



OSEP Symposia Series: Retaining Effective Personnel to Serve Children with Disabilities

Symposium Live Recording

May 15, 2019

Dawn Ellis

"Welcome"

>> Dawn Ellis: Good afternoon and welcome to the second event in the 2019 OSEP symposium series, Retaining Effective Personnel to Serve Children with Disabilities. I'm Dawn Ellis with the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs, and I will be serving as your moderator for today's event. First, a bit of information about technology. Participants will be muted throughout the symposium. We invite you to submit questions in the ask a question box under the Q&A tab, and near the bottom of your screen. We will try to address as many questions as possible during the Q&A session, and at the end of the event. Additional questions may be answered after the event and posted on the symposium website. To enhance your viewing experience, we recommend closing all your programs and internet browsers including emails throughout the symposium.

If you happen to lose audio or video, try refreshing your browser, logging into a different browser or asking for help in the chat box. Additional tech support information can be found on the OSEP symposium series website. During this year symposia series, we are discussing the importance of effective personnel for all children with disabilities. In April, we explored policies and practices that can be utilized to effectively prepare personnel. During today's event we look into best practices for retaining effective personnel, and how we can support this process. At the final symposium of the year in August, we will learn about how educational agencies can attract effective personnel to their organizations. I encourage you to also visit the symposium website to access the resources that were gathered to enhance the information you will use today, and you may use to further ongoing your efforts.

If you missed the first symposia on teacher preparation in April, you may also access a copy of that event and the resources on the OSEP ideas that work website, where you can connect today. This symposium and the accompanying materials are great resources to share with your colleagues and engage in improving effective personnel. Before we get started with today's presentations, I want to share with everyone that you will hear from several speakers today. Some are departmental grantees, and others are practitioners and stakeholder partners. We have designed this symposium to share valuable information that we think will assist our grantees in their very roles of improving results for children with disabilities, and their families. However, the contents of the presentations do not necessarily



represent the policies of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the federal government.

As I mentioned, today's symposium will focus on retention of effective personnel. During this presentation, you will hear from experts and practitioners as they discuss the challenges and promising practices of retaining effective personnel in both early childhood, and K through 12 settings. The knowledge and skills personnel need to be effective with students with disabilities, including the importance of expertise and topics such as high leverage practices, database individualization, and classroom management addressing behaviors. Additionally, they will discuss the critical role of coaching an ongoing professional development, to ensure all educators have the knowledge and skills needed to remain in the field. Without further ado, let's get started with our first speaker. The director of the Office of Special Education Programs at the U.S. Department of Education, Laurie VanderPloeg.

In this capacity, she serves as the advisor to the assistant secretary of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, on matters related to the education of children and youth with disabilities. When Laurie joined us for the first symposium in April, she kicked off OSEP's initiative to work with stakeholders to address effective personnel through attraction, preparation, and retention. This topic is one that is of particular interest to her, and we are happy to have her here again today. Laurie VanderPloeg.

Laurie VanderPloeg
"Opening Remarks"

>> Laurie VanderPloeg: Good afternoon and welcome everyone. I'm pleased that you are able to join us today for the second of our 2019 symposia series and attract, prepare and retain. As Dawn said, we're going to be looking at some innovative strategies as well as some evidence-based practices from our presenters today, that hopefully will help us as we go through an implementation phase of getting this work done. So OSEP continues to be committed to engaging you as both internal and external stakeholders, as we work through this project. I just want to say for a minute, I use the analogy that particularly for the area of retention, that we have a bucket and our bucket has holes in it. So, what I hope that we're able to do as part of today's symposia is figuring out how do we plug the holes in the buckets, so we don't continue to lose or Special Ed personnel out of our profession at the high rate that we currently are losing them.

We need to continue to work together to ensure that we do have a very effective workforce in place, to be able to have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to be able to deliver that specially designed instruction for our students with disabilities across the nation. I'm very excited for the opportunity today to listen to our presenters and hear the information that they have to share. I think I've mentioned before that when we look at dissemination, dissemination is first of all-around awareness. I think we have a high level of awareness in relationship to what this issue is. The second piece is information, and we have been able to gather and share with you a high number of different research-based, evidence-based practices that we have been able to collect. The third and the most challenging for us and you



today is going to be the implementation, and how do we get to work collectively in regards to implementation of these evidence-based practices, to build the capacity that we need to across the nation to do the work that we currently know that we need to do.

Before we get started, I'm really focusing in on personnel retention, there's a few questions that I want to just pose to ask. So, as we go through listening to the presenters today, we have an opportunity to think about how we would be responding to those. The first one has to do with how do we expand the use of and improve teacher induction programs? We know that there's a large responsibility for our local school districts in our state departments to pick up the pieces of professional development and try and develop the knowledge and skills. Actually today, there was an education week article that just came out about the importance of professional development in relationship to the teacher shortage, and the teacher retention issue. So, there's again, a lot of information out there, but how are we going to continue to provide the resources, and the support we need for our locals to be able to provide the level of opportunity?

Another one is how do we enhance professional development efforts to ensure that they reflect evidence-based practices, are focusing on in the greatest area of need and provide a high-quality level of services and opportunities for our students? Again, we know that the states and locals have a huge responsibility in relationship to that. Another question, how do we incorporate coaching and peer to peer learning opportunities into daily practice? We've been having a lot of conversations at OSEP around the effect of practice of coaching and mentoring, and we know that that is going to be an area that we want to continue to focus in on and be able to help provide that level of support to the teachers, and the providers in the field to be able to be more effective with the work that they're currently doing. Another one is how are we going to have effective administrators? We know that they have to be able to set very high expectations.

In the first symposia, you heard a little bit regarding the state of the profession survey that came out, and this is an area that I think we need to really focus in on a lot, in order to be able to retain the current staff we have. The survey results actually came back and told us that the lack of administrative support is probably one of the primary reasons that staff are leaving the field today. Our administrators are not familiar with the IEP process. They're not disseminating curricula and other resources that the Gen Ed teachers have. So, our Special Ed staff do not have the same level of access, and they're not providing them the time and the opportunity to really collaborate. So, we've got to also take a look at how do we develop effective administrators in this process that can continue to impact the field? We know that teachers that stay in the field for three to five years, we have a greater opportunity to retain those.

So, what are we going to put in place in those first three to five years to ensure that we have them for the longevity that we are going to need them, and that our students with disabilities actually deserve. So really without any further ado, I want to thank you very much for the time and energy that you're helping to put into this. We know that it is a collaborative effort across all of our stakeholder groups. You have a great lineup of presenters today that I know are going to deliver a wealth of information. I look forward to our continued partnership in this, and how we get into the implementation of all of the



wonderful knowledge and skills that your presenters are going to provide you today and go back and say how are we going to build a sustainable system so that we can attract, prepare and retain all of the future leaders of our students. So, thank you for being here today.

Liz Bettini

“Retaining Special Educators: Creating and Supporting Meaningful Roles”

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you, Laurie. By the way, I encourage you to read the full biographies of each of our speakers, which are available on the website and through the speakers' bios tab under your video display. They are doing fascinating work, and I'm only giving you a glimpse of their achievements today. Our next speaker will be Elizabeth Bettini. Elizabeth is an assistant professor in the Special Education Program in the Wheelock College of Education and Human Development at Boston University. Her research examines how working conditions influence special educators' efforts to effectively serve students with disabilities. Currently, she is working on several research projects, investigating the consequences and predictors of novice special educators' perceptions and their workloads are manageable. She will provide an overview of retention. Welcome Elizabeth.

> Elizabeth Bettini: Hi. Thank you so much for having me. It's such an honor to be here talking about Special Education teacher's retention and working conditions. Go ahead, next. First, I want to say special educators have an obligation to meet the needs of students with disabilities. That's their primary charge, and our charge as a community is to support them to do that effectively. Next, okay. Sorry. So special educators, we know that they're motivated to fulfill that charge. They're motivated to serve students with disabilities. They get into this field because they want to serve students with the most significant learning and behavioral needs. We know from research that the students are not the reason why they're choosing to leave, although there are student characteristics that are associated with higher rates of attrition. For example, special educators are more likely to leave when they serve students in high poverty schools, or when they serve students with emotional and behavioral disabilities.

Those characteristics are not the reason why they say that they're leaving. Instead, what we find through our systematic review of research that Bonnie Billingsley and I have in revision right now, is that special educators are leaving because they don't feel like they have the capacity to meet the demands of their students' needs. So, it's not the students that's leading them to leave. It's whether or not they are able to meet the demands that are placed on them, and effectively serve their students. Importantly here, I'm talking about capacity in terms of two things. So first of all, I'm talking about capacity in terms of special educators' preparation, the extent to which they have the knowledge and the skills to effectively serve their students. I think that's where we often tend to focus. We tend to think that if we can give people all of the knowledge and skills, then they can go in and be effective and want to stay over the long haul.

I think all of us, everyone who is here in this symposium probably was at some point a highly effective special educator, still continue to be effective teachers. I think all of us, I could put any one of the people here in this symposium into a situation where you were set up to fail. I know I could put myself into a



situation where I was set up to fail. Where my working conditions didn't facilitate my ability to use my knowledge and skills to serve my students. I'm also talking about capacity to meet students' needs in terms of the working conditions that we provide to special educators. So those working conditions include the demands that we're placing on folks, the paperwork, the caseloads, instructional responsibilities, the extra responsibilities they're assigned, as well as the resources that we're providing them. So, by resources I'm talking about both the logistical resources to do their work.

So, the material resources, do they have the materials that they need to purchase reinforcers for their students on behavior plans? Do they have the curricula to provide high quality instruction that targets student's needs? As well as time, do they have time to plan their lessons? Do they have time to plan them thoughtfully looking at student data, while also maintaining their IEP compliance responsibilities? Do they have time allocated to actually meet with their students for intensive instruction, or do they have to negotiate for that time with their general education colleagues? Then do they have social support? So, do their general education colleagues understand the nature of their role? Do they value that role? Do they incorporate them into their instruction in meaningful ways? Do their administrators support their role, and ensure that they have the other supports that are necessary? So, we can think about those two areas of capacity falling along the grid, and we can ask ourselves two key questions.

The first is, do special educators experience opportunities to learn effective practices? For example, through their preparation in their professional development. Then the second is do they experience working conditions that support them in actually using those practices to serve students effectively? To each of those questions, we can answer yes or no. So, in an ideal world where I know we would all like to be, we would be answering yes to both of those questions for all of our teachers. Our teachers would have the knowledge and skill that they need, and they would have the conditions in which they can use those practices to serve their students effectively. What we find is that when teachers are able to answer yes to both of those questions, they're much more likely to stay. When teachers are well prepared, feel that they have appropriate knowledge and skills and feel that their working conditions are supportive, they're highly likely to intend to stay or to actually stay.

We're in a little more shaky situation when we have to answer no, to either of those questions. So, you can imagine that if you're a teacher in that bottom left quadrant where you have a lot of knowledge and skill, but you're in a situation that is setting you up to fail, you're in a situation where you're working conditions don't facilitate using effective practices, that can be incredibly frustrating. I know I've been in that situation where I had practices that I knew my students needed, but that I was not able to enact them because of the circumstances in which I was working. We see that teachers who are in that set of circumstances are much more likely to intend to leave, and to actually leave. By contrast, if you've got great working conditions, but you don't have the knowledge and skills, then you're not going to make good use of the conditions in which you're placed.

Finally, where we don't want to see anyone is in that bottom right quadrant, lacking both the knowledge and skills to effectively serve students, and lacking conditions that would facilitate your capacity to use



those practices. When we have teachers, who are in that quadrant, those are the folks who have the highest likelihood of leaving. All right. So other folks who are here today are going to talk extensively about providing teachers with knowledge and skills, so I'm going to hone in a little bit more on working conditions. I'm going to provide you guys with a framework for how I think about working conditions. To effectively serve students with disabilities, we need to think first of all ... Go ahead next slide. Good. So, these are the working conditions that support special educators in effectively serving students with disabilities.

First of all, we know that teachers are more likely to intend to continue teaching when they experienced positive affect of outcomes. So, when they are less stressed, when they are less burned out. Stress and burnout are associated with both the quality of instruction that teachers are providing, as well as their intent to continue teaching over the long haul. Those things are predicted by their demands. So, when teachers feel that their demands are too great for them to meet all of those demands within a reasonable workday, then they are more likely to experience stress and burnout, and more likely to intend to leave. However, resources can mitigate the effects of those demands. So, if teachers have high demands, but they also have strong resources to meet those demands, they are less likely to experience those negative outcomes.

Again, the resources refers to social resources such as administrative and collegial support and school culture, as well as logistical resources such as time and material resources. All right, so I'm just going to quickly share some findings from a study that some colleagues and I did this though. This was myself, Michelle Cumming, Kristen Merrill O'Brien and Nelson Brunsting, and it was generously funded by the Spencer Foundation. So, we were looking at special educators who are in self-contained classes for students with emotional and behavioral disabilities. We had 171 folks from all over the country, and we predicted their intent to stay in school as a function of those affective outcomes. So, their emotional exhaustion, which is a component of burnout, their stress and their workload manageability. We found that those things were predicted by their administrative support, which is a social resource as well as the demands and the logistical resources that were placed upon them.

So, folks who had more adequate plan time, who felt like their planning time was more appropriate, rated their workloads more manageable. They were less likely to be emotionally exhausted, and more likely to intend to stay. Then importantly, their perceptions of their planning time was related to the extent to which they were teaching a group of students, who shared common instructional needs so they could target their students' instructional needs, and then their access to curricular resources such as textbooks, and scope and sequence, and so on. Next slide. One more. All right. So that's a useful framework for us to think as we're all thinking about how to better support the special educators within our sphere of influence. We can ask ourselves a series of questions around this framework. For every special educator we work with, we can ask ourselves, does this special educator experience working conditions that support their use of effective practices?



Are their instructional groups reasonable? If they're supposed to be providing intensive reading interventions to students who are several years below grade level, do they have an instructional group in which students share common instructional needs so that they can really target their students' needs? Do they have time with that group of students? Are extra responsibilities such as bus duty and subbing for other folks, distracting them from service delivery? Do their colleagues and administrators understand and support their roles? Do they have the planning time that is commensurate with their responsibilities? So if they're teaching a lot of different subjects, they might need more planning time. Do they have enough protected time with their students to actually promote their students' learning gains? Do they have the curricular resources that they need to actually provide instruction in all of the subject areas that they teach?

What I'd like us, I think all of us, everybody in this room would like for all of the teachers who we interact with to be in that top left quadrant. We would like to be able to say yes to both of those questions for all of our teachers. So what I'd like everyone to think about is for the teachers within your sphere of influence, what are your leverage points for improving their opportunities to learn and then their opportunities to use effective practices? What kind of leverage do you and your colleagues have through your positions in education? Thank you.

Allan Phillips

"Provider Shortages in Part C"

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you Elizabeth. Next we have Allan Phillips. Allen has been involved in the disability field both personally and professionally for 40 years. He currently is the State Part C coordinator for the District of Columbia, and he is also a board member on the Infant and Toddler Coordinator Association, which is the National Association for Part C Programs. Alan will provide a look at the challenges and promising practices of retaining personnel in early childhood settings. Welcome Allan.

>> Allan Phillips: Good afternoon. Thank you. I'm really pleased to be here. Next slide. The ITCA board, we do an annual survey, which is called our keeping points. This is done for every Part C program, all the states. This is from the last year. As you can show, are you experiencing a provider shortage? It's a very high number. That's been a historical problem for our Part C programs, and this is what it was for the last year. Next slide, please. This might be a little hard to read, but this just indicated what state said they were short of. We have 14 different services and as you can see, the major ones are OT, speech therapy, and physical therapy, which are also the three most used services across the country for our providers. I've talked to my colleagues and this is something we discuss regularly, and I've gotten some thoughts on what they've experienced, and how they can support their program. Next slide, please.

Really I think it really comes down to the leadership, and these are some thoughts that we've had and discussed over time. This is the foundation of it, and I'm taking a slant. I'm not going to provide marketing strategies and other activities to recruit folks, but I think it's critical that leadership really sets



the stage. You develop a clear vision, mission, and purpose for the program and you articulate it regularly. This is very similar for systems change and just developing all of our programs. People need to know where we're going, and how we want to get there. You need strong professional development. Of course, we are licensed folks that worked for Part C, but it's an evolving field with new evidence-based practices coming out, fidelity of practices showing that we're doing what we say we're doing. That requires ongoing professional development in your programs.

Having manageable workloads and expectations, our previous speaker hinted at that too and I think that's a core thing. In Part C, we can have waiting lists and if more kids are coming in, and your service coordinator has a very large case load, they are not going to be able to fulfill all the requirements of this mandated program, and they will be more frustrated. You've got to sometimes spend some more money, get appropriate caseloads or get support to the folks that are doing the work every day. Finally, not finally, provide opportunities for the support to the staff. There are a whole host of things that are available now. Peer support groups, some coaching activities, ongoing professional development, teaming meetings, having folks peer to peer work. It develops a feeling that it's a good place to work, you feel supported and your program will get a reputation that hey, it is a nice place. We really care about our mission and we really care about our staff that are doing the work.

I wrap that all around by calling it developing a culture of learning. We are continuously learning in serving our students that have disabilities. There are new practices, there's more research, there are higher demands. If we have an environment that we will try things and want to learn new things, it has to be well supported that we're all learning this together in a safe place. I think if you can weave those in as your basis for your programs, then you can do other things to recruit and attract other folks. Thank you.

Margo Candelaria

"Maryland's Pyramid Model and Workforce Development"

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you, Allan. Next we have Margo Candelaria. Margo is the Co-director of the Parent Infant Early Childhood team at the Institute for Innovation and Implementation at the University of Maryland School of Social work. Across all her work, she has focused on program evaluation and implementation science, to improve programs for families with young children by using data to inform a continuous quality improvement process. With an emphasis on workforce development, Margot will share a local implementation effort focused on retaining early childhood personnel. Welcome, Margo.

>> Margo Candelaria: Hi. Thank you. You can go to the next slide. I'm going to talk about the Pyramid Model, the National Pyramid Model work that we are implementing, and have been implementing for several years in Maryland. It's primarily driven through two funding streams within the Maryland Department of Education. So we first got funding from the division of early childhood many years ago, to do training and training of trainers in the [inaudible 00:28:00] Pyramid Model. More recently we have moved towards a coaching and technical assistance model, and started a Cadre of master coaches and trainers, and have deepened our work with our state leadership team to better support work force



development throughout the state. Concurrently, we had funds come through from the division of early intervention and Special Education, focusing on the OSEP counties in Part C within Maryland, focused more specifically not just on training, but doing in depth coaching around supporting social emotional development of young children and families through the home visiting Part C programs.

Both of these efforts have included extensive data collection and an online statewide data collection system. Just one example of the work that we're doing is this Cadre of master trainers and coaches. We started almost a year and a half ago identifying 30 people across the state, representing all of the regions and various settings where we encounter young children and need workforce development. So this includes trainings for all Cadre members, and so far we've done practice based coaching, the TPOT model. The TPSTOS is coming in the summer. We've redone all of the train the trainer slides so that everybody is up to date on current and best practices of the Pyramid Model, as they're learning to train in the model. We also do monthly webinars to support coaching practices and coaching to fidelity, and bring in invited speakers, including speakers from out of state who have successfully implemented coaching in their state, to really get people thinking around how do we support this, how do we fund it, how do we maintain it and sustain it.

We also do one on one consultation and coaching of the Cadre members in this parallel process of coaching the coaches. This is an example of our state leadership team plans moving forward. So as Allan just said, leadership is very important. We're investing a lot of time and energy in redoing what's called the benchmarks of quality for at the state level, and the intention here is how do we at the state level make sure we are adequately supporting the workforce to implement this model? So that includes making sure we have representation and membership from all the right stakeholders at the state level, from Headstart, from Special Education, from local districts, so that everybody's implementation is supported and they're at the right table. This also has included getting childcare and our stars, Maryland excels people to think about how do we incorporate incentivizing coaching in their systems.

Within Part C specifically, we are supporting the Pyramid Model in multiple ways. The OSEP, counties have really, the state level has taken on supporting social emotional development and building workforce capacity to support that as a primary goal. They've not only brought Pyramid Model, but they've also brought routines-based interview, and reflective practice-based coaching. These are all being integrated simultaneously in the four OSEP counties. So, what that has meant is we've really supported how to integrate them, not just how to implement Pyramid Model. We're trying to do that in a data driven way, so people are tracking how they're progressing and we're encouraging family coaching. Actually, if you, well in the last, the bottom of the slide is just that we've also been able to adapt it to local needs. So, if a local jurisdiction says this is an area of emphasis for our population, we can adapt it as needed.

This is just a visual of our coaching model, that we are coaching lead staff in the [inaudible 00:31:44] counties, and they do peer coaching on how to coach families to support social emotional concerns. This is just another example of the benchmarks of quality on how we're using data to support the work. The



first box at the top just shows that in the beginning when we first measured it, most of the counties were not reporting systematic screening for social emotional concern. We went in, we coached them, we helped them think through what measures would you use, how would you do it? Six months later, three of the four counties were doing it. We do have an online data tracking system that tracks how many trainers, what trainers they're doing, how they're coaching, are they coaching at a program level, classroom level outcomes, fidelity, certain measures? Too much to go into right now, but we are trying to track it for our state.

This is just an example of the kinds of data we can get to show that coaches are using coaching strategies, high fidelity coaching strategies in a variety of ways across all of the coaching practice meetings. We've been able to move forward and not just focus on OSEP counties. We've now incorporated additional counties in our Part C work. We also are now incorporating Part B, 619, so some jurisdictions are having their um, what we call child find and Maryland three to five programs engage in data collection around training and coaching. We are also now engaging pre-K and K Special Education districts as well. This is a visual of a study that we're beginning to implement right now, so we have one county who has asked that all of their pre-K Special Ed teachers be trained, and coached ongoing. We've one county who said right now they can only commit to training and not coaching.

It was a natural opportunity to do an experiment on what is the benefit of coaching on teacher stress and teacher efficacy, and some of this came from within the district where they said, "We really want to be able to track this." So, this is a study we have going on right now, and hopefully we'll be able to demonstrate positive outcomes of actual engaging coaching, not just training on workforce development. Our next steps are just to continue deepening our support, particularly within the Part C teams and continuing to expand into Part B, Pre-K and kindergarten. In Maryland, we have a prohibition on suspension and expulsion of pre-K through second grade. So, we really see the Pyramid Model is a way to support teachers and not just, obviously complying with the legislation but also successfully keeping kids in schools in ways that don't burn them out. That's it.

Michael Kennedy

"Retaining Effective Personnel: The Role of High-Leverage Practices"

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you, Margo. Next, we have Michael Kennedy. Michael is an associate professor of Special Education in the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia. His main area of research is the design, implementation and experimental testing of multimedia-based interventions to support pre and in-service teachers. Knowledge and implementation of evidence-based and high leverage practices. He also creates instructional vignettes to support literacy related outcomes for students with high incidents disabilities, and implementation of high leverage practices. Michael will share the importance of HLPs, and why they should be a core component of in-service development. Welcome, Michael.

>> Michael Kennedy: Thank you. Thanks to OSEP for having me today, this is a real treat. So, I'm here today to talk about high leverage practices, which I'll refer to throughout as HLPs. Specifically, I'm very



interested in the extent to which HLPs and the associated resources can help to reduce what we might consider to be a revolving door of teachers leaving the field. A quick word on what HLPs are, and then I'll also counter with what they are not. What they are is a set of practices that are considered to be the essence of effective teaching. They are associated with positive student outcomes, and many consider them to be the backbone of more complex practice. So later on, we'll talk about the differences between evidenced based practices and HLPs. One of the things I'll talk about is some of the components of HLPs are indeed embedded within evidence-based practices, but more on that in a few minutes.

The HLPs cut across grade levels and content areas, they apply to students across the ranges of disability fields and learning challenges. As noted, we can break these down into component parts, because the HLPs have been written at a very large grain size. They're intended to be broad, but we can also look within the broadness to find the nuance that can really guide practice. There are 22 HLPs written for Special Education. They cut across four domains; collaboration, assessment, social, emotional, behavioral and instruction. Some examples of the HLPs is use explicit instruction, that's from the instruction domain. From the collaboration domain, collaborate with families. From the social emotional domain, teach social skills. The assessment domain, evaluate and make ongoing adjustments using data, and then provide intensive instruction as an example from the instruction domain.

As you look at these, these are simply samples, but as you look at them, everyone would say, "Well yeah, these are things that we should definitely be using in terms of practice," but there's more to it than that and that's what we're here to talk about. A quick note on some of the confusion around HLPs, there really is a difference. HLPs should not be considered in lieu of, they should not be considered a replacement for evidence-based practices. Instead, some HLPs actually can be considered evidence-based practices. HLP number 20 provide intensive instruction is a good example of that. However, effective teaching is far more complex. You can't simply read the HLP document, see these practices and now I know how to do them. It doesn't work that way. These are intended to be guiding of practice.

We really have to look within to find the nuance, and how these sync up and enhance evidence-based practices as compared to thinking it's this or this. There's been confusion and some controversy around this. We want to be really clear about that. One of the things that I think always happens in teaching, I know this was the case when I was a young educator. My desire to be a good teacher was far stronger than my actual range of skill and practice. I like this picture. I think it demonstrates this idea well, but the audience of this symposium, we're researchers, we're faculty, we're other leaders in the field. It's our responsibility really to provide our teachers and training those in the field with a strong repertoire of practices that are known to be effective under a range of circumstances. I remember my first day as a teacher, the classroom door closed and I'm looking around like, what's been done here? Now what, this is, someone's made a terrible, terrible mistake. It was the principal.

So, I was looking for resources related to HLPs that could be used to help support on a novice teacher, someone in training, even veteran teachers to help be successful. One of the first things that I think all



of us need is just simple awareness and knowledge of these practices. A great place to get simple exposure is resources that are freely available right this minute. CEC, the Cedar Center funded by OSEP have done a terrific job of putting out a wide variety of resources around the HLPs that we can get a lot of good information about. Also highleveragepractices.org is also a terrific website that has all kinds of free resources, some of which I'll talk about in a minute. As you go to the highleveragepractices.org website, you can find lists of the HLPs. Then within each, the specific blurb about each. This is a really nice intro to the HLPs, but that's really what we want all we can consider this to be is an intro.

Teachers need stronger and more connected supports to their individualized practice. I'm not going to read a book on HLPs, and then show up on Monday morning. Now I'm ready to do that. I don't think it quite works that way. I think reading books and accessing information of that sort is a terrific beginning, but we have to make it personalized. We have to make it connected. Some of the ways that CEEDAR, OSEP, CEC are doing that is, here's an example here, right off of the website is the new professional development guide for teachers. Within this are terrific resources. They've got power points, they have agendas with suggested agendas. That was classy. Other resources to go along with it. I've been heading up along with some of my team and collaborators, a video series around the HLPs where we introduce the videos but then also show real teachers and real kids.

Some with disabilities, others with not. Mostly with and talking about okay, when it comes to provide explicit instruction, when it comes to providing intensive instruction, providing high quality feedback across a range of settings; high school, middle school, elementary, significant disabilities, high incidents, disabilities, what do these practices look like? That's really what this video series is all about. So that's been an exciting project to be part of, and more videos are forthcoming. Within each video, this is really one of the key things. So, as I said, the HLPs have been written at this high grain size, and we want to break that down into a little bit more specificity. So, within the videos, we have tried to do that where we pick out the key components, the HLPs within the HLPs if you will and give a little bit more nuance. So, you can look for that level of detail in our videos.

One of the things that teachers benefit from is also receiving meaningful coaching in their classroom. The coaching come from a wide variety of sorts, not every school has access to a coach, but it can come from peers. It can come from actual coaches, instructional coaches, self-study is a possibility, from administrators. Someone coming in to evaluate and not only evaluate, but just give meaningful personalized coaching is really terrific. This is really important though. There's a real challenge with observers for giving HLP feedback, because of the grain size. Some of the times when we're implementing are they doing it or not in terms of implementation. So, the next few slides, did the teacher use explicit instruction, provide feedback or systematically designed instruction towards learning goals? It's yes, they did it. Okay, that's good, but there's more of a nuance to it than that. We really do need to be more specific when we're communicating with our teachers.

We need to break these HLPs into the component parts, and research can guide us in doing that. When we're applying these HLPs to elementary, middle, high school across disability categories, we must do that in order to be specific enough with our teachers. So, while HLPs were identified with the best



available research, we still need these smaller components that can be identified. Here's an example of what that's looked like in some of our work. This is right from Anita Archer and Charles Hughes' book *Explicit Instruction*, and we identified the 16 or 17 critical elements of providing explicit instruction. Putting this kind of checklist into the hands of administrators, into coaches, into colleagues working together, provides us with a much more specific way to say is this explicit instruction being implemented in a high-quality way? In addition to that, coaches can also benefit from guiding questions and other prompts that they can work with. So, working not just to identify the components, but also these are the kinds of questions we should be thinking about and grappling with as educators.

It's also not only for observation, but we want other materials. So, on this handout, we can see that there are relevant journal articles that we've identified. Relevant websites, Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds will talk in a few minutes about the NCII website. It's a treasure trove of high-quality materials that are evidence-based and should be in the hands of teachers, and that's what we should be identifying and putting into the hands of teachers to go along with the coaching and support with them. The last word I want to say is also about modeling. So often in professional development, somebody like me shows up and talks. Talking about these practices is fine. All well and good, but we also need to have more of a role play. We need to have more of a modeling. Teachers need to see themselves in the instances where the practices are being implemented, and modeling is a very effective way to do that. We don't always have high quality videos.

We're trying, but we can't capture all the nuance of every single practice, but as I'm developing professional development, I know my local setting, I know my local teachers, I know what my students need, and I can do that kind of model to help support implementation of the practices. So that's my time. Thank you for having me and see you around.

Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds

"Developing Expertise to Support Students who Require Intensive Intervention"

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you, Michael. Next, we have Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds. Rebecca is a principle researcher at the American Institutes for Research, AIR, where she serves as the co-director of the National Center on Intensive Intervention, and as project director for an Investing in Innovation and Improvement Development Grant. Rebecca will share with us that in addition to the knowledge and skills of HLPs that Michael discuss, some personnel especially those who work with children with the most intensive needs, need additional knowledge and skill to be effective. Welcome, Rebecca.

>> Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: Good afternoon. Often, we have folks not quite understanding why intensive intervention is so important. Remediation programs or standardized intervention programs that you may might see at a tier two level of a MTSS or RTI system are often sort of seen as the standard approach to providing intervention to all students. What we know about students with intensive needs is that they actually need more help. Standardized programs that have been validated are not necessarily universally effective. So, by that we mean that there are about 20% of at-risk students that



we estimate, that do not respond adequately to programs that work generally for students who have intervention needs. So, these students need something more.

Another thing we know about this population of students is that they often require significantly more practice of intended 30 times the number of practice opportunities than their peers to learn new information. So, this means we need to think differently about how time is spent and how their school day runs, because we're not going to be able to make the day 30 times longer. So, we have to think more creatively about what we do for these students, to make sure they learn critical information. Through the National Center on Intensive Intervention, we focus on database individualization as an approach to providing intensive intervention. This DBI process is rooted in 40 years of randomized trials that started at the University of Minnesota, on a clinical experimental teaching. The basis for this DBI approach is to start with a validated program that again, we know is generally effective for most students, to monitor progress and see if students are responding first.

So, number one, we need to make sure that they're getting the program that is being delivered with fidelity, and then we're monitoring progress to see if it's working or not. If it is working, we say great, keep doing it. If it's not working, this is when we need to go to the next phase. This is where we look at diagnostic data. This can be academic information, work samples, achievement test data. We can be doing some error analysis of our progress monitoring samples, or it could also be information from the behavior realms of information from functional assessment, attendance info data or other kinds of information about a student's health, vision, hearing and so forth. By gathering this information, we're then able to develop a hypothesis about why the student may not be making adequate progress. Based on that hypothesis, we adapt the intervention and implement those adaptations and then see how they're working. Again, we're monitoring their progress using a validated tool.

At this point again, we look at how that response has looked. If they are responding, great. We say keep doing what you're doing, keep taking data to make sure it's continuing, but keep doing what you're doing. If it's not working, we go back to the diagnostic data to come up with additional potential hypotheses about the student's intervention needs, and use that to then further adapt the intervention and monitor progress. Students with severe and persistent learning and behavior needs, we know require ongoing and data driven instruction to design to address the challenges that they have at school. I think that that's something that most people who are working in this field would generally agree with. However, teachers also need additional training and support to develop this expertise. It is unrealistic to expect that a teacher leaving a teacher preparation program in her first year of teaching, is going to have the range of skills needed to meet the needs of this very diverse population. So, we really need to be thinking about how as a system do we provide these ongoing supports.

We often get asked the question about who should deliver intensive intervention. I'd say the top of that list should be special educators. These people are uniquely trained with both the pedagogical skills, and the ability to use data to provide this kind of instruction. In addition, intervention specialists, people who are reading mathematics or behavior specialists may be also uniquely equipped to do this work.



Other folks in the school that may be in a position to either provide the intervention or provide supporting roles in this work could be school psychologists, social workers, or related service personnel depending on the nature of the need. I want to clarify here however that although they may play an important supportive role and the delivery of an intensive intervention, in most cases it was not going to be realistic to ask a classroom teacher to deliver intensive intervention of this intensity, nor should a para educator on his or her own be left to do this without adequate training and support.

What should these supports emphasize? If I'm a new teacher who's left my teacher preparation program and maybe I've got some good skills, but I know I need to continue to grow, what are some of the things that I should be looking for and where are the skills that I should be looking to develop if I want to be better at delivering intensive intervention? So, I'm going to talk about five things that I think would be really important for new teachers, or people providing professional development to teachers on an ongoing basis. These are some of the things I would suggest that you think about. The first is helping teachers to become very facile with data. Both learning how to collect those data and interpret them and understanding their purpose. So, for example, screening, progress monitoring and diagnostic data serve very different purposes in schools. It's critical that teachers understand those purposes, so that they can interpret the information correctly.

Screening can help us determine who needs additional support, can help us identify individuals who may be at risk. It may also help us perform subgroup analysis or look overall at how is our school doing at serving its population. On the other hand, progress monitoring is really intended to be used to help you determine when a change is needed. This is usually done on an individual or small group basis to help a teacher determine whether or not a student, or small group of students is responding to instruction or intervention. Then the third category on this list is diagnostic data, and this is intended to help determine why progress isn't maybe what you would like it to be. So, this allows you to dig into more information about the students to identify skill, strengths, and weaknesses, to help make productive adaptations. On our center's website, you can learn more about valid and reliable screening and progress monitoring tools on our tools charts. Then we also provide a list of common diagnostic tools that we see used in the field, both in the realms of academics and behavior, and the links are provided on the slide.

The second recommendation I would make is to develop expertise in explicit instruction, which you've heard, I probably had identified as a high-leverage practice. This is a high-leverage practice for which there is a strong evidence-base. The reason I say this is because explicit instruction is really fundamental to most validated intervention programs designed to help support students with intensive learning needs, or students who may be at risk for having a learning problems. Within explicit instruction that includes things like being planful in how you are delivering information, having a very clear role, a goal in mind and also providing information about how you should approach modeling, how you should provide feedback and give opportunities for practice. There are a number of things that comprise delivering explicit instruction. Again, this is something that you may start to learn as part of your preparation program, but this is something that all of us can continue to get better at.



Opportunities to do this should really be a foundational piece of any teachers work. We have information on this course that we have recently posted to our website on focused on explicit instruction. This is free and downloadable. It can be used by faculty members, can be used by professional development providers, or an individual who just wants to learn more. In addition, coming soon we have courses on mathematics, reading, and classroom management for students receiving intensive intervention. So, stay tuned for those. Number three is to develop skills to support students with challenging behavior. There are a range of tools that we provide in this area as I mentioned earlier. We have tools charts that provide screening and assessment. I'm sorry, screening and progress monitoring reviews of different tools. We have those in the area of behavior in addition to academics. There's also a professional learning module on that space.

We also provide guidance on how to conduct functional assessment, and then also how to think about providing classroom management supports to students who are receiving intervention. Whether it's in the context of an intensive intervention, or whether it's a student who has intensive intervention needs, who's participating in a general education environment. This chart just provides links to a number of different resources in this space. The fourth is to learn strategies for intensifying and intervention. So, we at the center, approach thinking about intensifying and intervention using a taxonomy of intervention intensity. So that may include considering things like strength of the program. So how strong is the evidence that the validated platform you're using is actually effective? Is the dosage sufficient for a student to be able to actually make progress?

If the program recommends that you deliver it four days a week, and you're delivering at one day a week, is that going to be enough to see the kind of changes you might hope for? Is the intervention aligned to the student's area of need? You would be surprised at how often those two things are not well considered when students are placed into intervention programs. Then in addition, we think about things like intending to transfer, behavior planning and individualization of the supports that are provided based on student response. So, we also provide a number of content specific resources about how to approach intensification. We have a number of lesson plans, examples in literacy and mathematics, and also some standardized tools. Not standardized, but function-based behavior intervention supports that are designed to help teachers think about how to implement behavior supports for students either in the classroom, or an intervention group, but that are linked to the function of their behavior.

You can go ahead and continue with the slide. So, we have a number of resources available on our website. These include videos, scripted lessons and so forth. Finally, our final recommendation is to get used to planning for the whole child, very often and historically the way we've rolled out tiered supports, we've had an academic intervention group and a behavior intervention group that sits in plans separately. We would advocate particularly when you reach the intensive intervention level, that these teams plan together. Very often these students who have academic problems may develop co-occurring behavior problems, as a way to avoid challenging academic work. On the flip side, a child with a behavior problem may also miss out on so much instruction that they get behind academically, and then



these problems snowball. So, in our work we very much advocate the teams work together and have people with both sets of expertise on the team when planning for a student.

We've got a number of resources in this space as well. We've got a book on essentials of intensive intervention as well that is coming out at the end of this month as well as a number of free and downloadable forms on our website, designed to help intervention teams collect data for planning meetings to collect data for how to develop an initial intervention plan for a student, and even a sample agenda and process that they might follow for conducting an intervention planning session. So, with that, I'm going to turn it back to our moderator. I believe we got another person coming. So, thank you very much.

Terry Scott

"Classroom Management Through the Lens of Effective Instruction: What Teachers Can Do"

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you, Rebecca. Next, we have Terry Scott. Terry is a Professor and Distinguished University Scholar in the College of Education in Human Development at the University of Louisville and is director of the Center for Instructional and Behavioral Research in schools. Terry will describe his collaborative work with the state of Kentucky, providing technical assistance for ongoing professional development focused on school wide prevention systems, and the role of instructional variables in managing student behavior, one of the most frequently cited reasons teachers cite for leaving the classroom. Welcome, Terry.

>> Terry Scott: Thank you and welcome. I have the job of talking about the relationship between behavior in the classroom and what that means for teachers. I feel like the table was set for me coming in first was with Bettini talked about some of the challenges we have for keeping teachers and training teachers and setting them up to be successful. Then Michael Kennedy talked a lot about HLPs and set the occasion for what that means. What I want to do is take that to the next step, and talk about what does that mean for the teachers that are both coming in and that are already there for us? The next slide. One of the things we know is that, and you've heard this already today. If you ask new teachers or even experienced teachers, what are the things that bother you the most about going to your job every day? Behavior is always at or near the very top of that list. It's a big reason for burnout.

One of the things we know is that we don't train people very well to deal with those things. So, at higher Ed, we aren't doing all that we could or should to set people up to be comfortable when they get to the classroom, and see kids having problem behaviors. One of the things we also know about that is most of the problem behaviors that we're going to see in a school, in fact what you're seeing on the slide here is an analysis of 23,000 suspensions. 70% of those emanate from the classroom. If all the data we have says behaviors are going to happen in the classroom, and teachers are ill equipped to deal with those, what it is a prescription for both student and teacher failure. So, I'm setting a really bleak scene here from the start, but I'm going to go on to so what can we do about it? The next slide. There are things that we know work and again, Michael laid out HLPs and gave great examples of those, but I want to think about HLPs in another way. What if we called them high probabilities?



In other words, for every kid that's having a problem or not out there, there are a million things you could do. I'd like you to think about it like this. If you are watching a classroom on video and the kids in that classroom were having problem behaviors, and I told you I'll give you \$1 million if the kids in that classroom reduce their problems, are more on task and there's better learning going on. What would you want the teacher in that room to do? Without ever even looking at that classroom, you already in your mind know clearly there are some things I don't want that teacher to do. Nothing you could choose is 100%. Nothing's going to work for every kid, nothing's going to work every time, but some things are much more likely to work. That's what the HLPs are all about. I like to think of instruction first and again, that's really what Michael did is talked about instruction. I think the better part of what I want to talk about for classroom management today is instructional.

I'd like to take this back to a very famous researcher in education named David Berliner. After doing dozens of years, decades of work looking at classrooms and what is often called the effective classrooms literature, David Berliner boiled this down and said, "If I had to take everything I've looked at and say there's one thing that was most important, it would be engagement." To what degree does the teacher have the ability to make that student look and listen and be interested? In fact, what he said is if you're an educator, you should think of engagement as the foundation of everything we do. It should be like if we were physicists, it would be our gravity. If we were biologists, that would be our homeostasis. If we were psychologists, it would be our reinforcement. Engagement. When I talk to schools and teachers about engagement, a common refrain is well, I'd love to engage those kids, but they've got problem behaviors.

To me, I think that's the whole reason why we need to talk about effective instruction, and effective management. Those two things together are what worked for us for engagement. We can't engage kids without those pieces. So, some of the work we've been doing is actually going into schools, and watching what teachers do. We know the things that are high probability, high-leverage. How much of those things do teachers actually do? When you look at the data out there, and we've got tens of thousands of these observations, many of the things that I would say I would put my money on if I were betting are things that don't happen very often. So, we did a big analysis of three of the biggest effects. One would be active teaching. Is the teacher up looking at kids, talking about instruction? Two, to what degree is the teacher asking the kids what they think? We call these opportunities to respond.

It can be anything from raise your hand if you agree with me, to turn to your neighbor and tell him what you think, to build one of those at your desk, raise your green card. Anything that makes the kids think about the content of the instruction and respond. Third, to what degree is the teacher saying positive things to kids as feedback? It can be as simple as thank you. In fact, we even code thumbs up. So, we look at just those three things. The evidence that we have out there says you'll get your biggest effect from doing those, but we've always talked about these as instruction and they are, but here's what we found. If you were to cluster teachers in terms of how much of those three things they use, teachers using those things in the lower third of all teachers are 27% more likely to have kids off task, or another



way to say that as the kids in that room are 27% more likely to be off task, and a whopping 67% more likely to be disruptive.

What teachers do during instruction is the best predictor we have of what kids do during instruction. We just did another analysis with about 1,600 of these, and what we found is that you can also predict school suspensions based upon the school wide levels of those things that we see. That one is just for OTRs and positive feedback. Yet if you look at rates of positive feedback, the average kid is hearing something positive from a teacher anywhere between once every five, and once every 20 minutes depending upon their age. We have all these opportunities to say, "Wow, thanks for being here. Thanks for being seated. Thanks for looking at me, thanks for ..." We don't take advantage of all the opportunities we have. Go to the next slide, please. I think we have to consider that effective instruction and classroom management are symbiotic, or synergistic. You can't use one effectively without the other.

I always like to think back on I was a counselor in a residential treatment facility for five years before becoming a Special Ed teacher. When I got my first job in special Ed, behavior management was a piece of cake except that I really didn't know how to use instruction. While it started out being easy to manage behavior, there is a point where the kids were looking at me like, why are we sitting? I really didn't have a good answer for that. You have to have management so that you can make instruction work, and when instruction works and you're saying, "Wow, you guys are really good at this," management becomes easy. As it becomes easy, instruction works better, and we need this to cycle in that direction. Unfortunately, if when a kid walks in the room, the first thing that happens is a negative interaction, then instruction that's not engaging, which sets up this escape motivated problem behavior and a negative interaction that's even bigger and suspension, and we know where this goes. It's negative and it's a poor prognosis for the future of both the student and the teacher. The next slide.

If we were going to look at what are the things that good managers do? These are the HLPs, these are the big things. I'm not going to read through them. What I want you to think about as you look at those is what's the difference between looking at that and saying here's what effective management is, and looking at that and saying, here's what effective instruction is. If we were teaching, reading or math, there are rules. There are things you have to attend to; some basic foundations and we have to be explicit about those. We need to give examples and we're going to practice, and we're going to prompt, and we're going to encourage, and we're going to try to get into routines where kids are doing these things in authentic ways. We want a lot of back and forth with them, a lot of engagement. I want the teacher moving around the room and talking to kids and being engaged with them. I want there to be a genuineness to the relationship.

I'm describing our high probabilities for success with classroom management, but they're exactly the same as effective instruction. So, while I'm talking about effective instruction and effective management, to a large degree I consider them to be the same thing. That what we're doing is bottom line, how do we make kids successful? What are the things that I could do that would increase the



probability of the average kid being successful in my classroom? To do that, we have to change adult behavior first, us. It's our behavior that has to change before the kids are going to change. If I say what's two plus two and the kid says five, they're going to say five again the next time unless I do something different. So regardless of where the error occurs, it's going to be incumbent upon us as adults. To train adults to change our behavior is no different than looking at training or teaching kids. We need to be explicit with what the things are that work.

We need to engage adults, we need to have discussions in a back and forth. We need to prompt and remind and encourage them. We need to be around them. We need to give them feedback, and that's hard to do in the context of we're already in school and there's a lot of teachers here, and not a lot of administrators. So, a couple of the ways we've looked at dealing with that is to look at using structures that are already in the school. Things like professional learning communities. So, I want to show you a video coming up here. This is a clip of a little bit longer video. This is about 10 minutes long. What we do in these videos is we just simply say, here are some high-leverage practices. For managing a classroom, this particular set was move around the room, make eye contact with kids, use your words to set what's coming next. Prompts and reminders, et cetera. So, what we do is we talk about that briefly. These are the big ideas and then we say, here are some examples.

We actually got focus groups together with real teachers and said, give me an example of a time when that would be necessary? We shot these examples. As you watch this, at the end I think is the important part. What we want is for every teacher in that PLC or whatever else we're doing this, to watch this and then to have an opportunity at the end to say that wouldn't work in my room, which is a very common phrase. That's great, but it wouldn't work in my room because if they're not voicing that, we don't get a chance to say, you're right, your kids are unique. What do we have to do to make it work with your kids in your room, and really have an opportunity to coach through that? So, take a look at this.

>> Video of teachers using proximity, voice, and eye contact to prompt desired behavior without initiating a conflict.

>> Terry Scott: I want to show you one more thing very quickly. Again, what we did is we had focus groups of teachers tell us here are the things that we'd like to see. So, here's a mashup of examples of kids having problems, and other ones where kids are having problems and teachers are dealing with it.

>> Video of kids having behavior problems and teachers responding in different ways

>> Terry Scott: So very quickly then what we do is we go into schools, and we give them actual feedback. Here's what's going on in your school. If you go to the next slide. What we do is we give them, in the schools where we're playing with this, we give them an iPad if they don't have one, and we say in your PLC you need to go and do an observation of one of your peers. Let them set a goal and then on a regular basis, monthly, let's go in and observe one another and set goals for improving that. So, you can see the graph on the right there is from a school we're working with, with just positive and negative



feedback. So again, the big ideas here are instruction and management are part of the same animal. How we're going to do this is going to have to be engaging adults in the same way we've talked about engaging students. So, thank you very much.

Daniel Sherlock

"A Teacher's Perspective on Retention: The Importance of Effective Preparation"

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you, Terry. Next, we have Daniel Sherlock. Daniel is a Special Education teacher with the District of Columbia Public Schools. He also works as a research assistant at the University of Maryland College Park in cognition and development, and the bilingual and bi literacy research labs. He has worked for the past 15 years with individuals with disabilities in a variety of educational, clinical and recreational settings. He has an undergraduate degree in psychology from George Mason University, and a master's degree in Special Education from Vanderbilt University. We are very happy to have Daniel with us today to share a teacher's perspective about the skills and knowledge he has found useful, to facilitate his teaching career and success. Daniel.

>> Daniel Sherlock: Okay. So, I was asked to talk today about three points. My training as a Special Education teacher, how my training has effectively prepared me, and ways in which my training has led me to stay in the field. I've organized my remarks around several competencies that I feel are necessary to be an effective Special Education teacher. In what follows, I would describe these competencies and discuss the training that I received in each. Of the comprehensive list of knowledge and practice standards, for special educators have been developed by professional organizations and license your entities, I've narrowed my discussion here to two. Cognitive development and evidence-based practice. In doing so, I will not speak directly to the dedication in myriad of professional skills, which is time management and collaboration necessary for effective Special Education practice.

Rather, I set my aim on the knowledge foundations, the comparison core of effective practice. So, to begin, I will discuss the importance of training in cognitive development for special educators. By this I'm referring broadly to main general faculties such as memory retention and self-regulation, as well as the main specific processes such as motivation, reasoning and numeracy, literacy and other content domains. This of course is a simplistic and truncated account of the broad and diverse topics within the cognitive development literature. Purposes here are very [inaudible 01:19:10] to surveys. Much research has shown that various cognitive processes relate in complex and evolving ways throughout development. Findings show that both large and subtle developmental on individual differences exist. Then overtime these differences can manifest in significant learning difficulties for some.

For special educators, knowledge of the cognitive factors that underlie development is imperative for understanding our students' academic and behavioral difficulties. Armed with this knowledge, we can more purposefully and effectively target our assessment instructional efforts. As one example, a former second grade student of mine experienced significant decoding and spelling difficulties. Comprehensive evaluation revealed clear difficulties on a range of fun logical processing task, showing the profile developmental dyslexia. With this information in hand, I was able to select a progress monitoring



measure instructional practices aligned to our needs. Importantly, and as I'll expand upon next, both were empirically validated. Over time, I'm happy to share that she responded well to this intervention and was eventually exited from Special Education services.

It is sadly not always the case that our interventions are as effective. However, by considering underlying causal factors, we can avoid wasting valuable time and effort in programs and practices that may hold face validity but ignore the root causes for students' difficulties. I'm grateful that both my undergraduate and graduate teacher training programs strongly emphasize coursework and practice, informed by cognitive development. As a result, I left with an understanding of the underlying cognitive mechanisms to drive academic and social performance. As a teacher, this has proven invaluable. This training is provided as with the example of my former second grade student, a roadmap for assessment instructional efforts. Furthermore, this training prepared me to effectively discuss my student's unique learning needs and clear an actionable detail with colleagues and students' families.

In these ways, I've been able to approach my work competently, efficiently and effectively. I turn now to the topic of evidence-based practice. Identifying the cause of the problem is of little practical value if not followed by action. It is the job of Special Education also to intervene. To this end, validated assessments and evidence-based practices are key. By this I'm referring to assessment measures, instructional practices or programs that have been empirically validated specifically for students with disabilities. This is in contrast to practices that may hold popular appeal, and maybe critical and of importance for our work, but lacks scientific evidence regarding their effectiveness. Where detailed and nuanced definitions can be found at the What Works Clearinghouse and evidence for SO website among others.

Over the past 30 years, the enormous volume of empirical educational research has focused on validating assessments and interventions, aimed at behavioral and academic performance. From this collective literature, a large and growing inventory of validated assessments and evidence-based practices has steadily accumulated. The scope of this work is immense, and I therefore do not intend here to review it, rather I intend simply to make the point that it does exist. Thankfully in recent years, great efforts have been taken to synthesize and translate findings from this literature and high-quality practice guide, summaries and tutorials, all designed for educational practitioners. Moreover, many of these resources are freely available through publicly funded online technical centers, such as National Center on Intensive Intervention, the doctors met and discussed. In addition, many professional organizations and special interest groups have also gone to great lengths to translate this research for teachers and other educational practitioners.

The result of this work is open access to practical information about a large and ever-growing supply of assessments instructional practices, that have been shown effective through rigorous scientific investigation. Returning again to my former second grade student, it was my use of evidence based instructional practices that made all the difference for her. The same can be said for countless other students who have received such interventions. I would contend that sadly not all are responsive to even our best evidence-based interventions. For such students however, research is emerging on how to further tailor instruction to meet their unique learning needs in systematic and effective ways. Well



much work remains we have advanced significantly as a field over the past 40 years, and our goal of identifying effective ways, to identify and address our student's academic and behavioral difficulties. As I have discussed, this is culminated in large by the validated assessments and evidence-based practices.

We must now continue to expand special educators' understanding and adoption of them. Time is too valuable, and the stakes are too high for us not to. In closing, the two domains I touched upon today, cognitive development and evidence-based practice are central to the work of special educators. This has been the position held in varying forms by teachers, teacher educators for decades and continues to take the central in current teacher training programs initiatives. So, the progress in these areas then can at times be frustrating. Solely however, progress has been achieved. Moreover, we are well positioned to further these advances. Indeed, I hope that through this talk, I've made clear how easily and effectively such knowledge of practices can be applied to our work. As any special educator can attest, there's no shortage of challenges in our line of work. At times, our large caseloads, mountains of paperwork and never-ending list of responsibilities can easily become overwhelming.

There's no doubt that these and other factors lead to burnout, and sadly result in many leaving our profession. To improve teacher retention, great effort then will be needed on a number of fronts to address how we conceptualize structure and fund Special Education. In my remarks, I spoke to one critical component to these ends, training. Certainly, the training I received in cognitive development, evidence-based practices in addition to many other important areas, prepared me to enter into the profession with the requisite knowledge and skills to meaningfully understand my students' difficulties, and to effectively target them through interventions. Furthermore, the foundational knowledge that I developed has served as a launchpad for a career of continual growth and development. On reflection, this training then has been critical in my decision each year to continue teaching. So, training on the two-topic discussed here could not address all the challenges that confront special educators.

It can do much in supporting an effective practice and professional fulfillment. As the next step, I hope to see training in these areas more widely scaled and applied. Thank you for your time.

Alabama State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)

"How Instructional Coaching Supports and Sustains Effective Personnel in Alabama"

>> Dawn Ellis: [inaudible 01:25:22] known as SPDG. The Alabama SPDG developed as video to highlight how Alabama is using instructional coaching to support and sustain effective personnel in the state. As stated earlier, the department [inaudible 01:25:40]. When we come back live, we will have our panel join us to address some of your questions.

>> Jim Knight: There's a heck of a lot that's been written about the complexity of helping relationships. When we really look at what's involved in status issues, motivation, identity, professionalism and helping relationships, it becomes pretty clear that if you treat an adult like a child, if you do your professionalism to them and you watch them and try to make what they do, it violates almost everything we know about the nature of effective relationships between adults. If we feel our job is to



watch what teachers do and know what's best for them, and not give them a voice and monitor every little thing they do, because we don't have faith in teachers, we treat them like children. Just like we say, you got to put your coat on before you go outside. We say you've got to make sure you do the advanced organizer the way I said, and it's going to engender resistance that we have a history of teachers resisting professionalism, because they haven't been treated like adults. A helping relationship should be equal. It should be something that the teacher has a voice in. They should set the goals. So, we really see teachers as partners in the process. That's what we want is where everybody leaves better for the experience.

>> Narrator: For more than a decade, the Alabama State Personnel Development Grant, has focused upon instructional coaching as a method to support and sustain effective personnel. This is Alabama story told in the voices of teachers, instructional coaches and school staff.

Staff from Alabama use their coaching data to improve outcomes for teachers and students. For example, a few years ago, our stakeholders survey results found the projects had lower scores for feedback from coaches. As a result, Alabama provided additional training and increased their use of elbow coaching by consultants. Midyear coaching evaluation results found significant improvement in their coaching data.

>> Alabama Faculty 1: Maybe what we thought we were doing, we've been together for 10 years. We thought we were doing a good job, but we have learned that we were not getting the full potential out of each of us [inaudible 01:28:03], and we've seen great growth.

>> Donna Ploessl: Click of a button. A coach located in Melville, who happens to be an expert in behavior is able to connect with, collaborate with, and support a novice teacher to implement PBIS strategies in a rural classroom across the state. The teacher with the support of the coach, experiences success in practice and how the intervention impacts students' positive behaviors, and then continues to use the positive intervention.

>> Lisa Dear: The support I provide through E-coaching and coaching the teachers is incredible together. It definitely takes time, overcomes barriers of time of distance between us, and it is used only to provide support, collaboration among the teachers and it helps us to build lasting relationships with everyone involved.

>> Narrator: Coaching changed the way that my teachers viewed our school. We moved from teachers to teams of teachers. Small word difference, huge change at our school.

>> Ashley Clapy: Four years ago, I began this co-teaching journey as a general education teacher with Ms. Vicky Brown as our instructional support coach. As a result of Ms. Brown support, I decided to pursue certification in the area of Special Education. I will announce your request in assignment change from the general education classroom to the area of Special Education. Within instructional support for



Ms. Brown, we saw success quickly in our classrooms. We couldn't have accomplished so much in so little time without Ms. Brown's feedback, and her constant support.

>> Frannie S. Adams: During the 2017-2018 school year, we paired a first-year teacher, Special Education teacher with an experienced teacher with 20 years of experience. This dyad through intensive coaching became demo ready during the first 10 months. Now our Special Education teacher is excited about teaching. He has seen an increase in the student's test scores, and he has seen on reduction in discipline. We have learned that through coaching, it not only benefits our students, but it benefits our teachers also.

>> Alabama Faculty 2: The classroom. So, in my mind when I began to look at instructional coaching, is going back to the heart of education, and that's where teachers are teaching, and students are learning.

Questions and Answers

>> Dawn Ellis: Welcome back. I've asked some of the speakers to join together as a panel for the Q&A session. We have received numerous questions throughout the symposium, and we'll try to answer as many of those as we can. If you still have a question, please submit it in the ask a question box under the Q&A tab near the bottom of your screen. Our first question is for Michael. Are the factors that impact retaining effective personnel similar across disciplines, for example, special Ed, school psychology, others?

>> Michael Kennedy: I don't think they are. Broadly speaking there certainly I would think be factors that are common, pressures that impact all teachers. Lack of time and issues in preparation. We certainly can't prepare every teacher for every scenario, but I know that there are really big differences across the grade levels, across the disciplinary areas that are meaningful. I'm thinking about Special Ed teacher and all of the paperwork, managing IEP goals, implementing elements of intensive intervention. The body of knowledge and the amount of time that it takes for that teacher to do all of the nuanced parts of his or her job are quite different than a science teacher.

Then on the other hand, the science teacher has a very specific set of training from their disciplinary perspective, but then they're asked to teach kids with disabilities for whom they've received often very little training. Maybe one course intro to special Ed, which is not a course that prepares anyone really for anything with respect to implementing evidence-based practices. So, yes.

>> Dawn Ellis: Okay. Thank you, Michael. Our next question is for Margo. How can families be involved in supporting the retention of personnel in early childhood systems?

>> Margo Candelaria: That's a great question. I think there's two ways parents can be involved, particularly in Part C because it's home based primarily. We are depending on the providers to engage parents. You're not really coaching a peer provider to manage a classroom, you're really coaching a



parent to help manage behavior in the home. So that really depends on a partnership with the parent, and the National Pyramid Model has specific training and models that are individual parent coaching, as well as group parent groups. So that's the way I think to use the parent relationship as a way to I think increase confidence and capacity for the workforce. I think a bigger way is, I talked with the leadership teams that the Pyramid Model uses and that has several layers.

So, you can be at the state level, a jurisdictional level, or a program level leadership team. They always recommend having parent voice and representation on that leadership team to explain what it feels like from the parent's perspective. To have a child with behavioral or social emotional concerns, or to be involved in a family that's complex and needy in different ways, and what it feels like to receive support for that child or that family situation. I think that also helps the providers understand from a parent's perspective how to engage in that work.

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you, Margo. Rebecca, one of our participants writes, I wasn't trained to do intensive intervention in my preparation program. Where can I learn more?

>> Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: Well, my first recommendation is our website, the www.intensiveintervention.org. We have a variety of resources that are designed for universal consumption by anyone who is able to open a web browser. We provide information about how to review assessment and intervention tools using our tools charts. We also have a number of professional modules for TA providers, or technical assistance providers, professional development coordinators for school districts, faculty members that they can take and use and download themselves and embed into their PD or training materials. In addition, we've recently posted a series of online courses that are designed for a similar purpose that could be used in a flipped classroom kind of model. There are prerecorded lectures and practice activities, performance assessments and so forth, that folks can take and use as part of ongoing training.

I would encourage anyone who is interested in learning more to spend some time on our website, but also seek out professional learning opportunities related to some of the content that I spoke about during my session, because those elements are critical features of how to approach intensive intervention.

>> Dawn Ellis: Okay. Thank you. Daniel, we have, it's a two-part question for you. What pre-service experiences did you have that were critical to prepare you for effective practice?

>> Daniel Sherlock: Right. I spent, in my master's program is really where I was trained, a solid year of coursework, really going through evidence-based practices, a number of core content areas and behavior. Then the second part of my master's program was a full year of student teaching where we received some really great feedback weekly on all the things that we are doing, and it was really driven by evidence-based practices and providing justifications for the practice that we are selecting for our students.



>> Dawn Ellis: Okay. The second part of that is what in-service or professional development resources have been helpful for continued learning?

>> Daniel Sherlock: I relied really heavily on resources like National Center on Intensive Intervention and other publicly funded technical centers, and all the resources that are provided through those. I'm always amazed at how many free resources are out there if you're just willing to put in the time to look through them. A lot of the regional educational laboratories, for example, publish it seems like an unending list of reports on different practices, which are a great way to get familiar with them and then dive in more deeply if you're interested. I've relied a lot on that.

>> Dawn Ellis: All right. Thank you, Daniel. Rebecca, we have another two-part question for you. What are some models that support educators and partnering with parents as part of their implementation of the skills and practices?

>> Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: I think that MTSS is actually a very useful framework for thinking about communication with parents and families related to their students' progress. By that I mean at the core or tier one level, there should be general efforts to reach out to parents to let them know about the school's program, to do conferences with parents, to let them know about initial screening data for their students and what that information means. Also, general information about the schools, MTSS, RTI or PBIS framework. If there's one in place, that could be done in a PTA meeting or as part of an online webinar or video that you have on the website, or other published materials.

Then at that tier two level where maybe a student has been identified is at risk and is receiving some kind of intervention, then the communication also ratchets up. At that point, you are letting families know that they have been identified, the types of intervention supports they're going to receive within the context of general education, what you're going to do to help address that challenge. Then also you'll report regularly on the student's progress using valid and reliable progress monitoring data and thinking about formats for reporting on that information in a way that parents can understand. Then finally, when it reaches the level where a student may have an intensive intervention need, or even be referred for Special Education, at that point this information is not new. They've received some communication and feedback from teachers over the course of time.

They've had a chance to develop some relationships and understand what the school has already done to try to help address their student's learning or behavior needs. So, at that point then the intervention planning may become more focused and intentional and again, a Special Ed referral may happen at that point as well. I do think that that MTSS model can be helpful for thinking about this. A couple of places that I think provides some really excellent resources are the National Center on Learning Disabilities has some really useful information on their website, and on the understood.org website for communicating with, for teachers and parents facilitating communication and a parent toolkits for the kind of questions that they may want to ask when their students are being evaluated, or when they're about to attend a meeting to talk about intervention, or potentially Special Education needs.



I also think that it can be helpful. We have a series of materials on our website also designed for communicating with parents, and also thinking about how you communicate about data to parents, because I think that is one of the places where information can often be very confusing. Finally, I would say offering to meet with parents in a number of formats can be very helpful. As a person who has to travel for works from time to time, I last week had to miss my two-year old's nursery school conferences, first conference. I was very sad that I couldn't be there in person, but because they had a way for me to call in and do a conference call, that meant I could participate and still have that conversation and then follow up separately. I think willingness to think creatively about things like that and whether there are different formats for parents and families, who are working or who have other constraints, can be particularly helpful in facilitating this positive working relationship with families.

>> Dawn Ellis: Okay. The second part of that, what are some of the models that support educators in partnering with parents, and being advocates and champions for improved systems of support for educator retention?

>> Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: Again, I think models is not necessarily the word I would use, but I think some of the strategies I already noted are particularly critical. I also think that again, coming back to how do we talk about the data that we are sharing with parents, being very clear about when data where we're sharing about students compared to their peers who are working at grade level, versus performance compared to themselves. If they are working well below grade level, and what that may mean for how their performance may look both within the context of intervention they may be receiving, and then versus how they may look on a state assessment or end of year report card or something like that. Again, I think that if you think of this tiered approach to intervention and support, if we think of that in a parallel way for how we talk to parents, I think that that can be useful for how we may triage the level of supports that may be needed for different families, for different students.

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you. Terry, one of our participants writes, "I often find behavior issues overwhelm our other efforts to implement HLPs and other practices. When behaviors are severe and chronic, what should teachers do?"

>> Terry Scott: Well, when behaviors are severe and chronic, we need to take advantage of our systems of support. So, one of our systems of support is our PBIS or MTSS and those other things we have going on in our school. The second is our IDEA. We have things in place to provide supports at each of those levels, but I'd like to take it back even a step further than that and say if we don't have those systems in place and working well, then that's not as available to teachers. So, I think I'd like to take this back even a step before we identify kids that have those problems of that size, and say what are the basic things that we as a school believe in, and how do we support and encourage those things across all the adults in our school? Clearly, they are going to be kids for whom everything we've got and everything we can do is going to be insufficient, and they're going to need far more intensive care.



The only way we know who those kids are is to have provided all that prevention up front. So, if I'm a teacher and I've got a student in my classroom, who isn't responding to the things that I think are high leverage practices, my first thought is who can I get here to do some assessment with me to think through what I can do to possibly prevent some of that from happening tomorrow. I think that is the first step. How do we have a better tomorrow if we look at this like how do we fix this kid completely? That's a very difficult thing to look at. So, it should always come back to, what are the things that I could do in this room tomorrow that would increase the probability that that student would have some success, that I could use to say good for you and create a higher probability of the next success.

Again, it's always going to be we look for support, we try it, we assess it, we see if it's working and if not, we move on to the next thing. There's never we're done. We have to keep taking that next step.

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you. Michael, how do the HLPs and evidence-based practices intersect? The participant writes, "I'm afraid of teachers and others receiving mixed messages about what they should be doing."

>> Michael Kennedy: It's a controversial question. I'd be interested in both Terry and Rebecca's notes on this as well. Not that I'm dodging it. I think there has been a little bit of confusion just in the way that we've talked about HLPs. They're relatively new on the education scene. They've gained a lot of popularity very quick, which is a good thing, which means that the field has been calling for practices of this sort. I think the HLPs have been written in such a way that they make sense to practitioners, they make sense to teacher educators. All of this is a good thing in that we can help to better guide practice. I think where perhaps and I'm one of these people in talking about the HLPs, we haven't always been as explicit as we need to be about how they work alongside evidence-based practices. As been noted several times today, several HLPs like explicit instruction, have a solid evidence base.

So, we could consider it both to be an HLP and evidence-based practice. Many of the other HLPs, particularly in the accommodation or in the collaboration group, these are practices that haven't had randomized controlled trials, because they don't lend themselves to it. I'm collaborating with my colleagues or collaborating with parents, these are very difficult to study in the kinds of rigorous RCT kind of ways that we often expect. So just because those evidence of that empirical sort doesn't exist, doesn't mean it's not something that's special educators need to do. So that's one of the things that I think we need to talk about that HLPs are not a replacement for evidence-based practices. We shouldn't start doing HLPs and stop doing evidence-based practices. It's exactly the opposite of that. We need to be implementing practices for which we have the very best evidence, the implementing those with fidelity.

I think if we do those things, we'll recognize many of the components of evidence-based practices that we know and hold dear actually have many components of the HLPs embedded within them. So, I don't think it's a matter of either, or it's not a matter of HLPs are trying to push evidence-based practice out the door. I think we need to rethink how we're talking about how these practices work together to



support the needs of kids, particularly those with disabilities. I'd be interested in your reactions to that too, if that's okay. I'm taking over here.

>> Terry Scott: First of all, Michael's description earlier of that distinction between an HLP and an evidence-based practice I think is really important. I hear people say we're not going to use that HLP because we're doing this program, but a program and an HLP are different things. Whatever program or curriculum you've adopted, you should be asking yourself if it doesn't have all of these HLPs, how can we infuse them? I think of these as the building blocks of these things. Again, I think you've pointed this out really well. If people confuse the building blocks and the programs, then we've lost sight of what those were supposed to be.

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you. Daniel, this next one's for you. So many good teachers leave the classroom for leadership positions or more money. How do you think we can keep good teachers in the classroom where we need them?

>> Daniel Sherlock: Well, my district has a unique program from what I've seen, specifically aimed at that issue where effective teachers are able to serve part time as coaches, and part time as teachers. I don't know if that's realistic for every district or necessarily meets a need, but I suppose for me, the reason that I decided to stay is because I have found this as a great opportunity to continue learning each year. There's always a new challenge and since I think I was provided with good foundations for that learning, I've really enjoyed it. So, I think providing teachers really strong foundation, so they can be effective and that's motivating in itself, and perhaps the way to stay.

>> Dawn Ellis: All right, thank you. Margo, next question is for you. Can you explain a model of practice-based coaching?

>> Margo Candelaria: Yes. So, practice-based coaching is a cycle of coaching where generally you have four sessions. The most concrete example is you would do a TPOT, which is an observation of a preschool classroom and it's really, it's similar to a class but it's very focused on the social emotional development of children, and what the classroom looks like to do that. So, it's everything from environmental structure to promoting feeling language, to promoting social problem solving. Not having a majority of teacher directed activities. The coach would come in and do a two-and-a-half-hour observation, score the TPOT, and that's your foundation for sitting down with the teacher and saying, let's set an agenda and an action plan around the things that you want to work on.

So, you do have to get trained to be reliable in the TPOT, but once you do that, you can really sit down with the teacher and say, these are the strengths I see. Where do you see that you're struggling, and you set an agenda, an action plan? You generally do cycles of four to work on. You set goals, you coach them, you revisit what worked, what didn't. So ideally you do it weekly, but depending on the structure and availability, it can be once a month. It can be virtual, it can be peer coaching. There's been all kinds of adaptations, but it's generally around that structure of having some observation or feedback to say



these are your strengths, these are maybe where you're having some challenges. Then where we set some goals, and then you do some check ins and then you can reset from there.

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you. Terry, how do we get schools and districts to focus on the connection between instruction and behavior in a proactive way?

>> Terry Scott: Well, I guess I'm going to answer that similar to the way I answered the last question, which is systems but within the systems, leadership. A school is unlikely to go in a direction that the leadership isn't leading them. So, if we're going in and saying, let's all of us go in this direction and the leader isn't out in front saying, here's how it's connected. We're going to do it this way, we're all going to do these things. I'm going to assess it in these ways. We're going to set these goals. You're going to have personal goals that align with this. It's unlikely that these things are going to happen. So, I think anytime we talk about doing any kind of behavior change, whether it's kids or adults, it's do we have a system in place? I do think that PBIS or MTSS is a great way to think about building a system but again, it's going to come back to leadership.

If I were working on changing the school, the first thing I'd want to do is talk to leadership and say, what's our structure? What's our organization? What's your leadership message? How was that leadership message going to be trickled out? How are we going to implement that in a systematic way? Again, I'm just going to get back to effective instruction. How do we provide prompts for people? How do we encourage people, how do we do formative assessment and give people feedback? How do we set goals and work toward those goals? So again, I think we have to take everything back to systems when we look at it in terms of adults, and those systems will largely be, or the fidelity of those systems will largely be dependent upon the leadership.

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you. We have time for one last question. Rebecca, you're the lucky one. Can intensive interventions be delivered in the general education classroom?

>> Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: I'm not going to say never, but it is unlikely that most intensive interventions are well aligned with what needs to happen in a general Ed environment. So, by that I mean that a general Ed teacher may provide some support, particularly in the area of a student who may have a behavior, intensive behavior needs. They may provide some assessment information or other foundational information to help the intervention team to plan, but the role of the interventionists, special educator related service provider is really those are the folks who really should step in to provide the intensive and individualized instruction that most students with intensive intervention needs require.

>> Dawn Ellis: Thank you. Many thanks to today's speakers. We hope that you gained an understanding of the wide array of strategies for retaining effective personnel. Additionally, I want to thank you, the participants for attending today's event and for submitting your questions. A recording of today's event along with other event materials, will be posted in the coming days on the symposium website. That's



the osepideasthatwork.org. Lastly, please complete the survey that will pop up on your screen at the end of the event. Thank you and enjoy the rest of your day. We will see you in August for the last in this year series affective personnel, attracting, preparing, and retaining for a focus on attracting effective personnel. Have a nice day.