always have to read easy books and I like harder ones. The books they read in the regular literacy class are better...I like other people knowing I’m smart and can understand.”
Braydon’s uPAR Results:

"[The results] cemented the idea that students are general education students first. Many times, they engage in the GE setting & content if they just have access. We still have to provide remediation on decoding, but we MUST give access & opportunity for students to engage in high-level thinking in grade-level texts."

-- Braydon’s Teacher
(Megan Sova-Tower)

“His dad and I have always known how smart he is. Brayden understands grade-level material, but couldn’t read grade level stuff. We have always known he could understand at a much higher level than he could read!"

-- Braydon’s Mother
"I thought I was bad at reading? I’m good at reading? Can I show this to my teachers? Can I show this to my teachers at Kirkwood [Community College] next year? How do I get my college textbooks on audio? On my laptop? What if I don’t have a laptop next year? What about my phone?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Silent Read</th>
<th>Human Audio</th>
<th>Text Reader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s next for College Community?

Shift in Mindset
✧ Work on shared understanding of what it means to be a reader...
✧ Teach and use our Accessibility Purchasing Protocol

Shift in Practice
✧ Increase the understanding and implementation of our universal accessibility tool (RWG)
✧ Increase the implementation of built-in Google OCR tools (students & staff)
✧ Proactive planning for access
We welcome you to reach out with questions. We’re learning together!
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