2021-06-17

Perceptions of Special Education Services Delivered Through Online Learning Environments During COVID-19

Alex W. Wheatley
Brigham Young University

Perceptions of Special Education Services Delivered Through Online Learning Environments During COVID-19

Alex W. Wheatley

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Education Specialist

Ryan Kellems, Chair
Doug Petersen
Elizabeth A. Cutrer-Párraga

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education

Brigham Young University

ABSTRACT

Perceptions of Special Education Services Delivered Through Online Learning Environments During COVID-19

Alex W. Wheatley
Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education, BYU
Educational Specialist

Elementary and secondary schools saw a major shift in how instruction was delivered during the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools across the United States shut down or participated in online learning. This shift to online learning led many to question how special education services should be delivered to students with disabilities. The purpose of this study was to gauge perceptions of special education services delivered in a remote learning environment during a public health crisis. Teachers, related service providers, and parents of students with disabilities (n = 108) from across the United States were surveyed. Results showed synchronous online learning to be the most prevalent form of providing special education services. However, participants largely viewed online instruction as ineffective at providing quality services for students with disabilities. Implications for improving online services for students with disabilities could include identifying specific reasons for participants' negative views which may lead to more actionable steps in improving online learning moving forward. In addition, examining actions taken by schools that have led to positive impressions of online learning among parents and educators could also be used to improve perceptions of online instruction for students with disabilities. Directions for future research are also discussed.

Keywords: online learning, distance learning, special education, pandemic

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No thesis is an easy project, and to claim it was done alone is a gross misrepresentation. I first need to thank my wife for putting in long, hard hours at home so I could have the time to work. She stood by and offered support as I worked hard, changed my thesis due to COVID-19, and continued working. I am grateful to my thesis committee. Their feedback and quick responses during this thesis change were vital to my success. Finally, a special dedication to my mind. I almost lost you a few times during all this, but you managed hang in there. Hopefully, we still have a couple of good years left together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE i

ABSTRACT ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES vii

CHAPTER 1: Introduction 1

Statement of the Problem 1

Statement of the Purpose 2

Research Questions 2

CHAPTER 2: Review of Literature 3

IDEA Requirements 3

Assessment 4

Individualized Planning 4

Transition Planning and Services 5

Related Services 6

Quality of Instruction 6

Online Instruction 7

Advantages of Online Instruction 8

Disadvantages of Online Instruction 9

Empirical Evidence of Online Instruction 9

Teacher Perspectives of Online Learning 9

Parent and Student Perspectives of Online Learning 11

CHAPTER 3: Method 13

Participants and Setting 13

Recruitment 13

Participant Demographics 14

Measures 17

Data Collection 18

Data Analysis 19

CHAPTER 4: Results 20

Research Question Results 20

Question One: How Are Special Education Services Being Provided in a Remote/Online Learning Environment? 20

Question Two: How Does the Quality of Instruction Received by Students With Disabilities via Remote/Online Learning Compare With Face-to-Face Instruction? 21

Question Three: Is Online Instruction for Special Education Services Socially Valid Among Parents and Practitioners? 33

CHAPTER 5: Discussion 35

Findings 35

Limitations 38

Implications for Future Research 39

Conclusion 40

REFERENCES 41

APPENDIX A: Institutional Review Board Documents 46

APPENDIX B: Measure 48

APPENDIX C: Additional Tables 109

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 *Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants* 14

Table 2 *Results of Parent Responses About Quality Instruction* 22

Table 3 *Results of Teacher Responses About Quality Instruction* 24

Table 4 *Results of Related Service Providers' Responses About Quality Instruction* 26

Table 5 *Parent: Difficulty of Learning During Online Instruction* 28

Table 6 *Teachers: Level of Difficulty for Teaching During Remote/Online Instruction* 30

Table 7 *Related Service Providers: Level of Difficulty for Teaching During Remote/Online Instruction* 32

Table C1 *Parents: Providing Help to Children Pre/Post Online Instruction* 109

Table C2 *Parents: Child Special Education Services* 110

Table C3 *Parents: Who Was Present at IEP Meetings?* 111

Table C4 *Parents: Characteristics of Online Learning* 112

Table C5 *Parent: Communication During Online Learning* 113

Table C6 *Teachers*: *Extent to Which They Taught Subjects* 114

Table C7 *Teachers: Work Experiences* 115

Table C8 *Teachers*: *Technology* 116

Table C9 *Teachers: Meetings and Assessment* 117

Table C10 *Teachers: Contact With Parents* 118

Table C11 *Teachers: IEP Meeting Participants* 119

Table C12 *Related Service Providers: Extent to Which They Taught Subjects* 120

Table C13 *Related Service Providers: Work Experiences* 121

Table C14 *Related Service Providers: Contact With Parents* 122

Table C15 *Related Service Providers: Technology Use* 123

Table C16 *Related Service Providers: Meetings & Assessment* 124

Table C17 *Related Service Providers: IEP Meeting Participants* 125

Table C18 *Narrative Voices: Parents* 126

Table C19 *Narrative Voices: Teachers* 127

Table C20 *Narrative Voices: Related Service Providers* 129

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The worldwide COVID-19 pandemic has caused governments worldwide to shift students' formal education from on-site instruction to some form of online or distance learning environment during the 2020 school year (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, n.d.). This sudden change in how, when, and where students learn impacted all education parties (e.g., parents, teachers, students, and administrators). These parties may have found the change difficult and frustrating; however, it may have held even more weight for students with disabilities and their families, given the history between them and the public education system (Spring, 2017).

Statement of the Problem

The United States public education system serves all children, including students with disabilities, through brick-and-mortar and online learning environments. However, this has not always been the case. Children with disabilities were not guaranteed a public education until the introduction of public law (PL) 94-142 in 1975 (Spring, 2017). Before the passage of PL 94-142, some children with disabilities were denied public education, in part, because school staff did not know how to incorporate these students into the curriculum (Spring, 2017). Similar challenges can be seen today as educators try to navigate the world of remote/online learning (Rice, 2017).

The federal government sought to rectify the problem of integrating students with disabilities in various learning environments through a series of laws designed to give students a free and appropriate public education (FAPE). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA, 2010) required students with disabilities to be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE) and with their peers as much as possible. To accomplish the feat of

providing FAPE in appropriate environments with proper goals, IDEA has set guidelines for how special education services need to be provided. However, even with IDEA accommodations, interpreting guidelines for students with disabilities in an online instructional context can be difficult (Burdette et al., 2012). Furthermore, there is insufficient evidence to indicate the same positive impact by special educators in an online learning environment that brick-and-mortar schools have (Vasquez & Serianni, 2012).

Statement of the Purpose

Questions still abound about whether students with disabilities can convert learning from online instruction into functional skills (Stella & Corry, 2017). The purpose of this study was to explore teachers, related service providers, and parents of students with disabilities' perceptions of delivering quality special education services in an online learning environment. This was be done by gauging the quality of services for students with disabilities by those who provided special education services during the COVID-19 crisis in US public schools.

Research Questions

This study will address to the following research questions:

1. How are special education services provided in a remote/online learning environment?
2. How does the quality of instruction received by students with disabilities via remote/online learning compare with face-to-face instruction?
3. Is online instruction for special education services socially valid among parents and practitioners?

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

To explore these questions, we first need to better understand how services and quality instruction are delivered online to students with disabilities. Quality of services is defined as making sufficient progress toward the achievement of goals outlined in students' individual education programs (IEP). This was chosen based on IDEA requirements and recent precedent on goals and services being "appropriately ambitious" (Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District, 2017). Opinions from teachers, related service providers, and parents were sought. However, to understand the history of special education and online learning, we reviewed the literature in terms of what special education services need to be provided, how these services have historically been provided, and how past research has examined perceptions of providing special education services in online learning environments.

IDEA Requirements

The purpose of IDEA 2004 was to ensure that students with disabilities got the most out of education to reach their full potential. In other words, it was to ensure that students with disabilities received quality instruction, regardless of the learning environment, to prepare them to be successful in all aspects of life. There are many aspects of educational services that are listed in IDEA 2004. For the purposes of this study, points of interest have been consolidated and limited to assessment of disability and need for services, planning individualized goals and services, transition planning and services, and related services (e.g., speech, occupational therapy, counseling).

Assessment

IDEA (2004) requires schools to actively identify any students who may have an educational disability through the child find initiative. Under IDEA (2004), evaluations for child find must be done within 60 days of receiving parental consent. Evaluation decisions are not to be made from a single assessment. Rather, a preponderance of evidence from multiple sources needs to be available before a decision can be reached by school personnel and parents. Results from assessment data influence the individualized goals and services for each student. Assessment practices may look different depending on what disability is suspected.

Assessments are typically done by reviewing class assignments, tests, and results from teacher interventions; conducting formal testing of academic achievement and cognitive processing; and analyzing other disability specific data (Smith & Tyler, 2010). Some parts of this process may be difficult to complete in an online learning environment. For example, not all academic and cognitive tests can be delivered remotely.

Individualized Planning

An individual education program (IEP) is developed for each student eligible for special education services (IDEA, 2004). The IEP is created by a team of at least one general education teacher, at least one special education teacher or representative, the local education agent (i.e., school administration representative), appropriate related service providers, the parents or caregivers, anyone with knowledge of the student that the parents deem necessary, and, if appropriate, the student. Provisions are given for the exclusion of any member of the team. Meetings may be conducted in person, over the phone, or via video conference. This allows flexibility for team members in online learning environments as they seek to create a quality IEP.

The IEP is to include the student's present level of academic achievement, how the disability affects education, academic and/or functional life goals, how goals will be measured, and what related services are needed to achieve those goals. IDEA (2004) directs IEP teams to "[adapt], as appropriate to the needs of an eligible child under this part, the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction to address the unique needs of the child" and "to ensure access of the child to the general curriculum, so that the child can meet the educational standards" (§ 300.39[b][3]). This definition is known as specially designed instruction (SDI). Online learning can be considered a form of SDI by adapting methodology and instructional delivery using universal design for learning (UDL) principles to address and enhance student learning needs (Coy et al., 2014). However, online learning alone may not fully satisfy SDI or equal quality instruction.

Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District (2017) clarified SDI by stating that educational goals must be "appropriately ambitious." In other words, it is not good enough to set de minimis goals. Rather, IEP goals should be difficult, yet obtainable roads paved with quality SDI. According to the available literature, it is still unclear whether this standard can be fully met through online learning (Stella & Corry, 2017).

Transition Planning and Services

Transition services focus on improving the academics and functional capabilities of students with disabilities. These services take into account individual strengths and weakness, interests, and preferences. Assessment and services are to include community experiences, development of employment and daily living skills, and evaluation of functional vocational ability. Transition skills are best taught through authentic learning experiences in the classroom or in the community and are led by student interests and goals (Kohler & Field, 2003). Some

transition skills can be taught through the practice of video modeling (Gardner & Wolfe, 2013) which can be deployed through asynchronous instruction; however, instructor prompts and pre-teaching may need to accompany the video modeling intervention (e.g., Aldi et al., 2016). This may increase difficulty for parents or caregivers not trained on an intervention.

Related Services

Related services cover a wide range of supports to help students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum. These services may include speech, hearing, psychological counseling, transportation, physical therapy, occupational therapy, behavior support, social work, or medical help. All these services are typically done in person. Counseling can be done online but offers some drawbacks, such as a perceived lack of privacy and security (Young, 2005). Speech therapy can also be done online (Towey, 2012); however, it is unclear how or if other services can be successfully offered through online environments.

Quality of Instruction

Quality instruction for students with disabilities begins with the creation of individualized plans as set forth by IDEA. Opportunities to respond, positive reinforcement, and corrective feedback are key elements of instruction for all students (Hudson et al., 1993). Researchers have identified several evidence- and research-based interventions that are effective in improving academic and functional life skills. For example, Wong and colleagues (2015) identified 27 evidence-based practices or interventions for students with autism spectrum disorder. Many other evidence- and research-based interventions have been identified for students with other disabilities or needs, including the five core areas of reading instruction and associated practices (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). IDEA 2004 (2010) does not specify what interventions to use, only that interventions are evidence- or research-based.

However, it does mention that these interventions need to be delivered in the classroom or the student's home, if appropriate.

There are a few main models for providing students with quality instruction. The first is what is commonly referred to as the pull-out model of instruction. The pull-out model removes a student from the general education classroom to receive SDI in another setting (Smith & Tyler, 2010). This change in setting might be brief, such as a resource class, where the student experiences intensive instruction and is then sent back to the general education classroom. The change in setting can also occupy an entire class section or period, such as a support class for math in addition to the general education math course.

Another model of instruction is the push-in model. This model of instruction keeps the student in the general education classroom with SDI provided by the general education teacher or a special education teacher in a co-teaching arrangement (Smith & Tyler, 2010). Students with disabilities receive the same instruction as the rest of their classmates and receive SDI in the same setting and class period. The push-in model—also referred to as "mainstreaming"—has been shown to be more effective at improving academic attainment than other service models (Nind & Wearmouth, 2006).

On some occasions, a third model of instruction is used, which is services at home. This model is provided when a student cannot come to school (Smith & Tyler, 2010). Chronic illness and suspension are the most common reasons for SDI to be delivered in the home. Teachers may choose one of two methods to deliver SDI: personally visit the student at home, or remotely deliver SDI through internet technology.

Online Instruction

Online, or remote, instruction can be used to provide special education services at home or as supplementary instruction in the classroom. Online instruction is delivered in two main ways: (a) synchronous online instruction delivered in real-time through video teleconferencing platforms, or (b) asynchronous online instruction delivered through recorded material that can be watched at a later time (Coy et al., 2014). In either format, curriculum content is created and presented for students to engage with the subject and demonstrate content knowledge.

Online instruction has a history of using vendors to create curriculum for teachers to disseminate to students (Greer et al., 2014). Curricula from these vendors follow grade-level standards targeted to general education students. A common solution for special education teachers is to deliver the curriculum from the grade-level that meets skill level of the student with a disability (Greer et al., 2014). Educational games are also increasingly used to engage and instruct students with disabilities (Terras et al., 2018). The increase in use of these instructional delivery models brings promise and challenges in educating students with disabilities (Greer et al., 2014; Grossard et al., 2017; Terras et al., 2018; Tsikinas et al., 2016).

Advantages of Online Instruction

Online instruction has seen an increase in benefits beyond providing services to students who are suspended or have chronic health challenges. Smith and Meyen (2003) listed numerous benefits of emerging use of online instruction including (a) flexibility in when and where instruction takes place, (b) ability to repeat instruction as much as needed, (c) enhanced quality of communication and feedback, (d) ease of monitoring and tracking

data, and (e) integration with UDL. The same benefits for general education students may also apply to special education students. Ease of access, student motivation, and individualized support for students with disabilities have been identified as benefits of online instruction (Marteney & Bernadowski, 2016).

Disadvantages of Online Instruction

Traditional means of providing online instruction may not best meet special education instructional standards. Greer and colleagues (2014) assert that students with disabilities have repeated grade-level instruction many times once they reach upper elementary. Furthermore, they argue that delivering grade-level instruction that meets the student's skill level does not meet the standards of SDI. The authors suggested that teachers create and use their own curriculum or modify curriculum from vendors—which may be more difficult—in order to supply the needed instruction to special education students.

Empirical Evidence of Online Instruction

Few empirical research studies exist to show the effectiveness of online instruction for students with disabilities. Vasquez and Straub (2012) located only six empirical studies in their systematic review of literature. Those six studies were varied in scope and methodology and did not indicate statistically significant differences for online versus in-person learning. Rice and Dykman (2018) found the same results in their updated search of the literature.

Teacher Perspectives of Online Learning

Marteney and Bernadowski (2016) surveyed 80 general and special education teachers who used asynchronous online instruction in the US. These teachers reported improvements for students with disabilities namely, increased accessibility, academic improvement, improved student motivation, and better individualized student support. However, these results may need

to be interpreted with caution. For example, the survey evaluated academic performance in terms of student effort and not relative to the completion of IEP goals. This survey also indicated that 53% of teachers felt that IEP and 504 plans were easier to implement and accommodate than in-person. Furthermore, 67% of teachers felt that students did not or were not able to fully utilize all resources available in an asynchronous learning environment.

Burdette et al. (2012) surveyed special education directors in 46 states regarding instruction and services provided to students with disabilities in an online learning environment. Results showed a lack of consistent data collection in the types and quality of instruction and services. Participants' perceptions of online instruction were also mixed. Some respondents listed flexibility as a key factor for having online instruction, whereas others listed providing accommodations in an online learning environment as a challenge. Other challenges listed in the survey were supporting students with more severe intellectual or emotional disabilities, accessing the internet, defining LRE in an online context, and monitoring the quality of instruction and services (e.g., one state reported that almost all students in one district were not receiving supports as outlined in their IEPs).

Rice (2017) surveyed 18 administrators and 14 teachers across 15 states regarding professional development training relating to online learning for students with disabilities. Results from the survey showed an inconsistency in professional development opportunities. Most of the opportunities were individual consultations between teachers and administrators leaving teachers with limited opportunities to seek help or reference material when needed. Furthermore, Rice (2017) found that the professional development focused on compliance with the legal aspects of special education rather than instructional practices or interventions.

While teachers may be in favor of online instruction and associated technologies, many still feel a need for increased knowledge about equipment and methods to effectively teach (Bicen et al., 2018). Smith et al. (2016) surveyed university faculty to investigate how well teachers were being prepared to deliver online instruction to students with disabilities. The researchers focused on the standards set forth by the International Association of K–12 Online Learning (iNACOL). Sixty-four faculty members participated in this survey. Results of the survey showed that some standards were covered at least briefly in undergraduate special education programs. However, many of the standards were not covered, suggesting that teachers have not been sufficiently prepared to develop and deliver special education services via an online learning environment.

Parent and Student Perspectives of Online Learning

Students can feel frustrated with online learning. Students with disabilities have indicated that the impact of impairment or severity of disability is a barrier to their learning through online environments (McManus et al., 2017). McManus and colleagues (2017) also highlighted that personal and situational circumstances vary for people with disabilities. This variability may magnify barriers in online learning environments. Furthermore, students with disabilities may not get timely or clear answers to questions from instructors in an online learning environment compared to on-site learning (McManus et al., 2017).

Parents have reported similar challenges to that of teachers. Burdette and Greer (2014) surveyed 119 parents across the US seeking parent perspectives on online learning for their children with disabilities. A main finding of this survey showed that parents were generally pleased with the outcomes of online instruction. Seventy-one percent of parents reported that their child received services through a certified special education teacher. Forty percent reported

children received services online, with 31% face-to-face, 20% blended, and some parents noting that services were provided via telephone or text message. Approximately one quarter of parents (26%) reported that their children did not receive the related services found on their IEP. Parents reported several challenges in supporting their children with online learning. The main challenges reported were time and scheduling, using technology or programs, using instructional strategies, helping the child understand the assignment, encouraging the child to start and complete work, and communicating with teachers and school personnel (e.g., 26.1% of K–8 parents reported once a week communication and 40% reported fewer than 2–3 times a month).

CHAPTER 3

Method

Participants and Setting

Participants included special education teachers, paraprofessionals, transition coordinators, related service providers (e.g., speech-language pathologists, school psychologists, occupational therapists), and parents of students with disabilities. Participants varied by age, gender, and race/ethnicity. Individuals must have worked in a US public school or had a child with an active IEP enrolled in a school during the 2019–2020 school year in order to be eligible to participate. Furthermore, at least one of the following criteria had to be met to participate in the survey:

1. current certified general or special education teacher;
2. alternative route to licensure special education teacher;
3. special education teacher intern;
4. paraprofessional in a K–12 school;
5. related service provider (e.g., speech pathologist, school psychologist);
6. related service provider intern; or
7. parent of a student with a disability with an active IEP.

Recruitment

Participants were recruited electronically through Facebook and email groups using snowball sampling (Creswell, 2008). Members of Facebook groups typically included a mix of professionals and parents from all over the US, which allowed us to reach a large audience. A message with basic information on the purpose of the survey was posted in 15 parent and professional special education groups (e.g., Special Education Teachers, Parents of Special

Needs). A link to the survey was included in the message that took people directly to the survey. Members of these groups reacted to the posts with comments and "likes" which increased the posts' visibility for more potential participants. Messages were posted twice in each Facebook group and the link to the survey remained active for 10 weeks.

Colleagues and contacts of the researchers (10 in total) were sent an email with a brief description of the study and a link to the survey if they wished to participate. The email was not forwarded to schools or districts since institutional review board (IRB) approval accounted for email and social media groups and not the public school system. Potential participants were sent the email one time without any follow-up (see Appendix A for IRB documents).

Participant Demographics

A total of 108 participants completed at least half of the survey. The majority of participants were female (n = 106) and of white ethnicity (n = 94). Teachers (i.e., licensed special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and transition coordinators) made up the majority of participants (n = 81). Table 1 shows a complete breakdown of participant characteristics.

Table 1

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants

Participant Characteristic	Respondents	
	n	%
Gender		
Female	106	98.1
Male	2	1.9
Ethnicity/Race		
Black or African American	2	1.9
American Indian/Native American	0	0.5
Asian	1	0.9
Hispanic/Latino/a	7	6.5
White	94	87.0
Multiracial	4	3.7

Participant Characteristic	Respondents	
	n	%
Primary Role		
Licensed Special Education Teacher	78	72.2
Paraprofessional	2	1.9
Speech/Language Pathologist	2	1.9
Occupational Therapist	1	0.9
School Psychologist	5	4.6
Transition Coordinator	1	0.9
Parent	19	17.6
State		
AZ	3	2.8
CA	13	12.0
CT	2	1.9
GA	1	0.9
IA	4	3.7
ID	1	0.9
IL	6	5.6
IN	1	0.9
KS	6	5.6
KY	2	1.9
MA	6	5.6
MD	4	3.7
MI	1	0.9
MN	4	3.7
MO	4	3.7
MS	1	0.9
NC	2	1.9
NJ	3	2.8
NV	1	0.9
NY	6	5.6
OH	4	3.7
OR	6	5.6
PA	3	2.8
RI	1	0.9
TN	1	0.9
TX	9	8.3
UT	3	2.8
VA	1	0.9
WA	10	9.3
WI	1	0.9

Note. Total participants (*n* = 108).

The majority of parents who completed the survey had a bachelor's degree (n = 8). Six parents reported having a graduate degree, three had an associate degree, and two had a high school diploma. Most parents earned $51,000 or more in annual household income; seven reported an income of $51–100k/year, and another seven reported greater than $100k/year. The level of a child's disability was mostly moderate (n = 12). Mild level of disability was reported by three parents. Severe level of disability was reported by four parents.

Teachers answered questions about their training, school site, and work experience. Forty-four teachers primarily worked in elementary schools (grades K–5), with one participant in pre-kindergarten, 12 in middle school (grades 6–8), 21 in high school (grades 9–12), and three in post-high school program (ages 18–21). Forty-five participants (55.5%) reported that their school received Title 1 resources. Fifty-four teachers (66.7%) reported they received their initial training in special education, and 20 teachers (24.7%) reported completing an alternative route certification or an in-field certification for licensure.

Teacher work experience was examined in overall years of experience and special education years of experience. Thirty-nine teachers had 10 or fewer years of overall experience (range 1–10). Fifteen teachers had between 11 and 19 years of experience (range 11–19). Sixteen teachers had between 20 and 29 years of experience (range 20–29). Seven teachers had between 30 and 39 years of experience (range 30–36). A total of 52 teachers had 10 or fewer years of experience teaching special education. Fourteen teachers had between 11 and 19 years of experience in special education (range 11–19). Nine teachers had between 20 and 29 years of experience in special education (range 20–28). Three teachers had between 30 and 39 years of experience teaching special education (range 30–33).

Related service providers also answered questions about education, school site, and work experience. Six participants worked in elementary schools, one in pre-kindergarten, and one in high school. Three related service providers indicated their school received Title 1 resources, with another three indicating their schools did not receive such services. A total of six related service providers received their initial training in the public education system, with one receiving initial training in private practice, and one listing "other." Years of work experience among related service providers varied greatly. Two participants had experience under five years, two between 10 and 20 years, one with 24 years of experience, and two with experience between 35 and 40 years.

Measures

A survey was used to collect the data needed to answer the research questions. Survey items included demographic information such as role (e.g., parent, teacher, related service provider), number of years teaching, training background, severity of child's disability, and IEP services. Likert scale items were used where appropriate. The scale ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A copy of all survey questions is provided in Appendix B.

A project such as this is not yet found in the literature. Therefore, we developed a survey for this study. Validity and reliability of the items were not tested, as to do so would have gone beyond the scope of this project. However, the survey was reviewed for content and clarity by a panel of researchers with experience and PhDs in special education instruction, technology in education, and survey research.

The survey was piloted by six individuals before the final version was made available to participants. The pilot group consisted of teachers, parents, and related service providers. Pilot study participants were able to indicate problems with how the survey was delivered (e.g.,

sections not appearing when demographic information was selected). They also provided feedback on questions that were unclear or confusing. This feedback was applied by the researchers to improve the final version of the survey. Pilot study data were not included in the official survey results.

Data Collection

The survey was distributed online through Qualtrics during soft school closures at the end of the 2019–2020 school year. A link to the survey was provided during the recruitment process. Once an individual connected to the survey, they were presented with informed consent information and were required to acknowledge their understanding of risks and benefits by selecting "yes" or "no" in order to proceed. If they chose not to proceed, they did not have access to the rest of the survey. Individuals were able to discontinue their participation in the survey at any time.

The survey used a decision tree based on participants' demographic information that directed individuals to specific sections of the survey to complete. Based on pilot study data, the survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete. All survey responses were gathered and stored by Qualtrics in a secure environment.

Participant confidentiality was maintained by not asking for any identifiable information at any point of the survey. There was a chance for the participant to enter their name into a drawing for a gift card at the end of the survey. Rather than collecting this information in Qualtrics where it would be associated with their responses, they were directed to a Google form to enter their contact information. This way we were able to maintain deidentified survey responses.

Data Analysis

Data were imported into SPSS (Version 26) to be cleaned. Once in SPSS, response IDs were checked, and any duplicate responses were deleted. Participants who did not answer at least 50% of the survey questions were also excluded. SPSS was then used to analyze all survey responses. First, descriptive analyses were run to summarize participant demographic information. Then, responses from each individual group (i.e., parents, teachers, and related service providers) were analyzed to compute basic descriptive statistics and frequency of response choices for each item. From the resulting data groupings, we were able to insert data into tables in order to gauge general perceptions and opinions relative to our research questions.

CHAPTER 4

Results

Responses were analyzed by group using descriptive statistics. Each research question was explored by group. A complete list of all survey questions can be found in Appendix B and additional survey results are in Appendix C.

Research Question Results

Question One: How Are Special Education Services Being Provided in a Remote/Online Learning Environment?

Participants were asked to select how services were delivered during remote/online learning. For parents, results showed synchronous online to be the most common (n = 9; 47.4%), with five participants (26.3%) stating that services were not provided. Other methods for providing services included asynchronous online learning (n = 4; 21.1%), educational games (n = 5; 26.3%), whole class teacher-created modules (n = 4; 21.1%), individualized teacher-created modules (n = 2; 10.5%), consultation with a teacher (n = 4; 21.1%), and programs from third-party vendors (n = 1; 5.3%).

Teacher results also showed synchronous online learning to be the most common way to deliver services (n = 57; 70.4%), with only one participant (1.2%) stating that services were not provided. Other methods for service delivery included asynchronous online learning (n = 43; 53.1%), whole class self-created modules (n = 31; 38.3%), individualized self-created modules (n = 46; 56.8%), educational games (n = 29; 35.8%), consultation with a general education teacher (n = 27; 33.3%), programs by third-party vendors (n = 25; 30.9%), and other (n = 6; 7.4%).

Questions posed to related service providers were different because of the nature of the services they provide. Email correspondence was selected by all participants (n = 8; 100%), with home visits and suspended services not selected by any participant. Other delivery methods included video conferencing (n = 7; 87.5%), online learning modules (n = 5; 62.5%), and appointments for the student to come to school (n = 1; 12.5%).

Question Two: How Does the Quality of Instruction Received by Students With Disabilities via Remote/Online Learning Compare With Face-to-Face Instruction?

Participants were asked a series of questions about special education services and student progress during remote/online learning. The first set of questions—four in total—examined student work and IEP goal progress. Parent responses had an overall mean of 2.3 (SD = 1.4), with a range of 1–5 on the first three questions and 1–4 on the fourth. Parents were also asked two questions regarding support they received from teachers, including fidelity checklists for interventions. They reported an overall mean of 2.3 (SD = 1.5) with a range of 1–5 on both questions. Parents were asked one question about the quality of transition planning and services for their child. They reported a mean of 2.2 (SD = 1.4) with a range of 1–5. Finally, parents were asked one question about their child needing remediation of instruction. Responses to this item had a mean of 3.7 (SD = 1.6) with a range of 1–5. Table 2 shows a complete list of parent questions and item response summaries.

Table 2

Results of Parent Responses About Quality Instruction

Question	*n*	*M*	*SD*	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
Q21. My child progressed at the same rate (or better) during online instruction as they did before switching to remote/online instruction.	19	2.4	1.5	9	2	1	6	1
Q22. My child continued to receive quality transition planning and services during remote/online instruction as they did during regular school operations.	19	2.2	1.4	10	1	3	4	1
Q23. My child completed homework assignments at the same pace they did before switching to remote/online instruction.	19	2.3	1.2	7	4	4	4	4
Q24. I received the same amount or better support to help my child through remote/online instruction as I did with regular instruction.	19	2.3	1.5	9	3	2	3	2
Q25. I received instructions and checklists to follow for all instructional strategies or interventions that my child had to complete or participate in.	19	2.2	1.5	10	2	2	3	2
Q26. My child seemed to enjoy school more through remote/online instruction.	19	2.6	1.6	7	4	1	4	3
Q27. My child achieved the same amount (or better) of their IEP goals even with the transition to remote/online instruction.	19	2.4	1.1	10	1	1	4	3
Q28. My child received the same quality of education during remote/online instruction as they did during face-to-face instruction.	19	2.0	1.4	12	1	0	6	0
Q29. My child will need remediation of instruction/services once school is back to normal (face-to-face).	19	3.7	1.6	3	2	3	1	10

The first set of questions for teachers examined IEP goal progress, accommodations, and individualized instruction. Teacher responses had an overall mean of 2.0 (*SD* = 1.2) with a range of 1–4 on the first question and 1–5 on the other two questions. Three questions examined student work completion and progress with lessons and learning modules. These questions had an overall mean of 1.7 (*SD* = 0.9) and a range of 1–4. Teachers were also asked two questions regarding collaboration with other teachers and parents, including providing fidelity checklists for interventions. The overall mean for these items was 2.4 (*SD* = 1.2) with a range of 1–5 on both questions. Teachers were asked one question about the quality of transition planning and services for students. They reported a mean of 2.7 (*SD* = 1.1) with a range of 1–5. One question asked participants to compare quality of instruction for remote/online instruction and face-to-face instruction. This question had a mean of 2.0 (*SD* = 1.1) with a range of 1–5. Finally, teachers were asked one question about their students needing remediation of instruction. Responses had a mean of 4.1 (*SD* = 0.9) with a range of 2–5. Table 3 shows a complete list of teacher questions and response summaries.

Table 3

Results of Teacher Responses About Quality Instruction

Question	*n*	*M*	*SD*	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
Q26. As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for my students to meet IEP goals.	81	1.6	0.8	48	20	10	3	0
Q27. As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for me to accommodate each student individually.	81	1.9	1.1	40	22	10	8	1
Q28. I was able to provide special education instruction that met each student's learning needs and goals during remote/online instruction.	81	2.2	1.2	25	31	8	14	3
Q29. As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for me to consult with other professionals and parents on student needs.	81	2.5	1.2	22	19	17	20	3
Q30. During remote/online instruction, my students regularly participate in academic activities with their general education peers.	79	2.4	1.5	32	18	3	14	12
Q31. My students complete learning modules at the same pace they did before switching to remote/online instruction.	81	1.8	1.0	43	20	10	8	0
Q32. My students completed assignments at the same pace they did before switching to remote/online instruction.	81	1.7	1.0	46	19	7	9	0
Q33. My students progressed at the same rate (or better) during remote/online instruction as they did under typical learning conditions.	81	1.7	0.9	43	26	6	6	0
Q34. My students continued to receive quality transition planning and services during remote/online instruction as they did during regular school operations.	80	2.7	1.1	13	16	35	12	4
Q35. I provided parents with fidelity checklists and/or task analysis of all instructional strategies and interventions for every individual student.	80	2.3	1.1	26	21	20	11	2
Q37. My students received the same quality of education during remote/online instruction as they did during face-to-face instruction?	81	2.0	1.1	37	23	11	8	2
Q38. My students will need remediation of instruction/services once school is back to normal (face-to-face).	81	4.1	0.9	0	4	13	32	32

For related service providers, the first group of questions—three in total—examined student progress and accommodations. Related service providers had an overall mean of 2.2 (*SD* = 0.9), with a range of 1–4. Related service providers were asked one question on collaboration with teachers and parents. This question had a mean of 3.3 (*SD* = 1.2), with a range of 1–4. They were asked one question on reported problem behavior, including aggression, speech issues, motor issues, and anxiety or depression. They reported a mean of 3.1 (*SD* = 1.4), with a range of 1–5. One question asked related servers to compare quality of instruction for remote/online instruction and face-to-face instruction. This question had a mean of 2.5 (*SD* = 1.9), with a range of 1–5. Finally, related service providers were asked one question about their students needing remediation of services. Responses had a mean of 3 (*SD* = 1.3), with a range of 1–5. Table 4 shows a complete list of related service provider questions and response summaries.

Table 4

Results of Related Service Providers' Responses About Quality Instruction

Question	*n*	*M*	*SD*	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
Q25. As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for my students to meet IEP goals.	8	2.1	0.9	2	4	1	1	0
Q26. As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for me to accommodate each student individually.	8	2.3	1.0	2	3	2	1	0
Q27. As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for me to consult with other professionals and parents on student needs.	8	3.3	1.2	1	1	1	5	0
Q28. My students progressed at the same rate (or better) during remote/online instruction as they did under typical learning conditions.	8	2.3	1.0	2	3	2	1	0
Q31. I saw higher reports of problem behavior (e.g., aggression, speech/communication difficulty, motor issues, anxiety/depression symptoms) from parents during remote/online learning.	8	3.1	1.4	1	2	1	3	1
Q32. My students received the same quality of services during remote/online instruction as they did during face-to-face instruction?	8	2.5	1.9	4	1	0	1	2
Q33. My students will need remediation of instruction/services once school is back to normal (face-to-face).	8	3.0	1.3	1	2	2	2	1

Participants were also asked to rate how difficult it was for students to learn various skills and subject matter during remote/online learning. Areas of learning ranged from common academic areas (e.g., reading, writing, math) to specialized skills (e.g., motor skills, speech, behavior/emotional learning). A Likert-type scale was used ranging from 1 (*extremely difficult*) to 5 (*extremely easier*) and included an option for not applicable. Parents rated social skills (*n* = 9; 50.0%), writing (*n* = 10; 58.8%), reading (*n* = 9; 50.0%), and behavior/emotional learning (*n* = 13; 72.2%) as extremely difficult. Assistive technology (*n* = 10; 66.7%), phonological awareness (*n* = 9; 52.9%), and articulation (*n* = 8; 50.0%) all received frequent ratings as not applicable by parents. Table 5 shows a complete list of parent item response summaries.

Table 5

Parent: Difficulty of Learning During Online Instruction

Subject/Skill Area	Extremely Difficult		Slightly Difficult		Same as Face-to-Face		Slightly Easier		Extremely Easier		N/A	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Special Education: Assistive Technology	4	26.7	0	0.0	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	66.7
Speech: Phonological Awareness	4	23.5	2	11.8	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	52.9
Speech: Articulation	4	25.0	3	18.8	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	50.0
Special Education: Science	6	35.3	1	5.9	1	5.9	2	11.8	0	0.0	7	41.2
Special Education: Social Studies	7	41.2	1	5.9	1	5.9	2	11.8	0	0.0	6	35.3
Special Education: Transition	5	33.3	1	6.7	3	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	40.0
Special Education: Motor Skills	6	37.5	3	18.8	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	37.5
Special Education: Social Skills	9	50.0	3	16.7	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	27.8
Special Education: Writing	10	58.8	1	5.9	2	11.8	1	5.9	1	5.9	2	11.8
Special Education: Math	8	44.4	3	16.7	2	11.1	3	16.7	0	0.0	2	11.1
Special Education: Reading	9	50.0	2	11.1	3	16.7	2	11.1	0	0.0	2	11.1
Special Education: Behavior/Emotional Learning	13	72.2	1	5.6	3	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.6
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	83.3

Teachers rated social skills (*n* = 49; 63.6%), writing (*n* = 45; 58.4%), and behavior/emotional learning (*n* = 51; 67.1%) as extremely difficult. Phonological awareness (*n* = 38; 53.5%), articulation (*n* = 48; 68.6%), transition (*n* = 42; 56.8%), and other (*n* = 19; 76%) all received high ratings as not applicable. Only six responses across four items (i.e., assistive technology, social studies, social skills, and behavior/emotional learning) received a single rating as either slightly or extremely easier. Table 6 shows a complete list of teacher item response summaries.

Table 6

Teachers: Level of Difficulty for Teaching During Remote/Online Instruction

Subject/Skill Area	Extremely Difficult		Slightly Difficult		Same as Face-to-Face		Slightly Easier		Extremely Easier		N/A	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Special Education: Assistive Technology	30	41.1	9	12.3	1	1.4	1	1.4	0	0.0	32	43.8
Speech: Phonological Awareness	19	26.8	12	16.9	2	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	38	53.5
Speech: Articulation	14	20.0	8	11.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	48	68.6
Special Education: Science	25	33.3	15	20.0	6	8.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	38.7
Special Education: Social Studies	19	25.0	17	22.4	9	11.8	1	1.3	0	0.0	30	39.5
Special Education: Transition	14	18.9	12	16.2	6	8.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	42	56.8
Special Education: Motor Skills	28	38.4	9	12.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	36	49.3
Special Education: Social Skills	49	63.6	13	16.9	5	6.5	1	1.3	1	1.3	8	10.4
Special Education: Writing	45	58.4	25	32.5	3	3.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.2
Special Education: Math	35	44.9	33	42.3	4	5.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	7.7
Special Education: Reading	31	40.3	40	51.9	5	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3
Special Education: Behavior/Emotional Learning	51	67.1	10	13.2	3	3.9	1	1.3	1	1.3	10	13.2
Other	5	20.0	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	76.0

Related service providers had a wide range of responses. Phonological awareness (*n* = 2; 33.3%), articulation (*n* = 2; 33.3%), social skills (*n* = 3; 50.0%), and behavior/emotional learning (*n* = 4; 50.0%) were all rated as slightly difficult. All academic areas received high ratings of not applicable. Table 7 shows a complete list of related service providers' item response summaries.

Table 7

Related Service Providers: Level of Difficulty for Teaching During Remote/Online Instruction

Subject/Skill Area	Extremely Difficult		Slightly Difficult		Same as Face-to-Face		Slightly Easier		Extremely Easier		N/A	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Special Education: Assistive Technology	2	28.6	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	57.1
Speech: Phonological Awareness	0	0.0	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	66.7
Speech: Articulation	0	0.0	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	66.7
Special Education: Science	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
Special Education: Social Studies	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
Special Education: Transition	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	85.7
Special Education: Motor Skills	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	85.7
Special Education: Social Skills	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Special Education: Writing	1	14.3	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	71.4
Special Education: Math	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	100.0
Special Education: Reading	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	85.7
Special Education: Behavior/Emotional Learning	2	25.0	4	50.0	1	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5
Other	0	0.0	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	66.7

Question Three: Is Online Instruction for Special Education Services Socially Valid Among Parents and Practitioners?

This question was answered through Likert scale questions. The Likert scale ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Parents answered three questions. The first question, which stated "my child seemed to enjoy school more through remote/online instruction," had a mean of 2.6 (SD = 1.6), with a range of 1–5. The second question, which read "my child frequently complained to me about doing school (i.e., learning and/or completing assignments) online," had a mean of 3.6 (SD = 1.6) and range of 1–5. The third question, which stated "I prefer remote/online instruction over traditional face-to-face instruction," had a mean of 2.3 (SD = 1.5) and range of 1–5.

Likewise, teachers answered three related questions. The first question, "my students appeared more engaged during remote/online instruction," had a mean 1.8 (SD = 0.9), with a range of 1–5. The second question which read "approximately 50% or more of my students complained to me about learning and/or completing assignments online," had a mean of 3.4 (SD = 1.3) and range of 1–5. The third question stated, "I prefer remote/online instruction over traditional face-to-face instruction," and had a mean of 1.7 (SD = 1.0) and range of 1–5. Related service providers also answered three questions. The first question stated, "my students appeared more engaged during remote/online instruction." It had a mean of 2.3 (*SD* = 1.2), with a range of 1–4. The second question which read, "approximately 50% or more of my students complained to me about doing services online," had a mean of 2.9 (*SD* = 1.5) and range of 1–5. The third question stated, "I prefer remote/online instruction over traditional face-to-face instruction." This question had a mean of 1.5 (*SD* = 1.1) and range of 1–4.

Teachers and related service providers were asked how online instruction has impacted job satisfaction. Responses ranged from significantly worse (1) to significantly better (5). Both groups were asked "how would you rate overall job satisfaction during online instruction compared to face-to-face instruction?" For teachers, this yielded a mean of 1.9 (*SD* = 1.0), with a range of 1–5. Related service providers had a mean of 2.1 (*SD* = 1.1), with a range of 1–4. Participants were then asked, "if schools moved to remote/online instruction (either 100% or blended) in the future, would you keep teaching?" This was a "yes" or "no" question. Teachers responded with a mean of 1.3 (*SD* = 0.5), with 54 responding "yes" and 26 "no." Related service providers responded with a mean of 1.3 (*SD* = 0.5), with six responding "yes" and two "no."

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

This study sought to expand the discussion on parent and teacher perspectives of using remote/online instruction for special education services. While other studies sought localized perspectives with mixed results (Marteney & Bernadowski, 2016), this study gained input from participants throughout the US. This study lends insight into a national discussion on remote/online learning, specifically when this type of instruction is forced on students and educators, such as during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Findings

Synchronous online learning was the most common form of how services were delivered, with email correspondence being the most common for related service providers. Two possible interpretations come from these findings. First, teachers appear to prefer delivering instruction in real time over presenting pre-recorded material to their students. This may reflect their perceptions of educational design efficacy or their level of preparedness for using online technology to teach special education (Bicen et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2016). Second, it appears that the majority of related service providers cannot provide their services through synchronous/asynchronous online instruction. This may be due to lack of training in teletherapy practices or district policies that restrict the type of activities that can be done.

Perhaps the most surprising results from the first research question was that five parents (22.7%) reported that services were not provided at all during soft school closures. This sample is too small to generalize to a national population. However, it does demonstrate that at least some students were neglected even with the multitude of ways to provide remote/online instruction.

Answers to the second research question revealed high variability among respondents. With the exception of few questions, participant responses spanned from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This shows that there is a wide range of opinions on the efficacy of remote/online learning for special education and related services. However, means and frequency of responses indicated that remote/online is currently not perceived as effective for the majority of students with disabilities.

Most parents strongly disagreed with all questions. However, a majority also strongly agreed with the statement that their child would need remediation following remote/online instruction. What might be surprising are the responses to the item stating that their child received the same quality of instruction in remote/online learning as face-to-face instruction. A total of 12 parents strongly disagreed with the statement (one slightly disagreed) and six parents slightly agreed with the statement. This may suggest that while some students may benefit from remote/online instruction, parents still perceived that remote/online instruction is worse than in-person learning.

Results from the teacher and related service provider portions of the survey revealed the same patterns as the parent participants. Previous research indicates that many teachers feel unprepared in serving students with disabilities through remote/online learning (Bicen et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2016). This study not only supports those claims, but also suggests that the quality of instruction suffers as a result. This can be seen in the responses to the question regarding the need for remediation. Related service providers reported mixed results with a mean at neutral. However, teachers overwhelmingly agreed with the statement. The discrepancies in answers suggest that job responsibilities greatly impacted the view of quality instruction and need for remediation.

The final part of the second research question sheds light on the impact that job role plays in views of quality instruction through remote/online learning. This question asked participants to rate the level of difficulty to teach or for students to learn various skills. Most parents and related service providers rated items as not applicable. This highlights the individuality of services that exist across parent participants and the narrow scope of practice for related service providers. However, when examining only relevant responses, the majority of parents and related service providers rated skill areas as slightly or extremely difficult.

Teacher responses to this research question painted a more complete picture. Most teachers rated skills as slightly or extremely difficult. In fact, only four skill areas received one rating of slightly easier and one area (behavior/emotional learning) received one rating of extremely easier. It can be argued that if a skill area is extremely difficult to teach through a certain medium then the quality of instruction will be diminished. Alternatively, it could take longer to achieve the same quality of instruction as through other media. While these data do not settle this debate, our results do lend some insight into why teachers—as well as parents and related service providers—may view the quality of instruction through remote/online instruction as inferior to face-to-face instruction.

Arguably the most important research question in this study sought to explore the social validity of remote/online instruction for students with disabilities. According to our respondents, with the majority of responses being negative, it appeared that remote/online instruction during soft school closures was not perceived as a socially valid practice. The negative views appeared stronger among teachers, suggesting that those with more responsibility for curriculum and instruction see the practice as less socially valid than those with less involvement. This was seen particularly well in the question that states, “I prefer remote/online instruction over traditional

face-to-face instruction." Teachers and related service providers had a mean that fell between strongly and slightly disagree, whereas parent responses had a mean that fell between slightly disagree and neutral.

Teacher and related server job satisfaction paint an interesting picture. Related servers had mixed results, with teachers largely rated job satisfaction low. This is not new, as low teacher job satisfaction and retention is an international issue (Toropova et al., 2021). However, most teachers and related servers reported that they would continue to work even if schools moved to full online instruction in the future. This may suggest that online instruction does not play a major role in the job satisfaction and retention for many teachers. Further research is needed in this area.

Limitations

This study has a few limitations. First, while the overall sample size is 108 and participants come from multiple states across the US, the lack of diversity makes it difficult to generalize perceptions. The small number of parent and related service provider participants makes it difficult to generalize results for those groups in the same ways as teachers. Likewise, the lack of ethnic diversity—in total and within groups—means that the results may not generalize well to people of color.

Second, this study did not seek to understand why choices were made in delivering services or what exactly made the quality of instruction decline. The survey only sought participants' opinions on how services were provided, as well as the quality and social validity of special education services in the context of remote/online learning. Barriers to delivering services were not addressed; therefore, the study does not build upon previous research that may

guide professionals to specific courses of action (Burdette & Greer, 2014; McManus et al., 2017).

Third, this study only used results from descriptive analyses. This was done primarily because of slight variability in research questions among the different participant groups, as well as the length of the survey compared to the actual research questions. Therefore, relationships among demographic data and survey responses were not analyzed.

Finally, this survey did not go through a validation process. There may have been questions that participants felt confusion after reading. This could have led participants to answer questions in a way that was different than intended.

Implications for Future Research

A few areas warrant further research. First, it would be of value for researchers to target a larger representative sample of related service providers, parents, and teachers, particularly those who are men or from a racial/ethnic minority background. Sampling in this way may lead to better insight into the different groups that may find remote/online instruction efficacious or insufficient.

Results from this study showed that many parents and professionals are not in favor of remote/online instruction for students with disabilities. Identifying specific reasons for these views would add to the body of literature and could lead to more actionable steps. This line of research could also identify actions taken by schools that have led to positive impressions among parents and educators.

Future studies should consolidate and unify questions across all participant groups to make responses easier to interpret. This would make it possible to run inferential statistical analyses to examine relationships among participant groups. A shorter and more concise survey

may also lead to more participant responses, as this survey saw nearly 100 potential participants start the survey but ultimately not finish.

Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic made schools utilize different methods for providing quality instruction to students with disabilities. The shift to remote/online learning left many to question the quality and validity of special education services through such an instructional medium. This study evaluated how special education services were delivered in a remote/online learning environment during a public health crisis, the extent to which remote/online instruction has impacted the quality of instruction, and the social validity of the instructional practice for students with disabilities. Results showed synchronous online learning was the popular form of providing special education services. The majority of all participant groups viewed remote/online instruction to be ineffective at providing quality instruction for students with disabilities. Social validity of this instructional practice appeared to be negative. More research needs to be done to explore barriers that make remote/online instruction ineffective at providing quality instruction and to explore whether the perceptions in this survey persist across diverse populations (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity).

REFERENCES

Aldi, C., Crigler, A., Kates-McElrath, K., Long, B., Smith, H., Rehak, K., & Wilkinson, L. (2016). Examining the effects of video modeling and prompts to teach activities of daily living skills. *Behavior Analysis in Practice, 9*(4), 384–388. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40617-016-0127-y

Bicen, H., Bal, E., Gür, P., & Serttaş, Z. (2018). The level of proficiency of special education teachers and their opinions on instructional technologies. *Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience, 9*, 86–92.

Burdette, P. J., & Greer, D. L. (2014). Online learning and students with disabilities: Parent perspectives. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 13*(2), 67–88.

Burdette, P. J., Greer, D. L., & Woods, K. L. (2013). K–12 online learning and students with disabilities: Perspectives from state special education directors. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 17*(3), 65–72.

Coy, K., Marino, M. T., & Serianni, B. (2014). Using universal design for learning in synchronous online instruction. *Journal of Special Education Technology, 29*(1), 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/016264341402900105

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.

Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District, 137 S. Ct. 988 (2017).

Gardner, S., & Wolfe, P. (2013). Use of video modeling and video prompting interventions for teaching daily living skills to individuals with autism spectrum disorders: A review. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 38*(2), 73–87. https://doi.org/10.2511/027494813807714555

Greer, D., Rowland, A. L., & Smith, S. J. (2014). Critical considerations for teaching students with disabilities in online environments. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 46*(5), 79–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059914528105

Grossard, C., Grynspan, O., Serret, S., Jouen, A. L., Baily, K., & Cohen, D. (2017). Serious games to teach social interactions and emotions to individuals with autism spectrum disorders (ASD). *Computers & Education, 113*, 195–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.05.002

Hudson, P., Lignugaris-Kraft, B., & Miller, T. (1993). Using content enhancements to improve the performance of adolescents with learning disabilities in content classes. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 8*(2), 106–126.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, 20 U.S. Code § 1400 et seq. (2010).

Kohler, P. D., & Field, S. (2003). Transition-focused education: Foundation for the future. *The Journal of Special Education, 37*(3), 174–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669030370030701

Marteney, T., & Bernadowski, C. (2016). Teachers' perceptions of the benefits of online instruction for students with special educational needs. *British Journal of Special Education, 43*(2), 178–194. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12129

McManus, D., Dryer, R., & Henning, M. (2017). Barriers to learning online experienced by students with a mental health disability. *Distance Education, 38*(3), 336–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2017.1369348

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Teaching Children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its*

implication for reading instruction. National Reading Panel. https://www.nichd.nih.gov/sites/default/files/publications/pubs/nrp/Documents/report.pdf

Nind, M., & Wearmouth, J. (2006). Including children with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms: Implications for pedagogy from a systematic review. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *6*(3), 116–124. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2006.00069.x

Rice, M. F. (2017). Few and far between: Describing K–12 online teachers' online professional development opportunities for students with disabilities. *Online Learning, 21*(4), 103–121. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i4.1274

Rice, M., & Dykman, B. (2018). The emerging research base for online learning and students with disabilities. In K. Kennedy & R. E. Ferdig, *Handbook of research on K–12 online and blended learning* (pp. 189–206).

Smith, D. D., & Tyler, N. C. (2010). *Introduction to special education: Making a difference*. Merrill/Pearson Education.

Smith, S. J., & Meyen, E. L. (2003). Applications of online instruction: An overview for teachers, students with mild disabilities, and their parents. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 35*(6), 1–15.

Smith, S. J., Basham, J., Rice, M. F., & Carter, R. A., Jr. (2016). Preparing special educators for the K–12 online learning environment: A survey of teacher educators. *Journal of Special Education Technology, 31*(3), 170–178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162643416660834

Spring, J. (2017). *American education*. Routledge.

Stella, J., & Corry, M. (2017). A capability approach for online primary and secondary students with disabilities. *British Journal of Special Education, 44*(4), 448–464. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12187

Terras, M. M., Boyle, E. A., Ramsay, J., & Jarrett, D. (2018). The opportunities and challenges of serious games for people with an intellectual disability. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 49*(4), 690–700. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12638

Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review, 73*(1), 71–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247

Towey, M. P. (2012). Speech telepractice: Installing a speech therapy upgrade for the 21st century. *International Journal of Telerehabilitation, 4*(2), 73–78. https://doi.org/10.5195/IJT.2012.6112

Tsikinas, S., Xinogalos, S., & Satratzemi, M. (2016, October). Review on SG for people with intellectual disabilities and autism. In *European conference on games based learning* (p. 696). Academic Conferences International Limited. https://search-proquest-com.erl.lib.byu.edu/openview/8a1755d985b354550326918d993ae89e/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=396495

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.). *Education: From disruption to recovery.* https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse

Vasquez, E., & Serianni, B. A. (2012). Research and practice in distance education for K–12 students with disabilities. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 31*(4), 33–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/875687051203100406

Vasquez, E., III, & Straub, C. (2012). Online instruction for K–12 special education: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Special Education Technology, 27*(3), 31–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/016264341202700303

Wong, C., Odom, S. L., Hume, K. A., Cox, A. W., Fettig, A., Kucharczyk, S., Brock, M. E., Plavnick, J. B., Fleury, V. P., & Schultz, T. R. (2015). Evidence-based practices for children, youth, and young adults with autism spectrum disorder: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 45*(7), 1951–1966. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2351-z

Young, K. S. (2005). An empirical examination of client attitudes towards online counseling. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 8*(2), 172–177. https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2005.8.172

APPENDIX A

Institutional Review Board Documents

Implied Consent

My name is Alex Wheatley. I am a graduate student at Brigham Young University, and I am conducting this research under the supervision of Professor Ryan Kellems, from the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education. You are being invited to participate in this research study of special education and related services through online instruction. I am interested in finding out about how special education and related services are provided during times of online instruction and the impact it may have on IEP goals.

Your participation in this study will require the completion of the attached survey. This should take approximately 15 - 20 minutes of your time. Your participation will be anonymous, and you will not be contacted again in the future. You may enter your name at the end of the survey to be entered to win one of five $20 gift cards. There is approximately a 1 in 300 chance of winning a gift card. There will be a link to a separate form for you to enter your name; your name will not be linked to your survey responses. This survey involves minimal risk to you. The benefits, however, may impact society by helping increase knowledge about providing special education services through online instruction.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer for any reason. We will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem you may contact me, Alex Wheatley at alexw@byu.edu or my advisor, Ryan Kellems at rkellems@byu.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the IRB Administrator at A285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu; (801) 422-1461. The IRB is a group of people who review research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research participants.

The completion of this survey implies your consent to participate. If you choose to participate, please complete the attached survey by November 1, 2020. Thank you for your time.

Memorandum

To: Ryan Kellems
Department: BYU - EDUC - Counseling, Psychology, & Special Education
From: Sandee Aina, MPA, HRPP Manager
Wayne Larsen, MAcc, IRB Administrator
Bob Ridge, PhD, IRB Chair
Date: September 17, 2020
IRB#: IRB2020-365
Title: Exploring remote instructional delivery for students with disabilities

Brigham Young University's IRB has approved the research study referenced in the subject heading as exempt level, Category 2.

This category does not require an annual continuing review. Each year near the anniversary of the approval date, you will receive an email reminding you of your obligations as a researcher and to check on the status of the study. You will receive this email each year until you close the study.

The study is approved as of 09/17/2020. Please reference your assigned IRB identification number in any correspondence with the IRB.

Continued approval is conditional upon your compliance with the following requirements:

1. A copy of the approved informed consent statement can be found in iRIS. No other consent statement should be used. Each research subject must be provided with a copy or a way to access the consent statement.
2. Any modifications to the approved protocol must be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the IRB before modifications are incorporated in the study.
3. All recruiting tools must be submitted and approved by the IRB prior to use.
4. Instructions to access approved documents, submit modifications, report adverse events, can be found on the IRB website, iRIS guide: http://orca.byu.edu/irb/iRIS/story_html5.html
5. All non-serious unanticipated problems should be reported to the IRB within 2 weeks of the first awareness of the problem by the PI. Prompt reporting is important, as unanticipated problems often require some modification of study procedures, protocols, and/or informed consent processes. Such modifications require the review and approval of the IRB. Please refer to the IRB website for more information.

APPENDIX B

Measure

Special Education Distance Learning Survey

Start of Block: SECTION I: Informed Consent

Q1.1 Implied Consent My name is Alex Wheatley. I am a graduate student at Brigham Young University, and I am conducting this research under the supervision of Professor Ryan Kellems, from the Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education. You are being invited to participate in this research study of special education and related services through online instruction. I am interested in finding out about how special education and related services are provided during times of online instruction and the impact it may have on IEP goals. Your participation in this study will require the completion of the attached survey. This should take approximately 15 - 20 minutes of your time. Your participation will be anonymous, and you will not be contacted again in the future. You may enter your name at the end of the survey to be entered to win one of five $20 gift cards. There will be a link to a separate form for you to enter your name; your name will not be linked to your survey responses. This survey involves minimal risk to you. The benefits, however, may impact society by helping increase knowledge about providing special education services through online instruction. You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer for any reason. We will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem you may contact me, Alex Wheatley at alexw@byu.edu or my advisor, Ryan Kellems at rkellems@byu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the IRB Administrator at A-285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu; (801) 422-1461. The IRB is a group of people who review research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research participants. The completion of this survey implies your consent to participate. If you choose to participate, please complete the attached survey by November 1, 2020. Thank you for your time.

Q1.2 I have read the implied consent at the top of this survey and consent to be part of this study.

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If I have read the implied consent at the top of this survey and consent to be part of this study. = No

End of Block: SECTION I: Informed Consent

Start of Block: SECTION II: DEMOGRAPHICS

Q2.1 **Demographics**

Q2.2 Please indicate your sex. (Choose one response.)

- Female (1)
- Male (2)

Q2.3 Please indicate your ethnicity/race. (Choose one response.)

- Black or African American (1)
- American Indian/Alaska Native (2)
- Asian (3)
- Hispanic/Latino/a (4)
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (5)
- White (6)
- Multiracial (7)

Q2.4 What state do you live in?

▼ AA (1) ... WY (62)

Q2.5 What is your primary role? (Choose one response.)

- ○ Licensed teacher- special education (specify certification): (1)

_____

- ○ Licensed teacher- general education (specify certification): (2)

_____

- ○ Paraprofessional (3)
- ○ Administrator (4)
- ○ Speech/Language (5)
- ○ Occupational therapy (6)
- ○ School Psychologist (7)
- ○ Transition coordinator (8)
- ○ Parent (9)

End of Block: SECTION II: DEMOGRAPHICS

Start of Block: SECTION V: PARENT/GUARDIAN

Q3.1 Parent Information

Q3.2 Level of Education Obtained

- ○ High School Diploma/GED (1)
- ○ Associates Degree (2)
- ○ Bachelors Degree (3)
- ○ Graduate Degree (4)

Q3.3 Level of Household Income

- ○ (1)
- ○ 31-50k/year (2)
- ○ 51-100k/year (3)
- ○ >100k/year (4)

Q3.4 Instruction During the 2019-2020 School Year

Q3.5 How much time per day (average) were you able to help your child with school work before the move to remote/online instruction?

- ○ (1)
- ○ 1-2 hrs. (2)
- ○ 3-5 hrs. (3)
- ○ >5 hrs. (4)

Q3.6 How much time per day (average) were you able to help your child with school work after the move to remote/online instruction?

- ○ (1)
- ○ 1-2 hrs. (2)
- ○ 3-5 hrs. (3)
- ○ >5 hrs. (4)

Q3.7 How does the amount of time spent helping your child during online instruction compare to the amount of time you spent helping your child during normal school instruction?

- ○ Significantly Less Time (1)
- ○ Slightly Less Time (2)
- ○ No change (3)
- ○ Slightly More Time (4)
- ○ Significantly More Time (5)

Q3.8 What level of intensity is your child's disability?

- ○ Mild (1)
- ○ Moderate (2)
- ○ Severe (3)

Q3.9 What type of services does your child receive on the IEP? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Reading Comprehension (1)
- ☐ Reading Fluency (2)
- ☐ Written Expression (3)
- ☐ Math (4)
- ☐ Speech Therapy (5)
- ☐ Occupational Therapy (6)
- ☐ Counseling/Behavior (7)
- ☐ Social Skills (8)
- ☐ Other (specify) (9) _____

Q3.10 What special education services were provided to you during Online Instruction?

- [ ] Reading Comprehension (1)
- [ ] Reading Fluency (2)
- [ ] Written Expression (3)
- [ ] Math (4)
- [ ] Speech Therapy (5)
- [ ] Occupational Therapy (6)
- [ ] Counseling/Behavior (7)
- [ ] Other (specify) (8) _____

Q3.11 How were special education services provided during remote/online learning? (select all that apply)

- [ ] Programs provided by third party vendors (1)
- [ ] Educational games (2)
- [ ] Teacher-Created Individually Designed Learning Modules (3)
- [ ] Teacher-Created Whole Class Learning Modules (4)
- [ ] Consultation with Teacher (5)
- [ ] Synchronous Online Learning (child met in real time with classmates and teacher through video conference) (6)
- [ ] Asynchronous Online Learning (child watches a video module when they choose and complete assignments) (7)
- [ ] Not Provided (8)
- [ ] Other (specify) (9) _____

Q3.12 Who was present during all IEP meetings before the move to remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] General Education teacher (1)
- [ ] Special Education teacher (2)
- [ ] Local Education Agent (Principle or School/District Representative) (3)
- [ ] Related Service Provider (Speech, OT, School Psych) (4)
- [ ] Parent (5)
- [ ] Student (6)

Q3.13 Who was present during all IEP meetings after the move to remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] General Education Teacher (1)
- [ ] Special Education Teacher (2)
- [ ] Local Education Agent (Principle or School/District Representative) (3)
- [ ] Related Service Provider (Speech, OT, School Psych) (4)
- [ ] Parent (5)
- [ ] Student (6)
- [ ] Did not have an IEP meeting after the move to remote/online instruction (7)

Q3.14 How familiar were you with the technology your child's school uses.

- ○ Extremely familiar (1)
- ○ Very familiar (2)
- ○ Moderately familiar (3)
- ○ Slightly familiar (4)
- ○ Not familiar at all (5)

Q3.15 Where did you receive training for the technology used during remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] District Training (1)
- [ ] School Training (2)
- [ ] Self-Taught (3)
- [ ] My Child (4)
- [ ] Consultation with Teachers (5)
- [ ] Synchronous Online Learning (meeting in real time through video conference) (6)
- [ ] Asynchronous Online Learning (watch a video module) (7)
- [ ] Not Provided (8)
- [ ] Other (specify) (9) _____

Q3.16 How did your child access remote/online instruction.

- ○ Family Computer (1)
- ○ Rented Computer from School District (2)
- ○ Smart Phone (3)
- ○ Borrowed or shared device from family/friend (4)
- ○ Did not access remote/online instruction (5)
- ○ Other (specify) (6) _____

Q3.17 How often were you contacted by your child's special education teacher and other service providers asking about progress and delivering feedback?

- ○ At least once a week (1)
- ○ At least every other week (2)
- ○ Once a month (3)
- ○ Only after I contacted them (4)
- ○ Never (5)

Q3.18 How did the frequency of teacher contact during online instruction compare to regular instruction?

- ○ Significantly Less (1)
- ○ Slightly Less (2)
- ○ Same (3)
- ○ Slightly More (4)
- ○ Significantly More (5)

Q3.19 How prepared were you for the switch to remote/online instruction?

- ○ Significantly Unprepared (1)
- ○ Somewhat unprepared (2)
- ○ Neutral (3)
- ○ Somewhat prepared (4)
- ○ Significantly Prepared (5)

Q3.20 24. My child progressed at the same rate (or better) during Online Instruction as they did before switching to remote/online instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q3.21 24. My child continued to receive quality transition planning and services during remote/online instruction as they did during regular school operations.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q3.22 25. My child completed homework assignments at the same pace they did before switching to remote/online instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q3.23 I received the same amount or better support to help my child through remote/online instruction as I did with regular instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q3.24 I received instructions and checklists to follow for all instructional strategies or interventions that my child had to complete or participate in.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q3.25 My child seemed to enjoy school more through remote/online instruction.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q3.26 My child achieved the same amount (or better) of their IEP goals even with the transition to remote/online instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q3.27 My child received the same quality of education during remote/online instruction as they did during face-to-face instruction?

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q3.28 My child will need remediation of instruction/services once school is back to normal (face-to-face).

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q3.29 My child frequently complained to me about doing school (i.e., learning and/or completing assignments) online.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q3.30 I prefer remote/online instruction over traditional face-to-face instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q3.31 What was most challenging about doing remote/online special education instruction?

_____

Q3.32 What did you like about doing remote/online special education instruction?

_____

Q3.33 Is there anything you would like us to know that was not captured in any of the survey questions?

_____

Skip To: End of Survey If Condition: Is there anything you would... Is Not Empty. Skip To: End of Survey.

End of Block: SECTION V: PARENT/GUARDIAN

Start of Block: SECTION III: TEACHER

Q4.1 What grades do you primarily work with?

- ○ Pre-K (1)
- ○ Elementary (k-5) (2)
- ○ Middle School (6-8) (3)
- ○ High School (9-12) (4)
- ○ 12+ (18-21 program) (5)

Q4.2 How many years of teaching experience do you have?

- ○ Overall (1) _____
- ○ Teaching general education (2)

_____

- ○ Teaching special education (3)

_____

- ○ Instructional Aide/Assistant (4)

_____

Q4.3 Did you complete an alternative route to certification or an in-field certification?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q4.4 Did your school receive Title I resources?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Don't know (3)

Q4.5 Was your initial training in general or special education?

- General education (1)
- Special education (2)

Q4.6 Indicate the extent to which you taught the following subjects. (Choose one on each line.)	None/Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Occasionally (3)	Primary Responsibility (4)
Special Education (1)	○	○	○	○
Special education-Math (2)	○	○	○	○
Special education-Reading (3)	○	○	○	○
Special education-Transition (4)	○	○	○	○
Special education-Social Studies (5)	○	○	○	○
Arts (visual, performing) (6)	○	○	○	○
English/language arts (7)	○	○	○	○
Social studies/history (8)	○	○	○	○
Foreign language (9)	○	○	○	○

Science (10)	○	○	○	○
Math (11)	○	○	○	○
Vocational/technical education (12)	○	○	○	○
Health/physical education (13)	○	○	○	○
Other: (please specify) (14)	○	○	○	○

Q4.7 Instruction During the 2019-2020 School Year

Q4.8 How many hours per week on average did you work?

○ Face-to-Face: (1) _____

○ Remote/Online: (2) _____

Q4.9 How many hours per week did you teach special education?

- Face-to-Face: (1) _____
- Remote/Online (2) _____

Q4.10 How many students did you directly interact with in a typical day?

- Face-to-Face: (1) _____
- Remote/Online (2) _____

Q4.11 How much time did you spend directly interacting with students in a typical day?

- Face-to-Face: (1) _____
- Remote/Online: (2) _____

Q4.12 How much time did you spend preparing content in a typical day?

- Face-to-Face: (1) _____
- Remote/Online: (2) _____

Q4.13 Teaching Assignments

Q4.14 How was special education instruction provided during remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] Programs provided by third party vendors (1)
- [ ] Educational games (2)
- [ ] Self-Created Individually Designed Learning Modules (3)
- [ ] Self-Created Whole Class Learning Modules (4)
- [ ] Consultation with General Education Teacher (5)
- [ ] Synchronous Online Learning (meeting with students in real time through video conference) (6)
- [ ] Asynchronous Online Learning (students watch a video module when they choose and complete assignments) (7)
- [ ] Not Provided (8)
- [ ] Other (specify) (9) _____

Q4.15 Where did you receive training for the technology used during remote/online instruction?

- [ ] District Professional Development (1)
- [ ] School Professional Development (2)
- [ ] School/District Technology Specialist (3)
- [ ] Self-Taught (4)
- [ ] Consultation with Other Teachers (5)
- [ ] Synchronous Online Learning (meeting in real time through video conference) (6)
- [ ] Asynchronous Online Learning (watch a video module) (7)
- [ ] Not Provided (8)
- [ ] Other (specify) (9) _____

Q4.16 How did your students access remote/online instruction.

- [ ] Family Computer (1)
- [ ] Rented Computer from School/District (2)
- [ ] Smart Phone (3)
- [ ] Borrowed or shared device from family/friend (4)
- [ ] Other (specify) (5) _____

Q4.17 Were academic assessments conducted during remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] Initial Evaluations (1)
- [ ] Re-Evaluations (2)
- [ ] IEP (3)
- [ ] Not Conducted (4)

Q4.18 Were IEP/Evaluation meetings conducted during remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] Initial Evaluation (1)
- [ ] Re-Evaluation (2)
- [ ] IEP (3)
- [ ] Not Conducted (4)

Q4.19 Who was present during all IEP meetings before the move to remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] General Education teacher (1)
- [ ] Special Education teacher (2)
- [ ] Local Education Agent (Principle or School/District Representative) (3)
- [ ] Related Service Provider (Speech, OT, School Psych) (4)
- [ ] Parent (5)
- [ ] Student (6)

Q4.20 Who was present during all IEP meetings after the move to remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] General Education teacher (1)
- [ ] Special Education teacher (2)
- [ ] Local Education Agent (Principle or School/District Representative) (3)
- [ ] Related Service Provider (Speech, OT, School Psych) (4)
- [ ] Parent (5)
- [ ] Student (6)

Q4.21 How were IEP/Evaluation meetings conducted during remote/online instruction? (check all that apply)

- [ ] Video Conference (e.g., Zoom, Google) (1)
- [ ] At student's home (2)
- [ ] By appointment at the school (3)
- [ ] Email Correspondence (4)
- [ ] Phone call (5)
- [ ] Not held/temporarily suspended (6)

Q4.22 What was the quality of IEP meetings conducted online compared to face-to-face meetings?

- ○ Significantly Less (1)
- ○ Slightly Less (2)
- ○ Same (3)
- ○ Slightly More (4)
- ○ Significantly More (5)

Q4.23 How often did you contact each student's parent informing on progress and delivering feedback during remote/online instruction?

- ○ At least once a week (1)
- ○ At least every other week (2)
- ○ Once a month (3)
- ○ Only after I was contacted by parent (4)
- ○ Never (5)

Q4.24 How did the frequency of parental contact during online instruction compare to regular instruction?

- ○ Significantly Less (1)
- ○ Slightly Less (2)
- ○ Same (3)
- ○ Slightly More (4)
- ○ Significantly More (5)

Q4.25 How prepared were you for the switch to remote/online instruction?

- ○ Significantly Unprepared (1)
- ○ Somewhat unprepared (2)
- ○ Neutral (3)
- ○ Somewhat prepared (4)
- ○ Significantly Prepared (5)

Q4.26 As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for my students to meet IEP goals.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.27 As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for me to accommodate each student individually.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.28 I was able to provide special education instruction that met each student's learning needs and goals during remote/online instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.29 As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for me to consult with other professionals and parents on student needs.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.30 During remote/online instruction, my students regularly participate in academic activities with their general education peers.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.31 My students complete learning modules at the same pace they did before switching to remote/online instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.32 My students completed assignments at the same pace they did before switching to remote/online instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.33 My students progressed at the same rate (or better) during remote/online instruction as they did under typical learning conditions.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.34 24. My students continued to receive quality transition planning and services during remote/online instruction as they did during regular school operations.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.35 I provided parents with fidelity checklists and/or task analysis of all instructional strategies and interventions for every individual student.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q4.36 My students appeared more engaged during remote/online instruction.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q4.37 My students received the same quality of education during remote/online instruction as they did during face-to-face instruction?

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.38 My students will need remediation of instruction/services once school is back to normal (face-to-face).

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.39 Approximately 50% or more of my students complained to me about learning and/or completing assignments online.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.40 I prefer remote/online instruction over traditional face-to-face instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q4.41 How would you rate overall job satisfaction during online instruction compared to face-to-face instruction?

- ○ Significantly Worse (1)
- ○ Slightly Worse (2)
- ○ Equal (3)
- ○ Slightly Better (4)
- ○ Significantly Better (5)

Q4.42 If schools moved to remote/online instruction (either 100% or blended) in the future, would you keep teaching?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Q4.43 What was most challenging about doing remote special education instruction?

_____

Q4.44 What did you like about doing remote/online special education instruction?

_____

Q4.45 Is there anything you would like us to know that was not captured in any of the survey questions?

_____

Skip To: End of Survey If Condition: Is there anything you would... Is Not Empty. Skip To: End of Survey.

End of Block: SECTION III: TEACHER

Start of Block: SECTION IV: RELATED SERVICE PROVIDERS

Q5.1 What grades do you primarily work with?

- Pre-K (1)
- Elementary (k-5) (2)
- Middle School (6-8) (3)
- High School (9-12) (4)
- 12+ (18-21 program) (5)

Q5.2 How many years of experience do you have?

- Overall (1) _____

Q5.3 Did your school receive Title I resources?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)
- ○ Don't know (3)

Q5.4 Where did your initial training take place?

- ○ Public School System (1)
- ○ Hospital (2)
- ○ Private Practice (3)
- ○ Other (specify): (4) _____

Q5.5 Indicate the extent to which you taught the following subjects. (Choose one on each line.)	None/Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Occasionally (3)	Primary Responsibility (4)
Special Education (1)	○	○	○	○
Special education-Math (2)	○	○	○	○
Special education-Reading (3)	○	○	○	○
Special education-Transition (4)	○	○	○	○
Special education-Social Studies (5)	○	○	○	○
Arts (visual, performing) (6)	○	○	○	○
English/language arts (7)	○	○	○	○
Social studies/history (8)	○	○	○	○
Foreign language (9)	○	○	○	○

Science (10)	○	○	○	○
Math (11)	○	○	○	○
Vocational/technical education (12)	○	○	○	○
Health/physical education (13)	○	○	○	○
Other: (please specify) (14)	○	○	○	○

Q5.6 Instruction During the 2019-2020 School Year

Q5.7 How many hours per week on average did you work?

○ Face-to-Face: (1) _____

○ Remote/Online: (2) _____

Q5.8 How many hours per week did you teach special education?

- Face-to-Face: (1) _____
- Remote/Online (2) _____

Q5.9 How many students did you directly interact with in a typical day?

- Face-to-Face: (1) _____
- Remote/Online (2) _____

Q5.10 How much time did you spend directly interacting with students in a typical day?

- Face-to-Face: (1) _____
- Remote/Online: (2) _____

Q5.11 How much time did you spend preparing content in a typical day?

- Face-to-Face: (1) _____
- Remote/Online: (2) _____

Q5.12 How were services provided during remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] Video Conferencing (e.g., Zoom, Google) (1)
- [ ] Visit to student's home (2)
- [ ] Appointment for student to come to school (3)
- [ ] Email correspondence (4)
- [ ] Modules for students to watch with assignments to complete (5)
- [ ] None/services were suspended (6)

Q5.13 Where did you receive training for the technology used during remote/online instruction?

- [ ] District Professional Development (1)
- [ ] School Professional Development (2)
- [ ] School/District Technology Specialist (3)
- [ ] Self-Taught (4)
- [ ] Consultation with Other Teachers (5)
- [ ] Synchronous Online Learning (meeting in real time through video conference) (6)
- [ ] Asynchronous Online Learning (watch a video module) (7)
- [ ] Not Provided (8)
- [ ] Other (specify) (9) _____

Q5.14 How did your students access remote/online instruction.

- ○ Family Computer (1)
- ○ Rented Computer from School/District (2)
- ○ Smart Phone (3)
- ○ Borrowed or shared device from family/friend (4)
- ○ Other (specify) (5) _____

Q5.15 Were assessments (e.g., speech, OT, AT, social/emotional, IQ) conducted during remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Initial Evaluations (1)
- ☐ Re-Evaluations (2)
- ☐ IEP (3)
- ☐ Not Conducted (4)

Q5.16 Were IEP/Evaluation meetings conducted during remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] Initial Evaluation (1)
- [ ] Re-Evaluation (2)
- [ ] IEP (3)
- [ ] Not Conducted (4)

Q5.17 Who was present during all IEP meetings before the move to remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] General Education teacher (1)
- [ ] Special Education teacher (2)
- [ ] Local Education Agent (Principle or School/District Representative) (3)
- [ ] Related Service Provider (Speech, OT, School Psych) (4)
- [ ] Parent (5)
- [ ] Student (6)

Q5.18 Who was present during all IEP meetings after the move to remote/online instruction? (select all that apply)

- [ ] General Education teacher (1)
- [ ] Special Education teacher (2)
- [ ] Local Education Agent (Principle or School/District Representative) (3)
- [ ] Related Service Provider (Speech, OT, School Psych) (4)
- [ ] Parent (5)
- [ ] Student (6)

Q5.19 How were IEP/Evaluation meetings conducted during remote/online instruction? (check all that apply)

- [ ] Video Conference (e.g., Zoom, Google) (1)
- [ ] At student's home (2)
- [ ] By appointment at the school (3)
- [ ] Email Correspondence (4)
- [ ] Phone call (5)
- [ ] Not held/temporarily suspended (6)

Q5.20 What was the quality of IEP meetings conducted online compared to face-to-face meetings?

- ○ Significantly Less (1)
- ○ Slightly Less (2)
- ○ Same (3)
- ○ Slightly More (4)
- ○ Significantly More (5)

Q5.21 How often did you contact each student's parent informing on progress and delivering feedback during remote/online instruction?

- ○ At least once a week (1)
- ○ At least every other week (2)
- ○ Once a month (3)
- ○ Only after I was contacted by parent (4)
- ○ Never (5)

Q5.22 How did the frequency of parental contact during online instruction compare to regular instruction?

- ○ Significantly Less (1)
- ○ Slightly Less (2)
- ○ Same (3)
- ○ Slightly More (4)
- ○ Significantly More (5)

Q5.23 How prepared were you for the switch to remote/online instruction?

- ○ Significantly Unprepared (1)
- ○ Somewhat unprepared (2)
- ○ Neutral (3)
- ○ Somewhat prepared (4)
- ○ Significantly Prepared (5)

Q5.24 As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for my students to meet IEP goals.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q5.25 As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for me to accommodate each student individually.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q5.26 As a result of remote/online instruction, it has been easier for me to consult with other professionals and parents on student needs.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q5.27 My students progressed at the same rate (or better) during remote/online instruction as they did under typical learning conditions.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q5.28 My students appeared more engaged during remote/online instruction.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q5.29 Approximately 50% or more of my students complained to me about doing services online.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q5.30 I saw higher reports of problem behavior (e.g., aggression, speech/communication difficulty, motor issues, anxiety/depression symptoms) from parents during remote/online learning.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q5.31 My students received the same quality of services during remote/online instruction as they did during face-to-face instruction?

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q5.32 My students will need remediation of instruction/services once school is back to normal (face-to-face).

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q5.33 I prefer remote/online instruction over traditional face-to-face instruction.

- ○ Strongly disagree (1)
- ○ Somewhat disagree (2)
- ○ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- ○ Somewhat agree (4)
- ○ Strongly agree (5)

Q5.34 How would you rate overall job satisfaction during online instruction compared to face-to-face instruction?

- ○ Significantly Worse (1)
- ○ Slightly Worse (2)
- ○ Equal (3)
- ○ Slightly Better (4)
- ○ Significantly Better (5)

Q5.35 If schools moved to remote/online instruction (either 100% or blended) in the future, would you keep teaching?

- ○ Yes (1)
- ○ No (2)

Q5.36 What was most challenging about doing remote special education instruction?

_____

Q5.37 What did you like about doing remote/online special education instruction?

_____

Q5.38 Is there anything you would like us to know that was not captured in any of the survey questions?

_____

APPENDIX C

Additional Tables

Table C1

Parents: Providing Help to Children Pre/Post Online Instruction

Questions and Response Options	*n*	*%*
How much time per day (average) were you able to help your child with school work before the move to remote/online instruction?		
< 1 hr.	11	57.9
1-2 hrs.	5	26.3
3-5 hrs.	3	15.8
> 5 hrs.	0	0.0
How much time per day (average) were you able to help your child with school work after the move to remote/online instruction?		
<1 hr.	2	10.5
1-2 hrs.	7	36.8
3-5 hrs.	6	31.6
> 5 hrs.	4	21.1
How does the amount of time spent helping your child during online instruction compare to the amount of time you spent helping your child during normal school instruction?		
Significantly Less	1	5.3
Slightly Less	1	5.3
No Change	3	15.8
Slightly More	2	10.5
Significantly More	12	63.2

Table C2

Parents: Child Special Education Services

Services	Received/Listed on IEP		Received During Online Instruction	
	n	%	*n*	%
Social Skills	13	68.4	0	0.0
Math	12	63.2	8	42.1
Reading Comprehension	11	57.9	6	31.6
Reading Fluency	9	47.4	5	26.3
Written Expression	11	57.9	3	15.8
Speech Therapy	10	52.6	6	31.6
Counseling/Behavior	8	42.1	3	15.8
Occupational Therapy	7	36.8	3	15.8
Other	3	15.8	5	26.3

Table C3

Parents: Who Was Present at IEP Meetings?

IEP Meeting Participants	Before Online Instruction		During Online Instruction	
	n	%	*n*	%
Parent	18	94.7	10	52.6
Special Education Teacher	17	89.5	10	52.6
General Education Teacher	16	84.2	7	36.8
Local Education Agent	15	78.9	7	36.8
Related Service Provider	13	68.4	6	31.6
Student	4	21.1	0	0.0
No IEP meeting during online instruction	0.0	0.0	8	42.1

Table C4

Parents: Characteristics of Online Learning

Questions and Response Options	Characteristics	
	n	%
Where did you receive training for the technology used during remote/online instruction?		
Self-Taught	12	63.2
My Child	4	21.1
Consultation with Teachers	3	15.8
School Training	2	10.5
District Training	1	5.3
Synchronous Online Learning	1	5.3
Asynchronous Online Learning	1	5.3
Not Provided	9	47.4
Other	0	0.0
How familiar were you with the technology your child's school uses?		
Extremely Familiar	2	10.5
Very Familiar	2	10.5
Moderately Familiar	5	26.3
Slightly Familiar	7	36.8
Not Familiar at All	3	15.8
How did your child access remote/online instruction?		
Family Computer	5	26.3
Rented Computer	9	47.4
Smart Phone	1	5.3
Did Not Access Remote/Online Instruction	1	5.3
Other	3	15.8
How prepared were you for the switch to remote/online instruction?		
Significantly Unprepared	7	36.8
Somewhat Unprepared	4	21.1
Neutral	1	5.3
Somewhat Prepared	7	36.8
Significantly Prepared	0	0.0

Table C5

Parent: Communication During Online Learning

Baseline Characteristics	Communication	
	n	%
How often were you contacted by your child's special education teacher and other service providers asking about progress and delivering feedback?		
At Least Once a Week	5	26.3
At Least Every Other Week	3	15.8
Once a Month	3	15.8
Only After I Contacted Them	5	26.3
Never	3	15.8
How did the frequency of teacher contact during online instruction compare to regular instruction?		
Significantly Less	10	52.6
Slightly Less	3	15.8
Same	3	15.8
Slightly More	2	10.5
Significantly More	0	0.0

Table C6

Teachers: *Extent to Which They Taught Subjects*

Subject/Skill Area	None/Never		Rarely		Occasionally		Primary Responsibility	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Special Education: Assistive Technology	21	28.8	23	31.5	17	23.3	12	16.4
Speech: Phonological Awareness	31	43.1	15	20.8	17	23.6	9	12.5
Speech: Articulation	41	57.7	15	21.1	12	16.9	3	4.2
Special Education: Science	16	21.1	15	19.7	23	30.3	22	28.9
Special Education: Social Studies	16	20.5	13	16.7	24	30.8	25	32.1
Special Education: Transition	26	35.1	12	16.2	16	21.6	20	27.0
Special Education: Motor Skills	24	33.3	17	23.6	18	25.0	13	18.1
Special Education: Social Skills	4	5.1	3	3.8	24	30.8	47	60.3
Special Education: Writing	1	1.3	1	1.3	13	16.9	62	80.5
Special Education: Math	1	1.3	1	1.3	15	19.2	61	78.2
Special Education: Reading	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	11.5	69	88.5
Special Education: Behavior/Emotional Learning	4	5.1	9	11.5	19	24.4	46	59.0
Other	8	53.3	1	6.7	2	12.3	4	26.7

Table C7

Teachers: Work Experiences

Question	Face-to-Face		Remote/Online	
	n	*M*	*n*	*M*
How many hours per week did you teach special education?	78	24.6	77	6.9
How many students with IEPs did you directly interact with in a typical day?	78	12.1	79	31.3
How much time did you spend directly interacting with students with IEPs in a typical day?	78	9.1	77	5.0
How much time did you spend preparing content in a typical day?	77	3.6	77	5.6

Table C8

Teachers: *Technology*

Question	Responses	
	n	%
Where did you receive training for the technology used during remote/online instruction?		
Self-Taught	70	86.4
School/District Technology Specialist	12	14.8
Consultation with Teachers	44	54.3
School Training	18	22.2
District Training	34	42.0
Synchronous Online Learning	20	24.7
Asynchronous Online Learning	15	18.5
Not Provided	7	8.6
Other	3	3.7
How did your students access remote/online instruction?		
Family Computer	55	67.9
Rented Computer	51	63.0
Smart Phone	35	43.2
Barrowed or Shared Device from Family/Friend	18	22.2
Other	19	23.5
How prepared were you for the switch to remote/online instruction?		
Significantly Unprepared	40	49.4
Somewhat Unprepared	23	28.4
Neutral	5	6.2
Somewhat Prepared	11	13.6
Significantly Prepared	2	2.5

Table C9

Teachers: Meetings and Assessment

Question	Guided self-help	
	n	%
Were academic assessments conducted during remote/online instruction?		
Initial Evaluations	8	9.9
Re-Evaluations	21	25.9
IEP	52	64.2
Not Conducted	28	34.6
Were IEP/Evaluation meetings conducted during remote/online instruction?		
Initial Evaluations	17	21.0
Re-Evaluations	37	45.7
IEP	73	90.1
Not Conducted	6	7.4
How were IEP/Evaluation meetings conducted during remote/online instruction?		
Video Conference	74	91.4
Phone Call	44	54.3
At Student's Home	0	0.0
By Appointment at the School	2	2.5
Email Correspondence	2	2.5
Not Held/Temporarily Suspended	12	14.8
What was the quality of IEP meetings conducted online compared to face-to-face meetings?		
Significantly Less	10	12.8
Slightly Less	25	32.1
Same	37	47.4
Slightly More	6	7.7
Significantly More	0	0.0

Table C10

Teachers: Contact With Parents

Questions	Responses	
	n	%
How often did you contact each student's parent informing on progress and delivering feedback during remote/online instruction?		
At Least Once a Week	51	63.7
At Least Every Other Week	18	22.5
Once a Month	7	8.8
Only After I was Contacted by Parent	3	3.8
Never	1	1.3
How did the frequency of parental contact during online instruction compare to regular instruction?		
Significantly Less	7	8.6
Slightly Less	8	9.9
Same	13	16.0
Slightly More	27	33.3
Significantly More	26	32.1

Table C11

Teachers: IEP Meeting Participants

IEP Meeting Participants	Before Online Instruction		During Online Instruction	
	n	%	*n*	%
Parent	78	96.3	71	87.7
Special Education Teacher	80	98.8	77	95.1
General Education Teacher	73	90.1	60	74.1
Local Education Agent	78	96.3	75	92.6
Related Service Provider	76	93.8	67	82.7
Student	30	37.0	25	30.9
No IEP meeting	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table C12

Related Service Providers: Extent to Which They Taught Subjects

Subject/Skill Area	None/Never		Rarely		Occasionally		Primary Responsibility	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Special Education: Assistive Technology	4	57.1	1	14.3	2	28.6	0	0.0
Speech: Phonological Awareness	5	71.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	28.6
Speech: Articulation	5	71.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	28.6
Special Education: Science	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Special Education: Social Studies	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Special Education: Transition	5	71.4	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	14.3
Special Education: Motor Skills	5	71.4	1	14.3	0	6.3	1	14.3
Special Education: Social Skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4
Special Education: Writing	5	71.4	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	14.3
Special Education: Math	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Special Education: Reading	6	85.7	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0
Special Education: Behavior/Emotional Learning	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	37.5	5	62.5
Other	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	50.0

Table C13

Related Service Providers: Work Experiences

Question	Face-to-Face		Remote/Online	
	M	*Mdn*	*M*	*Mdn*
How many hours per week on average did you work?	18.6	25.0	32.0	40.0
How many hours per week did you preform job specific duties (e.g., counseling, therapy)?	15.7	12.0	24.0	27.5
How much time did you spend preparing for job specific duties in a typical day?	1.1	1.0	2.6	2.8
How many students with an IEP did you directly interact with in a typical day?	10.0	2.5	8.3	11.3
How much time did you spend directly interacting with students with an IEP in a typical day?	2.4	0.0	3.6	3.8

Table C14

Related Service Providers: Contact With Parents

Baseline characteristic	Guided self-help	
	n	%
How often did you contact each student's parent informing on progress and delivering feedback during remote/online instruction?		
At Least Once a Week	4	50.0
At Least Every Other Week	2	25.0
Once a Month	1	12.5
Only After I Contacted Them	1	12.5
Never	0	0.0
How did the frequency of parental contact during online instruction compare to regular instruction?		
Significantly Less	2	25.0
Slightly Less	0	0.0
Same	2	25.0
Slightly More	1	12.5
Significantly More	3	37.5

Table C15

Related Service Providers: Technology Use

Question	Guided self-help	
	n	%
Where did you receive training for the technology used during remote/online instruction?		
Self-Taught	6	75.0
School/District Technology Specialist	1	12.5
Consultation with Teachers	6	75.0
School Training	2	25.0
District Training	2	25.0
Synchronous Online Learning	1	12.5
Asynchronous Online Learning	4	50.0
Not Provided	0	0.0
Other	1	12.5
How did your students access remote/online instruction?		
Family Computer	2	25.0
Rented Computer	5	62.5
Smart Phone	3	37.5
Barrowed or Shared Device from Family/Friend	0	0.0
Other	3	37.5
How prepared were you for the switch to remote/online instruction?		
Significantly Unprepared	4	50.0
Somewhat Unprepared	3	37.5
Neutral	0	0.0
Somewhat Prepared	1	12.5
Significantly Prepared	0	0.0

Table C16

Related Service Providers: Meetings & Assessment

Question	Guided self-help	
	n	%
Were assessments (e.g., speech, OT, AT, social/emotional, IQ) conducted during remote/online instruction?		
Initial Evaluations	2	25.0
Re-Evaluations	1	12.5
IEP	2	25.0
Not Conducted	6	75.0
Were IEP/Evaluation meetings conducted during remote/online instruction?		
Initial Evaluations	4	50.0
Re-Evaluations	6	75.0
IEP	8	100.0
Not Conducted	1	12.5
How were IEP/Evaluation meetings conducted during remote/online instruction?		
Video Conference	8	100.0
Phone Call	4	50.0
At Student's Home	0	0.0
By Appointment at the School	0	0.0
Email Correspondence	0	0.0
Not Held/Temporarily Suspended	1	12.5
What was the quality of IEP meetings conducted online compared to face-to-face meetings?		
Significantly Less	1	12.5
Slightly Less	2	25.0
Same	3	37.5
Slightly More	1	12.5
Significantly More	0	0.0

Table C17

Related Service Providers: IEP Meeting Participants

IEP Team Members	Before Online Instruction		During Online Instruction	
	n	%	*n*	%
Parent	8	100.0	8	100.0
Special Education Teacher	7	87.5	7	87.5
General Education Teacher	6	75.0	6	75.0
Local Education Agent	7	87.5	7	87.5
Related Service Provider	7	87.5	7	87.5
Student	2	25.0	3	37.5
No IEP meeting	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table C18

Narrative Voices: Parents

Question	Response
Is there anything you would like us to know that was not captured in any of the survey questions?	"Being a latina mother without famil[y] during [p]andemic with 2 special needs kids has been the cause of my anxiety. [School didn't] help us or guide us [through] this my son [didn't] receive anything and still they are way back in this."
	"Both parent and educator. Decided to 1/2 time homeschool due to the lack of success."
	"Communication has had to increase with the school with remote learning at times questions are answered other times they are not. My child has gone without AT extensions since Spring although 10 consult AT hours are written in the IEP."
	"I have been able to support his learning with the online instruction. I am much more aware of his challenges now than I was during face to face instruction."
	"[Online] learning eliminated most or all distractions that impacted my child's school learning."
	"My child has a diagnosis of social phobia, which makes being at school very very difficult. They are almost incapable of attending video classes but it's much easier for them to complete assignments at home than in class."
	"Nothing was/is tailored to match IEP. No modifications for online leaning. Expected to assist all 6 spec needs kids by myself."
	"The sped teacher was available, giving assignments on 3rd party websites, giving constant assessments. I saw my child's true struggles and could give one on one help during distance learning. We are now homeschooling for 20/21."
	"We had 0 IEP help during remote learning."

Table C19

Narrative Voices: Teachers

Question	Response
Is there anything you would like us to know that was not captured in any of the survey questions?	"All of our special needs students are with us 5 days per week. On noncohort days they are in the library with paraeducators completing work assigned by teachers on media platforms such as google classroom." "During the 2019-2020 school year, my students were in a self co gained classes for students with severe-profound intellectual disabilities. They were both nonverbal, visually impaired and rarely participated in remote learning." "I strongly prefer face-to-face when it is safe- either not during a pandemic, or with appropriate PPE and safety precautions (which have not been planned/provided for). The stress load on myself and staff has significantly increased and is almost unbearable, but the alternative of placing ourselves at risk with students who cannot wear masks, physical distance, exhibit high-risk behaviors (spitting in others' faces, mouthing, biting, require crisis intervention/physical management, etc.), require hands-on/physical prompting for all instructional tasks/personal care/self-regulation, is absolutely a worse option for ourselves and our families." "I think special education need technology tools specific to their needs. Making what is provided to general education teacher work for special education is not adequate. Training, materials and appropriate resources are needed." "I was really confused with the questions that wanted you to fill out the "face to face" and the "remote/online" options especially since some schools are hybrid. I answered those questions as "face to face" was before my school shut down and "online/remote" was after the school shut down." "I work for a company that teachers 100 online prior to the pandemic. Prior to that I taught a hybrid model so my survey might not look normal :)." "I work with students that have significant cognitive deficits. Online learning was next to impossible with my students. Parents of two of my students would not allow them to be online. My paras and I would make weekly visits when it was allowed to see them to work with them." "I worked harder during remote learning than I have since I first started teaching."

Question	Response
	"I'm in a rural district and we were very close to meeting the metrics to reopen before the state closed all schools."
	"Mentioned in this survey are my feelings regarding my experience with remote learning in March-June 2020 when there was no preparation for remote teaching and learning. In 2020, remote learning and teaching is equal to face-face teaching and learning because of the time teachers have been given to prepare, etc. I believe my students are receiving a quality education this school year so far, even from home."
	"My students are doing "ok". I am "ok" at providing quality instruction. My parents are unhappy and unable to provide the time needed as "aides" in the home because they have to work and have other children."
	"My students online were not motivated and avoided unwanted tasks. They did not attend Google Meets."
	"Online learning was better due to extreme behaviors in my classroom, but it was not better for the kids."
	"Online teaching results in me spending less time on behavior management. I can mute them if disruptive, if they leave, I don't need to chase them, etc. I was able to focus more on instruction for some groups of students than before. Online teaching became significantly more effective once my district purchased and provided software and apps outside of doing everything through la video meeting. As a special education teacher, I spend significantly more time over a synchronous video meeting than most general education teachers. Parents also were in better attendance and more involved in IEP and Evaluation meetings."
	"Teaching online sucks."
	"The hardest part of trying to teach my online students is that several of my parent literally told me they were the ones completing the assignments. So really the students aren't receiving instruction at all and are regressing so much because of the online."
	"The quality of the online instruction changed a lot from last school year to this school year. While I had very little effect or even communication with students last year, policies and guidance changed so I was able to zoom with students all day long instead of maybe once a week."
	"We changed to virtual in March 2020 so my answers were based on 2019-2020 school year."
	"I teach severe needs students."

Table C20

Narrative Voices: Related Service Providers

Question	Response
Is there anything you would like us to know that was not captured in any of the survey questions?	"A lot of this is student/family specific. I have seen some kids make massive gains and some not a lot. IEP meetings vary as to placement in terms of who is present. I have two SLPAs so do a lot of online supervision of them with students but they are the ones primarily doing therapy. I evaluate, monitor, observe, etc." "Some of the benefits to remote learning were that it was easier to keep to my contract time, I was about to focus on my job duties more and had less odd jobs assigned to me by administrators. I was about to better keep up on my documentation. Threats to self and other have also been significantly less (50 per month to 2 per month). Our district last spring decided for us that we could not engage with students over zoom or video, and could only use Google classrooms. I only had one regular student interaction which was a phone call to one of my 3rd graders that surprisingly lasted an hour each time." "When working remotely, it was easier to be on the computer for many more hours than a typical day, which is why the job satisfaction went down. The kids seemed happy to work with adults from school [because] they were only at home for so long."