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GOALS:

• Move district towards promising practice

• Develop/refine policies and procedures

• Allow for equitable consideration and provision of services for all students

• Build capacity among IEP teams/replace expert model

• Support the Armies of One!
BREAKING DOWN THE PROCESS

Figure 2. AT Consideration Flowchart
Welcome to the Illinois Assistive Technology Support site for K-12 schools.

Purpose:
This website is intended to provide information about the provision of assistive technology (commonly referred to as "AT") in the K-12 school setting, to Illinois educators and parents. The determination of a student's need for AT, selection of the appropriate AT, implementation of AT services and ongoing support for a student using AT is an critical process requiring many individuals, including a wide variety of school professionals as well as the student and their parents or guardians, to work together to determine how the student can best meet his or her educational objectives.

Infinitec has created and maintains this free public website as place to house information that we trust will be very useful to the stakeholders involved in the school-based AT process.

What will you find here?
Resources which can be found by exploring the menu bar above include:

AT4IL.ORG
ILLINOIS ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT WEBSITE
TEAM MEMBERS

• Administrator
• SLP
• OT
• PT
• IT/Ed Tech
• Gen Ed

• Autism
• Parent
## Consideration

**More than a checkbox :)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AT is not considered for students with disabilities.</td>
<td>AT is considered for all students with disabilities and the consideration is generally based on the unique educational needs of the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AT is considered only for students with severe disabilities or students in specific disability categories.</td>
<td>A collaborative process is established and generally used by IEP teams to make AT decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AT is considered for all students with disabilities but the consideration is inconsistently based on the unique educational needs of the student.</td>
<td>A collaborative process is established and generally used by IEP teams to make AT decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AT is considered for all students with disabilities and the consideration is generally based on the unique educational needs of the student.</td>
<td>A collaborative process is established and generally used by IEP teams to make AT decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AT is considered for all students with disabilities and the consideration is consistently based on the unique educational needs of the student.</td>
<td>A collaborative process is established and consistently used by IEP teams to make AT decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Assistive technology (AT) devices and services are considered for all students with disabilities regardless of type or severity of disability.**

2. **During the development of the individualized educational program (IEP), the IEP team consistently uses a collaborative decision-making process that supports systematic consideration of each student’s possible need for AT devices and services.**

3. **IEP team members have the collective knowledge and skills needed to make informed AT decisions and seek assistance when needed.**
PRE-REFERRAL
# Sample Pre-referral Technology Checklist

**Please select 3 tools not already in use by the student.**  
Please document a minimum of 6 times you have tried each tool over the course of two weeks to demonstrate effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Have Tried</th>
<th>Will Try</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern/Classroom Tool/Strategy/Accommodation/Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highlighters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colored overlays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whisperphones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed test materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed information on board/overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks (print or digital/internet version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional software to remediate basic reading and/or reading comprehension skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase print size of materials, spacing, white space, color by photocopy or computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text-to-speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tool #1
- **Date:**  
- **Result:**

### Tool #2
- **Date:**  
- **Result:**

### Tool #3
- **Date:**  
- **Result:**

**Additional Comments:**

*Please attach artifacts (physical or digital) as appropriate.*
INFORMATION GATHERING
LESSON LEARNED:
A WELL-WRITTEN IEP IS WORTH ITS WEIGHT IN GOLD!
FRAMEWORK: SETT

- Student
- Environment
- Task
- Tools
As many schools and districts are now rushing to buy every student a digital device, I'm concerned that most one-to-one implementation strategies are based on the new tool as the focus of the program. Unless we break out of this limited vision that one-to-one computing is about the device, we are doomed to waste our resources.

In every case of failure I have observed, the one-to-one computing plan puts enormous focus on the device itself, the enhancement of the network, and training teachers to use the technology. Then, teachers are instructed to go!

But go where?

Adding a digital device to the classroom without a fundamental change in the culture of teaching and learning will not lead to significant improvement. Unless clear goals across the curriculum—such as the use of math to solve real problems—are articulated at the outset, one-to-one computing becomes “spray and pray.”

TECHNOLOGY CAN BE A BARRIER
COMMON ERRORS

- SETT ≠ Assessment
- TSET and other variations on a theme...
- Only considering tools we know or own
- Tech is the only solution
Assistive Technology Consideration Flowchart

1. What is it that we want the child to be able to do within the educational program that he/she isn’t able to do because of his/her disability?

2. What has been tried?
   (Please refer to the Technology Consideration Checklist for ideas)

3. Is it working?
   - Yes
     Please provide documentation and evidence to support this conclusion
   - No
     Please provide documentation and evidence to support this conclusion
Assistive Technology Services Referral Form

Type of Service Being Requested:  
- Assistive Technology Assessment (requires parent signed permission – formal AT process)
- Assistive Technology Consultation
- Assistive Technology Training

Date of Request:

Student Name:  
School Attending:  
Case Manager/Primary Contact:  

Grade Level:  
Teacher:  
Student Homeroom Teacher:  

REFERRAL
TIMEFRAMES
INITIAL PLANS VS. REALITY
INITIAL PLANS

- Half-day sessions
- 3-year process
  - Year 1: Develop all practices
  - Year 2: Support implementation among AT Team and school IEP teams
  - Year 3: Consult
REALITY...

- Half-day sessions
- 3-year process
  - Year 1: Consideration
  - Year 2: Consideration and Development of Assessment Process
  - Year 3: Supporting AT Team Referrals
FUTURE

• Develop capacity among AT Team members (Equipment knowledge, implementation strategies, problem-solving, process implementation)

• Develop AT Assessment Process

• Develop AT Implementation Process

• Provide Professional Learning to AT Teams, IEP teams, families
QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

DAVE HOHULIN

DHOHULIN@UCPNET.ORG

IL AT Manual - http://www.at4il.org

QIAT Matrices - indicators.knowbility.org


Alan November Website - http://novemberlearning.com/educational-resources-for-educators/teaching-and-learning-articles/why-schools-must-move-beyond-one-to-