COVID-19 Practices in Special Education: Stakeholder Perceptions and Implications for Teacher Preparation

Melissa Jenkins

Jennifer D. Walker

University of Mary Washington

Abstract

In light of COVID-19, school divisions across the country closed their doors and shifted to remote instruction. In Virginia, little guidance was provided to assist educators and teacher educators with making this transition, particularly for students with individualized education programs (IEPs). In May of 2020, researchers surveyed Virginia stakeholders involved in special education to assess the effectiveness of instructional delivery and procedural compliance as it related to students' IEPs. Quantitative and qualitative data analysis reveal that while schools and school divisions were generally viewed as effective with the procedural components of a free and appropriate public education, they were less effective, or ineffective, with the provision of specialized instruction. Implications for teacher preparation programs are discussed.

Keywords: FAPE, COVID-19, Teacher Preparation

As a result of the global COVID-19 pandemic, Virginia's Governor ordered the closure of K-12 schools beginning March 16, 2020, for a minimum period of two weeks (Office of the Governor, 2020, March 13). The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) attempted to minimize disruption to instruction, so schools initially provided short-term assignments or packets of work, which could be completed independently at home. Ten days after the temporary closure, the Governor of Virginia issued another executive order closing K-12 school buildings for the remainder of the academic year (Office of the Governor, 2020, March 23).

In addressing building closures, Virginia school leadership followed guidance from the United States Department of Education (USDOE, 2020, March 16) which stated that no individualized educational services were required for students with individualized education plans (IEPs) when educational programming was not occurring for general education

populations. However, once school resumed with educational programming, the USDOE was clear that Local Education Agencies were required to provide special education and related services to students. Little guidance came from the USDOE or VDOE about instruction, particularly as it related to students with special education needs. USDOE indicated that special education services should be provided "to the greatest extent possible," while also acknowledging "there may be exceptional circumstances that could affect how a particular service is provided" (USDOE, 2020, March 16, p. 3). VDOE stated, "there is no prescribed right way to provide services" and special education and related services could be provided "virtually, online, or telephonically" (2020, Introduction). Although the VDOE guidance was updated and clarified as the pandemic continued, this unique situation created many unknowns about IEP implementation and the provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE). Simultaneously, there was litigation indicating that when school divisions failed to implement the IEP as written, even under emergency conditions, it could be considered a denial of FAPE (Natanson, 2020). The message was clear that the requirement for FAPE had not changed as a result of school-building closures, necessitating the transition to virtual and remote learning.

Requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act

Regardless of the modality of instruction, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA, 2004) ensures FAPE for all students. Specifically, FAPE guarantees special education and related services are provided at public expense according to a student's IEP (Yell, 2019). Procedurally, FAPE is provided through the IEP process which requires notice to parents or guardians, parent or guardian input, individualized evaluations, the attendance of required members at meetings, adherence to timelines, the inclusion of required components in the IEP, and implementation of the IEP (Yell at al., 2013). Substantively, the provision of FAPE

occurs with the development and delivery of services that are "reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress in light of the child's circumstances" (*Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District*, 2017, p. 15). Despite the emergency conditions created by the COVID-19 pandemic, both procedural and substantive requirements of FAPE remained intact.

Teacher Preparation to Provide FAPE through Virtual Instruction

Virtual learning was becoming increasingly prevalent in K-12 schools in the decade leading up to the COVID-19 pandemic (Archambault & Crippen, 2009; Greer et al., 2014). Fully online and hybrid formats require teachers to develop and present curriculum, conduct assessment, promote positive learning behaviors, and communicate information to both learners and families in ways that differ from traditional brick-and-mortar education (Greer et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2016). Additionally, special educators teaching through virtual formats must provide specialized instruction and address legal requirements to ensure FAPE. In recognition of these demands, the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (2011) developed *National Standards for Quality Online Teaching* to promote teacher preparation and positive student outcomes. These standards, however, are not directly tied to any accreditation body and therefore have limited integration into teacher preparation programs and are particularly limited in special education teacher preparation (Smith et al., 2016). In a study of 48 institutions of the Higher Education Consortium for Special Education, Smith and colleagues found that a majority of special education teacher preparation programs did not address aspects of virtual learning. These included legal issues in special education, creating and implementing assessments for online formats, aligning curriculum to content standards, or modifying assessments. The teacher educators in the study did, however, report an emphasis on integrating technology to support student engagement.

Virginia's requirements for teacher preparation programs align with the aforementioned research findings. Teacher preparation programs include standards that directly relate to FAPE, leading to coursework addressing federal and state special education laws, the application of assessment and evaluation measures, and the development and implementation of IEPs (Virginia General Assembly, n.d.). However, specific coursework about remote or virtual teaching modalities is not required.

Purpose

Given that core expectations of FAPE remained the same when school divisions shifted to remote and virtual learning formats, and research suggesting that special educators may have been underprepared to address legal and instructional components of FAPE through these formats, this study sought to understand special education stakeholder perceptions of how schools and school divisions addressed these requirements following school-building closures caused by COVID-19. Research questions were:

- How did Virginia special education stakeholders perceive their school and school division's efficacy in addressing instructional requirements of special education following COVID-19 school-building closings?
- How did Virginia special education stakeholders perceive their school and school division's efficacy in addressing legal and procedural requirements of special education following COVID-19 school building closings?

Implications of these findings may impact pre- and in-service teacher development programs.

Methods

Participants

Snowball sampling via social media platforms was used to recruit participants. To ensure broad distribution, the researchers posted the research invitation and survey link on at least two social media sites associated with special education in each of Virginia's eight TTAC regions.

One hundred forty-two stakeholders participated in the study and 111 completed the survey. The participants represented all eight of Virginia's TTAC regions. However, the greatest number of participants (77.46%) reported they were involved in special education in the Northern Virginia region. Conversely, participants from the Southwest and Southside regions each represented approximately 1% of the sample. The remaining regions were represented by 3% to 5% of the participants.

Participants represented a broad array of special education stakeholder roles including parents of learners with disabilities, special education teachers of standard and adapted curricula, related service providers, special education leaders, school social workers, and school psychologists. Approximately 46% of participants were parents and 44% were special education professionals. Just over 9% of participants reported they were parents of learners with disabilities and also special education professionals.

The participants were engaged with learners representing the full range of ages and grade levels served under IDEIA. Forty-six percent of participants reported supporting students with disabilities in multiple grade levels. Early childhood education or preschool programs were represented by 21% of participants, each elementary grade (K-5) was represented by 26% to 29% of participants, each middle school and high school grade was represented by 13% to 17% of participants, and 9% of participants supported students with disabilities in the post-graduate or transition years of public education.

Instrument

A cross-sectional online survey was developed to capture special education stakeholders' perceptions of school and school division effectiveness at meeting the instructional and procedural requirements of FAPE following COVID-19 building closures (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). Survey questions were drafted to focus on identification and evaluation, delivery of special education and related services, parent participation, and technology-related assistance (Yell, 2019). The drafted questions were piloted with six individuals representing various stakeholder roles in special education, including special education teachers, parents, a related service provider, and a special education administrator (Creswell & Geutterman, 2019). Feedback from pilot participants resulted in minor revisions to the wording of the survey to improve clarity.

The final survey consisted of five questions related to participant and school division characteristics, two open-ended questions inviting participants to identify areas of concern and areas of strength in school or division responsiveness to special education needs, nine questions asking stakeholders to rate school and division effectiveness in addressing instructional factors, and seven questions asking participants to rate school and division effectiveness in addressing procedural factors. (The instructional and procedural factors are listed in the first columns of Tables 1 and 2, respectively.)

Participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of each instructional factor on a scale of 1 to 5 using an ordered-category rating system (Brill, 2008). The rating scale defined levels of effectiveness by the degree to which instructional services or materials were available, accessible, and meeting special education needs. The rating scale for procedural factors used a similar 5-point scale basing effectiveness on the degree to which information was available to support team members in completing procedures in compliance with regulatory timelines. There

was no neutral response option for either rating scale because there are no situations in which these factors would be viewed as neither effective nor ineffective (Brill, 2008). Stakeholders did have the option of selecting *not applicable* if any instructional or procedural factors were not relevant to their students. The rating scale descriptors can be found in Appendix A.

Data Analysis

The survey resulted in both quantitative and qualitative data. Open-ended questions created a qualitative data set capturing participants' perspectives of concerns related to special education following building closures, as well as aspects that schools and divisions handled well. Rating scales resulted in a quantitative data set describing school and division effectiveness at addressing instructional and procedural factors that were identified by the researchers. Data analysis occurred in three phases.

First, a preliminary exploratory analysis of the qualitative data was completed. This initial analysis revealed that the quantitative questions developed by the researchers addressed many of the topics that were at the forefront of special education stakeholders' minds as the school year came to a close. The preliminary exploratory analysis also revealed an informative data set that was worthy of more in-depth thematic coding. The researchers hand coded the data using a combination of organizational and substantive themes, as well as in-vivo codes (Maxwell, 2013).

Following completion of the qualitative coding, the data from the rating scales were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Participants who indicated that a service or procedure (e.g., assistive technology) was not applicable to their students were excluded from calculations for that specific service or procedure. Modes and medians were calculated for each factor. Then, the rating scale was collapsed to reflect stakeholder perceptions of general effectiveness (ratings of

somewhat effective, *effective*, or *highly effective*) or ineffectiveness (ratings of *ineffective* or *somewhat ineffective*; Brill, 2008). Percentages of participants rating each factor as effective or ineffective were calculated for the collapsed scale.

In the final phase of data analysis, the researchers integrated the quantitative and qualitative data seeking points of convergence or divergence in the two data sets. Specifically, codes from the qualitative data were reviewed looking for evidence to support or reject conclusions drawn from the quantitative data or elaborate on the quantitative findings.

Findings

Stakeholder Perceptions of Instructional Efficacy

Data from the rating scales yielded quantitative information about stakeholder perceptions of school and division efficacy in addressing instructional requirements of special education following COVID-19 school-building closures. The descriptive data calculated from the rating scales are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

Participants' Ratings of Effectiveness for Instructional Factors

Instructional Factor	Mode		Median		Collapsed Scales: % of Participants Rating Effective*		Collapsed Scales: % of Participants Rating Ineffective**	
	Division	School	Division	School	Division	School	Division	School
Provision of instructional materials	3	3	3	3	61.72	73.73	38.28	26.27
Access to online learning platforms	3	4	3	3	69.47	73.99	30.53	26.01

General education instruction	3	3, 2	3	3	66.67	64.66	33.33	35.34
Modification of instructional materials	1	3	2	3	45.69	52.30	54.31	47.70
Specialized instruction for IEP goals	1	1	2	2	43.70	49.57	56.30	50.42
Provision of accommodations	1	1	2	2	42.86	46.15	57.14	53.85
Provision of assistive technology	3	3	3	3	52.87	54.65	47.13	45.35
Delivery of related services	1	1	1	2	23.40	33.72	76.60	66.28
Opportunities for communication	3	4	3	3	70.77	71.07	29.23	28.93

* Ratings of *somewhat effective* (3), *effective* (4), and *highly effective* (5) were collapsed into effective.
* Ratings of *ineffective* (1) and *somewhat ineffective* (2) were collapsed into ineffective.

Looking at the modal responses, schools and school divisions were most often described as *ineffective* (1) at providing specialized instruction for IEP goals, providing accommodations, and delivering related services. School divisions were also rated *ineffective* (1) at modifying instructional materials, whereas schools were rated *somewhat effective* (3) for this factor. Stakeholders most frequently rated both schools and divisions *somewhat effective* (3) at providing instructional materials and assistive technology. School divisions were rated *somewhat effective* (3) in providing general education instruction, while schools had a bimodal rating for this factor indicating that stakeholders were equally divided in rating schools *somewhat*

ineffective (2) and *somewhat effective* (3). School divisions were also described as s*omewhat effective* (3) in providing access to online learning platforms and opportunities for communication. Schools were rated *effective* (4) for these two factors.

The collapsed data provide information about the percentage of participants who rated each instructional factor as broadly effective (ratings of 3, 4, or 5) or broadly ineffective (ratings of 1 or 2). Less than half of stakeholders described schools and school divisions as being effective, to any degree, in providing specialized instruction for IEP goals or accommodations. Further, approximately 34% of stakeholders used an effective rating when describing the delivery of related services by schools and approximately 23% of participants described school divisions as effective in addressing this instructional requirement. Conversely, over 60% of participants assigned one of the effective ratings to schools and divisions when describing provision of instructional materials, access to online learning platforms, general education instruction, and opportunities for communication. When combining the collapsed scale data with the median data, it is evident that, even for the factors that had higher percentages of broadly effective ratings, no instructional factor was rated as more than *somewhat effective* (3) by more than 50% of the stakeholders.

Qualitative Descriptions of Instructional Efficacy

As with the rating scales, narrative data provided mixed perspectives related to the efficacy of instructional factors. An overarching sentiment of the qualitative data is well-captured by a special education team leader who wrote, “Students who have some level of independence, access to technology, and strong parental support have been maintaining skills. If any one of those pieces is missing it all falls apart.” Holistically, participants conveyed the need for many instructional factors to come together to meet the learning needs of students with

disabilities and deep frustrations about what did not work and how those failures impacted learners with disabilities. Of note, when asked what special education needs were addressed particularly well following building closures, over 25% of stakeholders responded, "Nothing" or something similar.

Qualitative findings support the quantitative data indicating communication was an area of relative strength. Parents frequently commented special educators were in regular contact with them. School counselors reached out to families of students who were not present for online learning, and early childhood special educators described establishing a "coaching model" with parents. While many expressed frustration about the amount of "unknowns," communication was generally described in a positive light.

Stakeholder comments also elaborated on the *effective* and *somewhat effective* ratings for access to online learning platforms, provision of instructional materials, and general education instruction. Schools and divisions were praised for providing laptops and using a variety of web conferencing tools to provide instruction. Stakeholders described the creation and dissemination of "packets" as something handled well. Parents acknowledged special educators for "checking-in" and "monitoring" general education class time. However, parents and educators expressed concern about a mismatch between these instructional opportunities and individualized student needs, which aligned with *ineffective* and *somewhat ineffective* ratings for specialized instruction and provision of accommodations. Specifically, parents and educators indicated packets often lacked individualization or accommodations and remote learning was described as incompatible with the needs of many students with disabilities. "Lack of structure" and reduced opportunities for "hands-on instruction" were frequently cited as challenging. Parents and educators conveyed concern that materials could not be differentiated enough to meet the needs of these learners and

many required direct parental support to participate. Further, educators expressed concern that research-based practices were not used during remote instruction. A special educator and parent of a child with a disability commented that no research-based programs for math or reading were used. Another teacher wrote, "We received no training or guidance on using technology or developing/implementing appropriate lessons. Our students have individual and specific needs and we were left to figure it out."

An additional concern related to the delivery of specialized instruction was reduced or discontinued special education services, including related services. An individual identified as both a parent and educator stated, "My students have not received their required special education services." Another parent explained that their child's special education service time had decreased from 15 hours per week in school to 40 minutes per week during remote learning. Multiple participants indicated related services were not provided, supporting the large percentage of participants who rated schools and divisions as broadly ineffective at providing these services. A parent commented, "He could have been receiving his speech therapy...He continued to (receive) his private therapy via Zoom. The school system just chose never to provide services." Another shared, "No supports either from OT or Speech or even a one on one chat with ABA from the county."

Stakeholder Perceptions of Procedural Efficacy

The data from the rating scales about stakeholder perceptions of school and division efficacy in addressing procedural requirements of special education are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

Participants' Ratings of Effectiveness for Procedural Factors

	Collapsed Scales

Procedural Factor	Mode		Median		% of Participants Rating Effective*		% of Participants Rating Ineffective**	
	Division	School	Division	School	Division	School	Division	School
Developing IEPs for services during closures	3	3	3	3	59.81	67.00	40.19	33.00
Developing IEPs for services once schools reopen	4	4,3	3	4	70.59	77.78	29.41	22.22
Scheduling and conducting IEP meetings	4	4	4	4	83.17	90.43	16.83	9.57
Scheduling and conducting transition meetings	4	4	4	4	72.86	79.17	27.14	20.83
Conducting special education evaluations or assessments	1	1	1	2	26.76	34.78	73.24	65.22
Scheduling and conducting special education referral or eligibility meetings	1	4	3	3	56.16	69.44	43.84	30.56
Including all required team members in meetings	4	4	4	4	82.18	85.85	17.82	14.14

* Ratings of *somewhat effective* (3), *effective* (4), and *highly effective* (5) were collapsed into effective.
** Ratings of *ineffective* (1) and *somewhat ineffective* (2) were collapsed into ineffective.

Procedures such as developing and conducting IEPs; transition, and eligibility meetings; conducting evaluations; and including all required team members in meetings were rated.

Modes and medians for each of the procedural factors indicate that stakeholders viewed schools and school divisions as being *somewhat effective* (3) or *effective* (4) at addressing procedural factors, with the exception of conducting special education evaluations or assessments, which was most frequently rated *ineffective* (1). School divisions were also most frequently assigned an *ineffective* rating (1) for scheduling and conducting referral or eligibility meetings.

The collapsed data show that for each of the procedural factors, with the exception of conducting evaluations, more than 55% of stakeholders assigned a broadly effective rating to school divisions and more than 67% of stakeholders did so for schools. Within these collapsed scales, an analysis of medians yields at least 50% of stakeholders rated schools and divisions as *effective* (4) or higher for scheduling and conducting IEP and transition meetings and including all required stakeholders. Schools also received *effective* ratings (4) or higher from more than 50% of stakeholders for developing IEPs to identify services once schools reopen. Conversely, only 35% of stakeholders believed school divisions were broadly effective at conducting special education evaluations. Even fewer stakeholders (approximately 27%) viewed schools as broadly effective.

Qualitative Descriptions of Procedural Efficacy

Procedural factors were mentioned far less than instructional factors in participants' narrative responses. When discussing special education factors that schools or divisions handled well, stakeholders mentioned use of virtual tools to schedule and conduct IEP meetings. This favorable opinion was evident in the rating scales, as scheduling and conducting IEP and

transition meetings and including all required team members were among the highest rated factors in the survey. Stakeholders described meetings as including "all providers available" and "meeting special education timelines." A school social worker commented, "I feel my assigned schools have done an excellent job of answering parent questions and managing the eligibility and IEP development processes."

IEP amendments and Temporary Learning Plans (TLPs) received mixed feedback. IEP development was rated as broadly effective (59% for divisions and 67% for schools), but qualitative comments were sometimes critical of the process, specifically when discussing TLPs. The divide in comments was primarily delineated by participant role. More educators found the process helpful, while parents indicated dissatisfaction. Educators described TLPs as a tool that "saved a tremendous amount of work" and allowed educators to "cover the most important pieces of each student's education." Parents tended to view the TLPs as an "attempt to reduce services in the IEP."

Special education evaluations were minimally mentioned in the narrative responses, and then only as a concern. One parent stated, "My child was supposed to be assessed for OT and visual impairment but can't because schools are closed." A school psychologist expressed concern there would be a backup of evaluations upon return to school due to the inability to complete assessments through virtual formats. This limited narrative commentary provides some insight into the ineffective ratings assigned to both divisions and schools for their handling of special education evaluations and assessments.

Discussion

Virginia special education stakeholders had mixed perceptions of school and division effectiveness at addressing the instructional and procedural requirements of FAPE when school

buildings closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Stakeholders largely viewed schools and divisions as effective at addressing procedural requirements of special education and providing general education instruction and instructional resources. Conversely, schools and divisions were predominantly rated as ineffective at providing specialized instruction, accommodations, and related services in the instructional category and conducting assessments for special education evaluations in the procedural category. It is notable that these are the factors that most clearly distinguish special education from general education and are the substantive essence of FAPE.

While the root causes of the instructional difficulties cannot be fully ascertained by this research, the qualitative findings suggest that many stakeholders perceived a mismatch between the individualized learning needs of students with disabilities and virtual learning experiences. Given research findings related to special education teacher preparation for virtual learning (Smith et al., 2016), it seems plausible that teachers were underprepared to address the learning needs of students with disabilities through virtual formats.

Similarly, the root causes of the more effective instructional practices cannot be ascertained by this research. However, school and division effectiveness at providing instructional materials, access to online platforms, general education instruction, and opportunities for communication may be, at least partially, attributed to the fact that these were required by both general and special education students. Therefore, additional planning may have been implemented to ensure these were in place.

Procedurally, schools and districts were rated in ineffective ranges for conducting assessments and evaluations needed for special education eligibility. These ratings are not entirely unexpected. Since evaluating and testing students for special education eligibility often requires face-to-face administration for reliability and validity purposes, it is not surprising that

the evaluation process was halted or delayed. In fact, USDOE guidance (2020, March 16) indicated that face-to-face evaluations would need to be delayed during school-building closures to mitigate health risks.

In contrast to the procedural challenges associated with conducting evaluations, schools and divisions were described as broadly effective at scheduling and conducting IEP meetings to plan for services during and after school closure and including all team members in meetings. Guidance provided on the topic of virtual IEP meetings (USDOE, n.d.) may have contributed to this outcome.

Implications for Teacher Educators

While most everyone would agree the circumstances created by a global pandemic are unique, the lessons learned from this period in education are still of value to teacher preparation programs, particularly as they relate to virtual learning experiences. Improved pedagogy for virtual learning could prepare teachers to deliver instruction following natural disasters, during inclement weather, or during any disruption in instructional delivery. Virtual learning has been on the rise in general education for many years and may provide an additional way to lessen regression and recoupment for students with disabilities. However, the findings of this research highlight specific challenges Virginia educators faced in providing FAPE through virtual and remote learning formats. While some of these challenges cannot be easily resolved through teacher preparation programs, there are take-aways and implications for teacher educators.

The findings of this research and previous research related to teacher preparation for virtual instruction suggest the need for teacher educators to evaluate how teacher preparation programs currently address virtual instruction and the individualization of services as related to FAPE (Greer et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2016). Teacher preparation for virtual instruction may be

enhanced by incorporating the *National Standards for Quality Online Teaching* into coursework (International Association for K-12 Online Learning, 2011) and possibly into state licensure requirements. At this time, Virginia licensure requirements address the use of technology to "promote student learning" (Virginia General Assembly, n.d.), but do not specify requirements related to virtual instruction. Therefore, most teacher preparation programs address the requirement by embedding technology as part of in-class instruction, not as a stand-alone remote instructional tool.

Moving forward, teacher preparation programs should expand the application of technology by integrating both the pedagogy of virtual instruction and its application. Coursework and clinical experiences could embed opportunities for creation, delivery, and assessment of virtual instruction. This might involve an exploration of virtual learning platforms, ways to individualize for student needs, data collection tools, and provision of accommodations and modifications during remote instruction.

Given the results that showed the "special" and individualized components in special education were the most ineffective factors during remote instruction, teacher preparation programs should specifically consider how they can better prepare special educators to deliver FAPE under a variety of learning conditions. A first step for teacher educators could be ensuring that requirements of FAPE are clearly embedded in programming; teaching pre-and in-service teachers that FAPE can be delivered remotely and demonstrating and assessing delivery of FAPE in remote environments. This could be accomplished through synchronous or asynchronous experiences, including bug-in-ear opportunities to practice through eCoaching (Rock et al., 2014).

Conclusion

While educators demonstrated effectiveness with procedural matters related to special education, the instructional delivery and individualization required for FAPE were less effective, and often ineffective. Stakeholder ratings of ineffectiveness were elaborated by narrative commentary expressing concerns about student regression in academic skills, behavior, communication, and social interaction. The concern was not only that students with disabilities would experience loss of skill but would also have greater losses than students without disabilities. To mitigate these risks, teacher educators must engage in careful consideration and dialogue about these concerns, so we better prepare special education teachers for future virtual instruction.

Appendix A

Descriptors for Ratings of Effectiveness

	Instructional Factor Ratings	Procedural Factor Ratings
Rating	Descriptor	Descriptor
Highly Effective (5)	These services or materials are consistently provided, readily accessible, and fully address the special education needs of my student(s).	All team members have the information needed to implement procedures and meet legal requirements well in advance of meetings or due dates.
Effective (4)	These services or materials are consistently provided, generally accessible, and address most of the special education needs of my student(s).	Most team members have the information needed to implement procedures and meet legal requirements prior to meetings or due dates.
Somewhat Effective (3)	These services or materials are generally available and accessible. Some of my students' special	One or more team members has the information needed to implement procedures and meet legal requirements. Information may be

	education needs are not met, but the most critical needs are still addressed.	shared just prior to meetings or due dates.
Somewhat Ineffective (2)	These services or materials are not consistently available. Some of my students' special education needs are not met, including some critical areas.	One or more team members is able to obtain needed information during meetings or on due dates allowing legal requirements to be met. There may be some inconsistent guidance regarding procedures.
Ineffective (1)	These services or materials are not available. My students' special education needs are not being met.	Information is not readily available to team members when needed. Guidance related to procedures is inconsistent or absent. Due dates and timelines are missed with no clear plan for addressing these issues.
Not Applicable	These services or materials are not elements of my students' education or IEP, even when school is open.	I have not had any requirement to participate in this type of meeting or activity since the COVID-19 closures.

References

Archambault, L., & Crippen, K. (2009). K-12 distance educators at work: Who's teaching online across the United States? *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 41*(4), 363-391. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2009.10782535

Brill, J. E. (2008). Likert Scale. In P. J. Lavrakas (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods.* SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J.W., & Guetterman, T.C. (2019). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Pearson.

Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District RE-1, 137 S. Ct. 988 (2017). https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/16pdf/15-827_0pm1.pdf

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

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et seq.* (2004).

International Association for K-12 Online Learning. (2011). *National Standards for Quality Online Teaching.* https://www.aurora-institute.org/wp-content/uploads/national-standards-for-quality-online-teaching-v2.pdf

Maxwell, J.A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Natanson, H. (2020, May 18). *Virginia investigates complaints that Fairfax's online learning fails students with disabilities*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/virginia-investigates-complaints-that-fairfaxs-online-learning-fails-disabled-students/2020/05/18/377f7fd2-992b-11ea-a282-386f56d579e6_story.html

Office of the Governor. (2020, March 13). *Governor Northam orders all Virginia K-12 schools closed for minimum of two weeks* [Press release]. https://www.governor.virginia.gov/newsroom/all-releases/2020/march/headline-854442-en.html

Office of the Governor. (2020, March 23). *Northam orders statewide closure of certain non-essential business, K-12 schools* [Press release].

https://www.governor.virginia.gov/newsroom/all-releases/2020/march/headline-855292-en.html

Rock, M. L., Schumacker, R. E., Gregg, M., Howard, P. W., Gable, R. A., & Zigmond, N. (2014). How are they now? Longer term effects of eCoaching through online bug-in-ear technology. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 37*(2), 161-181. https://doi-org.mutex.gmu.edu/10.1177/0888406414525048

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

United States Department of Education. (2020, March). *Questions and answers on providing services to students with disabilities during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 outbreak.* https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/memosdcltrs/qa-covid-19-03-12-2020.pdf

United States Department of Education. (2020, March 16). *Fact sheet: Addressing the risk of COVID-19 in schools while protecting the civil rights of students.* https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/ocr-coronavirus-fact-sheet.pdf

United States Department of Education. (n.d.). *Virtual IEP meeting tip sheets*. https://www.parentcenterhub.org/wp-content/uploads/repo_items/virtual-iep-meeting-tipsheets.pdf

Virginia Department of Education. (2020). *Special Education and Student Services (SESS) frequently asked questions*. https://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/health_medical/office/covid-19-sess-faq.shtml

Virginia General Assembly. (n.d.). Virginia Law Administrative Code. https://law.lis.virginia.gov/admincode/title8/agency20/

Yell, M. L. (2019). *The Law and Special Education* (5th Ed). Pearson Education.

Yell, M. L., Katsiyannis, A., Ennis, R. P., & Losinski, M. (2013). Avoiding procedural errors in IEP development. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 46*(1), 56-66. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005991304600107