

Using iPads to Support Student Participation in the Individual Educational Plan Process

ABSTRACT

In this research project, eleven (11) special education students went through a self-determination curriculum that included aspects of the “ASPIRE” training program during the school year to prepare them to lead their Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) meetings at year’s end. Six (6) students were given iPads to support their preparation for and participation in the IEP. The other five (5) were not provided with technology. The students with iPads were supported with training and technical assistance for iPad use. A survey was completed by student, teachers, and family following the IEP to collect perceptions of student ability and performance. All students were seen to have participated successfully in their IEP meetings. Students who used iPads were reported to have demonstrated leadership behaviors at their meetings to a greater degree than the control group.

INTRODUCTION

High school age students have been encouraged to attend and participate in their Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) meetings since the 1997 amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandated their invitation (Mason, Field & Sawilowsky, 2004). Students who participate in their IEP meeting have been shown to be more likely to reach goals (Agran & Hughes, 2008; Arndt, Konrad, & Test, 2006; Martin, Van Dycke, Christensen, Greene, Gardner, & Lovett, 2006; Mason, McGahee-Kovac, Johnson, & Stillerman, 2002; Kennedy & Haring, 1993; Perlmutter & Monty, 1977; Powers et al. , 2001; Realon, Favell & Lowerre, 1990; Van Reusen, Deshler, & Schumaker, 1989).

Student leadership in IEP meetings has been linked to enhanced communication and self-advocacy skills (Mason, McGahee-Kovac, Johnson, & Stillerman, 2002), improved academic performance (Schunk, 1985), and to elevated rates of completion of high school (Benz, Lindstrom, & Yovanoff, 2000). Further, there are indications that such participation has positive impacts upon employment and quality of life as students become adults (Furney & Salembier, 2000; Halpern, Yovanoff, Doren, & Benz, 1995; Wehmeyer, Agran, & Hughes, 2000).

A body of resource material has emerged during this period to describe the steps in preparing students for participation in their meetings (Konrad, 2008; Konrad, & Test, 2004; Mason, McGahee-Kovac, & Johnson, 2004; Torgerson, Miner, & Sehn, 2004; Test, Mason, Hughes, Konrad, Neale, & Wood, 2004). However, the practice remains under-utilized (Stanberry, 2010). Nevertheless, students who do lead their IEP meeting, regularly describe their experience as one of the most memorable learning experiences of their year (Hawbaker, 2007).

Stanberry (2010) suggests that the use of technology in student-led IEP meetings can help provide motivation for students to take a more central role in the planning and conduct of these meetings. Case studies presented appeared to indicate elevated involvement in meeting preparation and leadership.

PREPARATION FOR THE IEP MEETING

Martin, Marshall & Sale (2004) collected and analyzed the reflections of 1638 high school IEP team members. This study indicated that students with disabilities generally do not understand how to participate in their IEP meeting. These students need to be taught leadership and self-advocacy skills and about goal-setting and how to participate effectively in an IEP meeting.

ASPIRE (Active Student Participation Inspires Real Engagement) is a curriculum that seeks to foster active student participation in their IEP meeting, by providing the student with skills to direct and lead their meeting (Lynch, Crain & Moore, 2012). ASPIRE was adapted from the “I’m Determined” project of the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Education Training and Technical Assistance Centers. This approach was embraced and piloted by the Georgia Department of Education (GADOE). GADOE selected 14 districts for a broader implementation of the principles of ASPIRE under the Partnership for Success program.

The self-determination curriculum used in this project, which incorporated many aspects of the ASPIRE program, was a ten (10) lesson curriculum which asks students to explore transition planning, goal setting, self-advocacy, identifying needed accommodations, skills needed for classroom success, content and flow of an IEP meeting, assessing personal levels of performance, and extending invitations to the IEP meeting. The course consisted of teacher instruction, class discussion, and individualized activities which give students opportunities to personalize what has been discussed. The outputs consisted of a series of worksheets which may be used in IEP planning.

RESEARCH QUESTION

The research question in this study was, “Does student use of iPads in the preparation for and participation in IEP meetings lead to greater student leadership and participation in the IEP meeting?”

The survey (“Post-IEP Meeting Survey Results Combined for Students and Adults”) developed by Martin, Van Dycke, Christensen, Greene, Gardner, & Lovett (2006), was identified as a way to operationalize the definition of *student leadership in the IEP meeting*. This survey enumerates behaviors that have been identified with effective participation and leadership (See appendix). The survey was divided into five areas of IEP participation: (1) Prior knowledge, (2) Transition Issues, (3) Meeting Behaviors, (4) Positive Perceptions, and (5) Leadership. This survey was adopted as a means to assess the level of participation and leadership demonstrated in the meetings associated with this project.

SETTING AND PARTICIPANTS

All participants in this study were residents in a rural county in central Georgia. The district had been selected as a participating district in the Georgia DOE ASPIRE pilot program.

Nineteen (19) sophomores from the special education program of the county’s single high school were invited to participate in this study. They were invited on the basis of their perceived willingness to become active participants in their future Individual Educational Plan (IEP) meetings. This group was comprised of ten (10) students with learning disabilities, five (5) students with mild intellectual disabilities, two (2) students with emotional-behavior disorder, one (1) student with moderate intellectual disability, and one (1) student who was described as having other health impairment.

Students filled out a brief questionnaire to determine their level of interest and commitment to the project. Of the nineteen original students, twelve were invited to take part. The parents, teachers, and school staff working with these students agreed to take part in the study, as well.

DESIGN

The initial research design for this project was a Posttest-Only Control Group Design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). This experimental design was chosen because it was an accepted fact that none of the students had actively participated in IEP meetings in previous years. Only two students had actually

attended an IEP meeting before this project. Neither had spoken at their previous meetings. The twelve students who were selected for the project were divided into two groups. A rough equivalence between the two groups was attempted on basis of designating sets of matched pairs, from which participants would be randomly assigned to the two groups.

All participants (both groups) were included in a single “advisement group” for the purpose of training in the ASPIRE curriculum. This advisement group met weekly during the school year. All students were exposed to the same goal-setting, leadership, and self-advocacy instruction.

One group (treatment) was provided with iPads and training for the purposes of: (1) collecting work examples, and (2) preparing & delivering presentations at the IEP meeting. The other (control) group received no technology or technology support, but did receive preparation for participation in the IEP meeting.

Challenges to this design approach arose when two participants who learned of their random assignment to the control (non-iPad using) group withdrew from the project. Their withdrawal took place prior to the first ASPIRE instruction. Other individuals from the original pool were invited to take their place, but the “matched-pair” nature of the assignments may have been compromised to some degree. Ultimately there were five (5) individuals participating in the control group. The research team decided to proceed and to note developments related to these substitutions.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT

Technical assistance and training in the use of the iPad was provided to the students in the treatment group over a 6 month period. This consisted of two (2) whole-group trainings and four (4) sets of meetings with students individually or in small groups to address specific issues. These sessions were provided in addition to the ASPIRE training that both groups received.

iPads were provided to students by the regional learning resource agency. These were iPad version 2 units that were equipped with a camera. *Survivor* protective casings were provided along with a stylus. In addition to those that come standard on the iPad, apps that were provided to all students in the iPad group included: Keynote, Pages, Numbers, Dragon, VoicePad, Inspiration, ClaroSpeak US, Pictello, iHomework, inClass, SlideShark. As the project proceeded students requested access to additional apps such as: G Docs, Google Drive, Quick Office, Say Text, and Documents. These were also provided.

Because of concern that the project might create intermittent burdens upon the school building’s bandwidth and Wi-Fi system, the regional learning resource agency also provided technical support to the school for the project. The resource agency provided a separate Wi-Fi router to support iPad use in selected classrooms and areas of the school where the project participants used the iPads. This unit made it possible to expand access to the Internet (primarily in the classroom in which the students attended advisement). Wireless access was also available in the Career and Technical and Adult Education (CTAE) classrooms (where students also sought technical assistance).

METHOD

All students in the project attended regular meetings of their advisement group. Each advisement session was led by the same instructor. The advisement group met weekly for one class period from November until the end of the school year in May. The student IEP meetings were held in late February through March. All students received instruction in IEP leadership and participation, based upon the adapted ASPIRE curriculum, between November and February when the meeting commenced.

The iPad group was given two group training sessions on general iPad use by an AT specialist from the Center for AT Excellence, a consultant for assistive technology for this project. There were four additional meetings with students (in small group or with individuals) in the treatment group to provide technical assistance prior to the IEP meeting.

Students prepared for their participation and leadership in their IEP with the help of their advisement instructor and the Career and Technical (CTAE) instructor. Students using technology for this project brought questions about their preparations for their meeting to the technical advisor as well.

DATA COLLECTION

A survey, based upon that used by Martin, Van Dycke, Christensen, Greene, Gardner, & Lovett (2006), was used to collect data on the level of IEP meeting participation and leadership of each of the participants. This survey (see appendix) consisted of 39 questions. The questions employed a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 represented least agreement or lowest performance, and 5 represented full agreement or best performance. One version of the survey was prepared for staff and parents (see Appendix 1) to complete. A second, slightly more personalized, version of the survey was developed for the students (see Appendix 2).

All of the students in the project attended their IEP meeting. The survey was administered to the student, parents and the faculty in attendance immediately following the IEP meetings. Results of the survey were tabulated and descriptive statistics were calculated. Group means for each question were compared and the difference calculated (see appendix).

To test for significance, a two-tailed t-test (two-sample) assuming unequal variances (where $p < 0.05$) was applied (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Where p -values are lower than 0.05, we have greater confidence that the treatment was responsible for the difference in the scores of the two groups.

Comments were also solicited from all participants. These were collected and analyzed for insights into other data collected. In addition, an ASPIRE questionnaire was administered, as part of the ASPIRE curriculum, at the beginning of the advisement (ASPIRE) course and again at the end. The results appeared to run counter to the data collected in the survey (perceptions of performance/progress appeared to go down over time). When given the opportunity to comment, participating students said that, at the outset, they did not fully understand (have a real appreciation for) the questions in this particular instrument. The modified ASPIRE training and their IEP experiences had helped them realize what was involved in the questions. This may have implications for how this instrument is used in the future.

RESULTS

The survey was divided into five areas of IEP participation: (1) Prior knowledge, (2) Transition Issues (3) Meeting Behaviors, (4) Positive Perceptions, and (5) Leadership.

Prior knowledge

According to the surveys, students in both groups demonstrated an understanding of the reason and purpose of their meeting. The iPad group appeared to receive slightly higher marks regarding their awareness of what they were to do at the meeting than did the students in the control group (see Appendix 3).

Transition Issues

Nine items were considered under the Transition Issues section of the survey. Students in both groups were viewed to have taken comparably active roles in the discussions about living arrangements after high school. Members of the treatment group were viewed as being more active in discussions about educational opportunities after high school, supports students might need after high school, and community activities and services that the student may desire after high school. To a lesser degree, the treatment group was also seen as being more engaged in discussions about their classes for the coming year, future job possibilities, and possible school activities than their control group counterparts. While participants from both groups said that the IEP document was a good reflection of the student's own post-school vision, those observing the treatment group was more confident about this than those observing the control group (see Appendix 3).

Meeting Behaviors

Six behaviors were identified in the Meeting Behaviors aspect of the survey. They included talking in general, talking about needs, strengths, interests, making decisions, and discussing supports that the student currently requires. With regard to these meeting behaviors, members of the treatment group were seen as slightly more engaged in every aspect. The biggest differences were observed in regards to the treatment group students' willingness to talk about their own strengths and needs (see Appendix 3).

Positive Perceptions

With regard to perceptions of the meeting itself, there were few areas of difference between the two groups. The treatment group was perceived as being somewhat more comfortable when talking during the meeting. They were also seen as coming away from the meeting with more of a positive feeling. Very slight differences were perceived in how students were heard, respected, and understood at the meeting, and in the perceived achievability of their goals. Each of these areas was rated by all participants and observers in very positive terms (see Appendix 3).

Leadership

It is in the section on leadership where the greatest differences between the treatment and control groups appeared. In each of the twelve identified indicators of leadership, treatment group students were seen as engaging in these behaviors to a much greater degree than their control group peers. Students in the treatment group introduced themselves, introduced team members, stated the purpose of their meeting, reviewed recent progress, and asked for feedback, asked questions when they did not understand, identified needed supports, expressed personal interests, described their own skills and limits, and closed the meeting by thanking those in attendance. The difference in perception of the students in the two groups was sizeable. Differences in mean ranged from 0.6278 to 1.6333 on these survey questions. There were less extensive differences between the groups regarding the students' levels of engagement when discussing goals and options (see Appendix 3).

Variance

One student from the control group decided, on his own, to use PowerPoint on a classroom PC to develop a slide presentation with which to guide his meeting. When he announced that he wanted to use this approach, it was unclear how aware he was of the way in which treatment group members would use the iPads at their meetings. The research team did not prevent the student from pursuing this approach. While the student did not receive technical assistance as the treatment group had, he did seek out guidance for organization of the content he had gathered. This support was provided.

The research team decided to observe this student's outcomes and note how they might be different from those of other students in the control group. This student had a very successful meeting and received survey marks for leadership and communication at his meeting that were on par with those of the treatment group.

As the year progressed, it became apparent that one student from the control group had begun to withdraw his participation from the advisement group - in general. It was noted that there were factors outside of this class and this project that were affecting this student. The research team decided to note these factors and allow him to continue in this project. At the IEP meeting his involvement was minimal. He did speak at his meeting but his marks on the surveys were lower than other students in the control group. Nevertheless, he did participate.

COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

The research team sought to collect anecdotal comments from all participants. Meetings were held with participants in each group after the conclusion of the last IEP to debrief. Parent comments were solicited in writing. Separate meetings were held with students in the treatment group, with students in the control group, and with staff who worked with students in both groups.

Several themes emerged from the comments. Members of the staff observed that some students were using their iPads to do classwork.

"We had a couple of students who used their iPads to do research about nursing careers. This evoked a lot of useful discussion. They explored and discovered important specific information, not the generalized stuff I usually get in class."

"One student was particularly effective in discovering unique - and less obvious - uses for his device that helped him block out distraction and access information more directly and simply. It affected his class performance and the way he was perceived by his peers. He went from being just another student to a being a "go-to" source of information for the class."

"Having the iPads made a difference in their IEPs. I would like to see students use iPads more in classes next year."

Some students commented how they used their iPad in class and to support studying at home.

"Having the iPad helped me study. I have a way to find answers and how to do stuff."

"[The iPad] made me more curious."

"I used the iPad to do math homework. I found a site to walk me through math problems when I got stuck."

One student, who was not known to write, used the iPad to write stories.

Students observed that having their presentation on the iPad at their IEP meeting and projected on a screen before the group was an advantage. The context for their comments is understood. They did not have to introduce their point – it was already out before the group.

“You already had the information on the iPad.... so all you have to do is hook it up to the [white] board. And it’s right there. And you just talk about it as you go.”

“It helps get your thoughts out there better than you just trying to get it from scratch...better than just writing it on a piece of paper.”

“It was better to show it than to describe it all yourself.”

“Then you are actually just saying it to the person – in your own words – just talking like telling them [about] how you feel.”

“You show it as you go. It helps everyone else who is looking at it put the pieces together more quickly than if I try to tell them.”

“That way they know what you are talking about and you can go into more detail about what you are doing.”

Regarding the adapted ASPIRE training, one student observed that the outline of the presentation helped structure their thinking:

“I knew stuff but advisement helped me put it into words.”

The comments of the students in the treatment group were revealing and instructive about *how* the use of the iPad affected their confidence levels:

“I am not comfortable in front of people. When I get nervous I can’t ever get my point across. I start stuttering and stuff. ... I don’t like to be nervous.

“When we started talking about my goals, I started to get comfortable because I know what I want to do and I knew what was expected of me. I knew what I wanted to say about my future. That’s what got me out of my “shy zone”.

“The iPad made me prepare. So I felt more prepared at the meeting. Afterwards, I felt like I had accomplished something.”

“It’s not only that I know where I am going, [I know] it’s going to be me that make it happen”

Staff Observations about Students

The staff was positive about the progress made by the students in the control group. They commented upon the evidence of thought and planning that had gone into their IEPs. However, the staff observed that the presentation of their goals and plans was less impressive and less well articulated than that of the treatment group.

“The students who had iPads seemed to grow in confidence. They were proud to have the device. It was a boost to their self-esteem. Now they were special.... but, this time, for a *good* reason.”

“The students demonstrated a sense of responsibility for the iPads.”

“The students’ use of the iPad (presenting slides and talking about their plans and ideas) made for a more effective IEP meeting. The focus of the meeting was more on the student. The IEP was about what the student is doing instead of what we (the staff) will do for the student.”

“These students’ IEP meetings were phenomenal. They presented themselves in a way we had never seen them before. In the way they spoke... some had only spoken when they responded to a direct question in class.”

“There was more self-advocacy than ever before. They really spoke up.”

“It seemed like the project gave them a voice they didn’t know they had. I think some just realized what they were capable of...”

Parents Observations about Students and Their Meetings

Parents were very positive about the outcomes of their student’s IEP meeting. They observed that changes were taking place in the student’s sense of maturity and responsibility.

“The meeting was great! It was good to see [my student] overcome her fears of public speaking and lead a great meeting! [My student’s] leadership skills were outstanding! She bravely conducted her IEP meeting. The materials she used were well prepared and helped the meeting to flow. A student-led meeting like this is good for the student. It allows them to know what’s going on with their educational plan and it helps enhance their leadership skills.”

“I appreciated that the plan and the teacher-participants addressed the student’s needs, taking his strengths and weaknesses into consideration. The student added his input at the appropriate times during the meeting. The IEP was made with his preferences taken into consideration. I was pleased with the IEP meeting and its outcomes.”

“[My student] seems to concentrate more and have more confidence. [I was] very impressed [with his leadership] and his confidence was extremely strong. He has shown that he [can] express himself.”

“My child took more interest in looking up things on the computer. She did well showing her interest in her IEP meeting and I think she understands what her IEP is for now – and not something that her teachers make her do.”

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

It seems clear that all students participating in this project were perceived to have participated in their IEP meeting. Since none had participated in years past, every student was viewed to have improved their participation. It is further evident that students in both groups were seen as having achieved positive outcomes in the result of the IEP meeting.

With regard to four of the five areas of student IEP participation addressed in this study (prior knowledge, transition issues, meeting behaviors, and positive perceptions) both groups were given similarly high marks. While the treatment group scored somewhat higher on many measures, the differences between (mean scores of the) groups were generally narrow. It would appear that students in both groups demonstrated progress in participation and leadership in their meetings.

The major area of difference between the two groups appears to be in the level of leadership of the meeting. In each of the twelve items in this part of the survey, students in the treatment group were viewed to have taken a more active leadership role in their meetings. The greatest difference in mean scores was evident in how students in the treatment group were observed to have stated the purpose of the meeting, introduced those attending the meeting, discussed past goals and progress, asked for feedback during the meeting, and in opening and closing the meeting with expressions of welcome and thanks. There were also wide differences how the students were seen to be dealing with differences of opinion, initiating discussion of the limits of their own abilities, asking for clarification when they did not understand, expressing interest in future activities and classes, and talking about their own limits. While both groups appeared to be engaged and participate in their meeting, the treatment group appeared to take a more active leadership role in the meeting.

Questions:

Based upon survey results, it appears that students in both the control and treatment groups were viewed as successful in participating in and leading their meetings. However, it seems clear that the students in the treatment group experienced an advantage when it came time to present their ideas at their IEP meeting. Several factors were analyzed for their possible impact upon the results:

Variance: How did the students and their assignment to the two groups impact the results?

As observed above, the attempt at random assignment from among matched pairs was somewhat thwarted when some students elected at the outset not to participate in the project. The makeshift composition of the control group is a potential weakness in this study. Consideration must be given to the make-up of the treatment group as it relates to the analysis of their performance during the project.

However, after observing the two groups during the course of the project, the staff was convinced that the composition of the groups was not a factor. The success experienced by the student who attempted to “cross over” with his PowerPoint presentation may be confirmation that there was something else at work.

Technology: What was the role of the iPad?

To be sure, students in the treatment group used the iPad as a platform on which to explore their goals and options for the future and to gather information for their meeting. However, from student and teacher comments, it seems clear that the introduction of the iPads made a difference to the students in other ways, as well. Most reported feeling a sense of responsibility which they took seriously. Students were seen as being “special” for their role in this project. Staff observed that this seemed to encourage and bolster student confidence.

However, the student from the control group who created a PowerPoint presentation for his meeting introduced an interesting question. Was the iPad alone, with its uniqueness and its portability, sufficient to explain the observed differences? This student received survey marks for leadership that were comparable to the students in the treatment group. So it may be worthy of further research to investigate whether using PowerPoint and a personal computer would accomplish similar results?

Instruction: What was the role of the modified ASPIRE training?

It seems clear that all students profited from participation in the advisement group – during which the principles of ASPIRE were taught. All students were perceived as more effective at communicating about their needs and goals. The instruction they received provide the general outline of “what” should be discussed at the meeting.

The modified ASPIRE instruction presented all students with an outline for the conduct and flow of an IEP meeting. Students in both groups had this outline available to them as they planned their meeting. Students reported that it was an advantage to work from this template.

Instruction: What was the role of the Technical Assistance?

The students in the treatment group attended two training sessions on general iPad use. There were four additional small group or individual meetings with students in this group to provide technical assistance. These technical assistance sessions were largely devoted to technical aspects of preparation for the IEP meeting. Having the “main questions” provided by the advisement (modified ASPIRE) classes, these students used these sessions to determine what they wanted to say about each question. By doing this, students came to grips with important choices that lay before them. By committing their thoughts and ideas to these slides and by having them projected before the group assembled for their meeting, students reported a sense of relief that their basic point was well presented. As the group demonstrated acceptance of these ideas, a sense of confidence emerged in each case that encouraged students to talk in greater depth about their ideas.

Cognitive Support: What was the impact of having to create slides for a presentation at the meeting?

It is possible that the process followed in this project served to provide cognitive support for students in the preparation for and leadership of their meeting. Student comments were once again instructive in helping us understand what was taking place. Students reported that the fact that their ideas were contained in the slides and then projected before the group, made the task of communicating their thoughts less challenging. They reported feeling encouraged to elaborate upon the slide rather than struggling to describe their point from scratch.

The slides that students created were based upon an outline for planning for the IEP meeting. Students in both groups had this outline from which to work. However, the treatment group’s task of creating a slide presentation *forced* them to use the outline in the process of preparing for the meeting.

Beyond this, it may be that the development of each thought as a visual representation helped them associate the broader discussion they desired with the slide itself. As each slide was presented, the words and images contained in each slide may have served as a prompt to help them elaborate further. We observed that many students added images and graphics to each slide that they said helped define their ideas. This visual support added a multimedia dimension to the process. The engagement of

multiple senses was at work. Their ideas were in concrete, visual form rather than in the abstract. All of these appeared to play to the strengths of the students in the treatment group.

SUMMARY

This was a small study. It addressed a small range of students with disabilities. While the sources of variance were tracked and addressed, any conclusions must remain tentative. Nonetheless, the research team came to the following conclusions:

1. The presence of the iPad platform likely made a difference in two respects:
 - a. Setting the students apart as special in a positive way and providing them a sense of responsibility and purpose in this project.
 - b. Laying a foundation on which confidence was built as they developed a presentation that contained their ideas on this platform.
2. The ASPIRE-based self-determination training provided students in both groups with the background understanding for participation in their meeting. Each student demonstrated that they understood the key questions to address in their meeting.
3. The technical assistance sessions in preparation for their meeting provided students with the opportunity and support to craft their personal responses to the key questions. This step forced them to address these questions.
4. The centrality of the student's own ideas at the meeting, presented in multimedia form, together with the acceptance from staff and parents, provided a further encouragement to students to be assertive and provide leadership at their meeting.

APPENDIX 1. POST IEP MEETING SURVEY: STAFF & PARENTS

STUDENT # _____

STAFF/PARENT

	Prior Knowledge	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Don't Know	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1	The student knew the reason for the meeting,	1	2	3	4	5
1.2	The student knew what he/she needed to do at the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5

	Transition Issues	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Don't Know	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
2.1	The student helped identify classes for the student to take.	1	2	3	4	5
2.2	The student helped identify school activities for the student to be involved in.	1	2	3	4	5
2.3	The student discussed jobs the student might do after high school.	1	2	3	4	5
2.4	The student discussed opportunities for education after high school.	1	2	3	4	5
2.5	The student discussed where the student will live after high school.	1	2	3	4	5
2.6	The student discussed supports that the student will need in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
2.7	The student discussed community activities for the student	1	2	3	4	5
2.8	The student discussed services from outside agencies.	1	2	3	4	5
2.9	I believe the IEP reflects the student's post-school vision.	1	2	3	4	5

	Meeting Behaviors	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Don't Know	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
3.1	The student talked at the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
3.2	The student talked about the student's needs	1	2	3	4	5
3.3	The student talked about the student's strengths	1	2	3	4	5
3.4	The student talked about the student's interests.	1	2	3	4	5
3.5	The student helped make decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
3.6	The student discussed supports that the student needs now.	1	2	3	4	5

	Positive Perceptions of Meeting	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Don't Know	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
4.1	I believe people listened to the student at the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
4.2	The student felt comfortable saying what he/she thought	1	2	3	4	5
4.3	The student felt respected at the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
4.4	The student understood what was said	1	2	3	4	5
4.5	I believe the meeting was worth my time and effort to attend.	1	2	3	4	5
4.6	I think the goals on the IEP will be met.	1	2	3	4	5
4.7	I thought everyone at the meeting participated in the development of the IEP	1	2	3	4	5
4.8	I know what I am supposed to do next about the student's educational program	1	2	3	4	5
4.9	I feel good about this meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
4.10	I agree with the decisions made at this meeting.	1	2	3	4	5

	Leadership Steps	Not at All	Not Well	OK	Good	Excellent
5.1	Student introduced himself/herself.	1	2	3	4	5
5.2	Student introduced team members.	1	2	3	4	5
5.3	Student stated purpose of meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
5.4	Student reviewed past goals and progress.	1	2	3	4	5
5.5	Student asked for feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
5.6	Student asked questions if I didn't understand.	1	2	3	4	5
5.7	Student was able to deal with differences of opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
5.8	Student stated needed support	1	2	3	4	5
5.9	Student expressed interest	1	2	3	4	5
5.10	Student expressed skills and limits	1	2	3	4	5
5.11	Student expressed options and goals	1	2	3	4	5
5.12	Student closed meeting by thanking everyone	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

APPENDIX 2. POST IEP MEETING SURVEY: STUDENT

STUDENT # _____

STUDENT

	Prior Knowledge	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Don't Know	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1	I knew the reason for the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
1.2	I knew what I needed to do at the meeting	1	2	3	4	5

	Transition Issues	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Don't Know	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
2.1	I helped identify classes I wanted to take.	1	2	3	4	5
2.2	I helped identify school activities I want to be involved in.	1	2	3	4	5
2.3	I discussed jobs that I might do after high school.	1	2	3	4	5
2.4	I discussed opportunities for education after high school.	1	2	3	4	5
2.5	I discussed where I might live after high school.	1	2	3	4	5
2.6	I discussed supports that I might need in the future	1	2	3	4	5
2.7	I discussed community activities I want to be involved in.	1	2	3	4	5
2.8	I discussed services I might use from outside agencies.	1	2	3	4	5
2.9	I believe the IEP reflects my vision for when I finish school.	1	2	3	4	5

	Meeting Behaviors	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Don't Know	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
3.1	I talked at the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
3.2	I talked about my needs.	1	2	3	4	5
3.3	I talked about my strengths.	1	2	3	4	5
3.4	I talked about my interests.	1	2	3	4	5
3.5	I helped make decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
3.6	I discussed supports that I need now.	1	2	3	4	5

	Positive Perceptions of Meeting	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Don't Know	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
4.1	I believe people listened to me at the meeting	1	2	3	4	5
4.2	I felt comfortable saying what I thought.	1	2	3	4	5
4.3	I felt respected at the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
4.4	I understood what was said	1	2	3	4	5
4.5	I believe the meeting was worth my time and effort to attend.	1	2	3	4	5
4.6	I think the goals on the IEP will be met.	1	2	3	4	5
4.7	I thought everyone at the meeting participated in the development of the IEP	1	2	3	4	5
4.8	I know what I am supposed to do next about my program.	1	2	3	4	5
4.9	I feel good about this meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
4.10	I agree with the decisions made at this meeting.	1	2	3	4	5

	Leadership Steps	Not at All	Not Well	OK	Good	Excellent
5.1	I introduced myself.	1	2	3	4	5
5.2	I introduced team members.	1	2	3	4	5
5.3	I stated the purpose of meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
5.4	I reviewed my past goals and progress.	1	2	3	4	5
5.5	I asked for feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
5.6	I asked questions if I didn't understand.	1	2	3	4	5
5.7	I was able to deal with differences of opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
5.8	I stated needed support.	1	2	3	4	5
5.9	I expressed interest.	1	2	3	4	5
5.10	I made suggestions about my skills and limits.	1	2	3	4	5
5.11	I made suggestions about goals and options for my plan.	1	2	3	4	5
5.12	I closed meeting by thanking everyone.	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

APPENDIX 3. SURVEY RESULTS

Comparison of Means

	Prior Knowledge	IPad Group Mean	Control Group Mean	Difference	P-value
1.1	The student knew the reason for the meeting	5.0000	4.8000	0.2000	0.1036
1.2	The student knew what he/she needed to do at the meeting.	4.8000	4.4000	0.4000	0.0559

	Transition Issues	IPad Group Mean	Control Group Mean	Difference	P-value
2.1	The student helped identify classes for the student to take.	4.8889	4.4500	0.4389	0.0018
2.2	The student helped identify school activities for the student to be involved in.	4.5000	4.2000	0.3000	0.2638
2.3	The student discussed jobs the student might do after high school.	4.9444	4.5000	0.4444	0.0128
2.4	The student discussed opportunities for education after high school.	4.8333	4.3000	0.5333	0.0060
2.5	The student discussed where the student will live after high school.	4.6286	4.5000	0.1286	0.3790
2.6	The student discussed supports that the student will need in the future.	4.5714	3.9000	0.6714	0.0326
2.7	The student discussed community activities for the student	4.5000	3.8500	0.6500	0.0241
2.8	The student discussed services from outside agencies.	4.4000	3.5000	0.9000	0.0074
2.9	I believe the IEP reflects the student's post-school vision.	4.7778	4.4500	0.3278	0.0229

	Meeting Behaviors	IPad Group Mean	Control Group Mean	Difference	P-value
3.1	The student talked at the meeting.	4.9722	4.7000	0.2722	0.0208
3.2	The student talked about the student's needs	4.8056	4.3000	0.5056	0.0592
3.3	The student talked about the student's strengths	4.8611	4.4000	0.4611	0.0842
3.4	The student talked about the student's interests.	4.9722	4.6500	0.3222	0.1427
3.5	The student helped make decisions.	4.8889	4.5500	0.3389	0.0129
3.6	The student discussed supports that the student needs now.	4.8333	4.5000	0.3333	0.0831

	Positive Perceptions of Meeting	IPad Group Mean	Control Group Mean	Difference	P-value
4.1	I believe people listened to the student at the meeting.	5.0000	4.7500	0.2500	0.0210
4.2	The student felt comfortable saying what he/she thought	4.6667	4.3000	0.3667	0.1077
4.3	The student felt respected at the meeting.	4.9444	4.8000	0.1444	0.2818
4.4	The student understood what was said	4.8611	4.6000	0.2611	0.1636
4.5	I believe the meeting was worth my time and effort to attend.	4.8889	4.9000	-0.0111	0.9154
4.6	I think the goals on the IEP will be met.	4.8571	4.6000	0.2571	0.1716
4.7	I thought everyone at the meeting participated in the development of the IEP	4.8286	4.7000	0.1286	0.2186
4.8	I know what I am supposed to do next about the student's educational program	4.8571	4.8500	0.0071	0.9547
4.9	I feel good about this meeting.	4.9722	4.6000	0.3722	0.0130
4.10	I agree with the decisions made at this meeting.	4.9722	4.9500	0.0222	0.7123

	Leadership Steps	IPad Group Mean	Control Group Mean	Difference	P-value
5.1	Student introduced himself/herself.	4.6667	3.7000	0.9776	0.0050
5.2	Student introduced team members.	4.4722	3.2500	1.2222	0.0046
5.3	Student stated purpose of meeting.	4.8333	3.2000	1.6333	0.0000
5.4	Student reviewed past goals and progress.	4.4444	3.6000	0.8444	0.0092
5.5	Student asked for feedback.	4.4167	3.4000	1.0167	0.0055
5.6	Student asked questions if I didn't understand.	4.1563	3.4737	0.6826	0.0751
5.7	Student was able to deal with differences of opinion.	4.7188	4.0000	0.7188	0.0214
5.8	Student stated needed support	4.5278	3.9000	0.6278	0.0283
5.9	Student expressed interest	4.8000	4.1500	0.6500	0.0144
5.10	Student expressed skills and limits	4.6667	3.9500	0.7176	0.0047
5.11	Student expressed options and goals	4.8333	4.3500	0.4833	0.0308
5.12	Student closed meeting by thanking everyone	4.8333	4.0000	0.8333	0.0232

References

- Agran, M., & Hughes, C. (2008). Students' opinions regarding their individualized education program involvement. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 31, 69-76.
- Arndt, S. A., Konrad, M., & Test, D. W. (2006). Effects of the Self-Directed IEP on student participation in planning meetings. *Remedial and Special Education*, 27, 194-207.
- Benz, M. R., Lindstrom, L. & Yovanoff, P. (2000). Improving graduation and employment outcomes of students with disabilities: Predictive factors and student perspectives. *Exceptional Children*, 66, 509-529.
- Campbell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C. (1963) *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Houghton Mifflin Co. Boston.
- Furney, K., & Salembier, G. (2000). Rhetoric and reality: A review of the literature on parent and student participation in the IEP and transition planning process. In D.R. Johnson & E. J. Emanuel (Eds.), *Issues influencing the future of transition programs and services for students with disabilities* (pp. 111- 126). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.
- Halpern, A.S., Yovanoff, P., Doren, B. & Benz, M.R. (1995) Predicting participation in postsecondary education for school leavers with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 62, 151-164.
- Hawbaker, B.W. (2007). Student-led IEP meetings: Planning and implementation strategies. *TEACHING Exceptional Children Plus*, 3(5) Article 4. Retrieved 11/01/2012 from <http://escholarship.bc.edu/education/tecplus/vol3/iss5/art4>
- Kennedy, C. H., & Haring, T. G. (1993). Teaching choice making during social interactions to students with profound multiple disabilities. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 26, 63–76.
- Konrad, M. (2008). Involve students in the IEP process. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 43, 236-239.
- Konrad, M., & Test, D. W. (2004). Teaching middle school students with disabilities to use an IEP template. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 27, 101-124.
- Lynch, E., Crain, S. & Moore, P. (2012) Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership Conference presentation. <http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Georgia-PMP-Conference-Handouts.aspx>
- Martin, J. E., Marshall, L. H., & Sale, P. (2004). A three-year study of middle, junior high, and high school IEP meetings. *Exceptional Children*, 70, 285-297.
- Martin, J. E., Van Dycke, J. L., Christensen, W. R., Greene, B. A., Gardner, J. E., & Lovett, D. L. (2006). Increasing student participation in IEP meetings: Establishing the Self-Directed IEP as an evidence-based practice. *Exceptional Children*, 72, 299-316.
- Mason, C., Field, S., & Sawilowsky, S. (2004). Implementation of selfdetermination activities and student participation in IEPs. *Exceptional Children*, 70, 441-451.

Mason, C. Y., McGahee-Kovac, M., & Johnson, L. (2004). How to help students lead their IEP meetings. *TEACHING Exceptional Children, 36*, 18-25.

Mason, C. Y., McGahee-Kovac, M., Johnson, L., & Stillerman, S. (2002). Implementing student-led IEPs: Student participation and student and teacher reactions. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 25*, 171-192.

Perlmutter, L.C., & Monty, R.A. (1977). The importance of perceived control: Fact or fantasy? *American Scientist, 65*, 759-765.

Powers, L. E., Turner, A., Westwood, D., Matuszewski, J., Wilson, R., & Phillips, A. (2001). *TAKE CHARGE* for the Future: A controlled field-test of a model to promote student involvement in transition planning. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 24*, 89-104.

Realon, R. E., Favell, J. E., & Lowerre, A. (1990). The effects of making choices on engagement levels with persons who are profoundly mentally handicapped. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 25*, 248-254.

Schunk, D. H. (1985). Participation in goal setting: Effects on self-efficacy and skills of learning disabled children. *Journal of Special Education, 19*, 307-317.

Stanberry, K. (2010). Student-Led IEP meetings: Technology puts teens in the driver's seat. *Special Education Technology Practice, 12*(5), 15-18.

Test, D. W., Mason, C., Hughes, C., Konrad, M., Neale, M., & Wood, W. M. (2004). Student involvement in individualized education program meetings. *Exceptional Children, 70*, 391-412.

Torgerson, C.W., Miner, C.A., & Sehn, H. (2004). Developing student competence in self-directed IEPs. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 39*(3), 162-167.

Van Reusen, A. K., Deshler, D. D., & Schumaker, J. B. (1989). Effects of a student participation strategy in facilitating the involvement of adolescents with learning disabilities in the individualized educational program planning process. *Learning Disabilities, 1*(2), 23-34.

Wehmeyer, M. L., Agran, M. & Hughes, C. (2000). A national survey of teachers' promotion of self-determination and student-directed learning. *The Journal of Special Education, 34*, 58-68.