Making Informed Assistive Technology Decisions for Students With High Incidence Disabilities

Matthew T. Marino • Elizabeth C. Marino • Stan F. Shaw

Special education teachers and individualized education program (IEP) team members throughout the country are struggling to make appropriate decisions regarding assistive technology (AT) for students with high incidence disabilities. Although numerous authors and organizations have developed tools to assist IEP teams when considering AT, the task can be overwhelming. Successful AT programs utilize preassessment, collaborative problem-solving, effective implementation, and systemic evaluation. Each of these issues present different challenges to special education teachers.

This article is designed to simplify AT consideration for students with high incidence disabilities by highlighting several comprehensive resources that IEP teams can use to inform their decision-making process. Prior to our discussion of each resource, we identify barriers the IEP team may face when making AT decisions. It is our intention that the tools and resources presented herein should be used collectively by IEP teams to ensure that the AT needs of students with high incidence disabilities are addressed.

The Individuals With Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (Pub. L. No. 108-446, Part A, Sec 602, pp. 11–12) defines an AT device as "any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability." Federal law mandates the consideration of AT when writing a student's IEP. This means that it is a special education team's responsibility to ensure that AT is considered for all students, including those with high incidence disabilities. This task can be overwhelming due, in large part, to a critical shortage of AT specialists who help IEP teams make decisions regarding assistive technology for students with disabilities (Edyburn, 2004). Research indicates that members of IEP teams often have limited expertise regarding the types of AT that are available to students because of a lack of adequate training for preservice teachers entering the field (Cavanaugh, 2002). Despite this, there has been little to no increase by school districts in hiring AT professionals who can plan and supervise the effective implementation of AT (Edyburn, 2004).

In some cases, experienced special education teachers have limited knowledge of basic types of AT (Puckett, 2004). Even special educators who strive to stay current in the AT field have difficulty ascertaining current, appropriate information from the diverse resources that are available. For example, a special educator conducting

TEACHING Exceptional Children, Vol. 38, No. 6, pp. 18–25.

an Internet search for AT using Google will receive more than 12 million Web sites. Among these are a number of highly regarded instruments that present special education teachers with a framework for (a) AT assessment prior to the IEP meeting, (b) discussion during the development of an AT plan, and (c) establishing efficacy of the AT intervention. However, in order to effectively guide IEP teams during the AT consideration process, special education teachers must possess both a thorough understanding of AT resources and the legislation governing their implementation.

Successful AT programs utilize preassessment, collaborative problem-solving, effective implementation, and systemic evaluation.

Assistive Technology Legislation: A Brief History

AT legislation has improved the legal rights of individuals with disabilities to access information throughout the past 2 decades. The Technology Related Assistance for Individuals With Disabilities Act of 1988 (commonly referred to as the "Tech Act") was the first substantive federal legislation dedicated solely to AT. This law provided fundamental definitions for AT devices and services, promoted the availability and quality of AT, and required states to develop technology-related services for individuals with disabilities. In 1990, The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) expanded on the premise of the Tech Act by mandating that IEP teams provide AT if it was "required" for a student to receive a free, appropriate public education (FAPE). It states, in part, that "Each public agency shall insure that assistive technology devices or assistive technology services, or both . . . are made available to a child with a disability if required as part of the child's special education . . . related services . . . or supplementary aids and services." (P. L. No. 101-476, § 300.308).

Amendments to IDEA in 1997 included several important mandates that further extended individuals' with disabilities rights including: (a) students should be educated in general education classrooms to the maximum extent possible, (b) IEP teams must consider AT for every student during the development of an IEP, and (c) AT may continue to enhance students' access to FAPE outside of the school (e.g., in the student's home). This legislation bolstered student access to the general education curriculum and placed increased responsibility on special education teachers and IEP team members to make informed AT decisions.

Three additional legislative initiatives have significantly impacted AT consideration in the United States. These are:

- **The Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA).** This Act stipulated that individuals with disabilities be given equal access to public education, employment, transportation, recreation, and health care. Title IV of this Act specifically addresses AT, requiring telephone companies to provide telecommunication services for individuals with hearing impairments.
- **The 1998 Amendment to Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act.** This Act required that all electronic or information technology that is developed, procured, maintained, or used by the federal government be accessible to individuals with disabilities, unless an undue burden would be imposed on the agency.
- **The Assistive Technology Act of 1998.** This Act stipulated that further development and use of AT has profound implications for improving the lives of individuals with disabilities throughout the United States. It provided states with additional funding to develop comprehensive AT programs and advocacy services for individuals with disabilities. The legislation also recognized the potential benefits of incorporating AT during the production phase of new products using the principles of Universal Design.

In conjunction, these laws expand AT considerations beyond the scope of IDEA. What does this mean for special educators? First, special education teachers should understand, and have the ability to explain, legal issues associated with current AT legislation when developing transition plans for individuals with disabilities. This will enable students and their parents to use the law when advocating for services. Second, the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 provides insights into developing instructional units that incorporate AT utilizing the principles of Universal Design. Special educators who understand these principles can make informed recommendations to content area teachers and other members of the IEP team. Third, knowledge of the types of AT that are recognized in laws pertaining to federal and private employment agencies will enable a special educator to evaluate the longitudinal viability of any AT that is recommended for school use.

Even special educators who strive to stay current in the AT field have difficulty ascertaining current, appropriate information from the diverse resources that are available.

Consider the following example where establishing the longitudinal viability of an AT intervention could have a profound impact on a student's current performance and transition plan. A junior in high school struggles with writing. One of the student's content area teachers is advocating for AT in the form of an outlining program during essay exams to help the student organize his thoughts. This seems like an appropriate accommodation. However,

the student's parent points out that her son might not be able to use this AT in college courses and asks whether it would be more beneficial to teach the prewriting skills necessary to organize the paper without the AT. In this current case, both remedial and compensatory strategies might be appropriate, along with clear documentation in the student's transition plan as to the types, contexts, and effectiveness of specific AT. This documentation will allow the student's postsecondary disability service provider to make an informed decision regarding the types of accommodations he is eligible for. This decision is typically determined on a case-by-case basis.

A Special Educator's Experience

As we have noted, IEP teams across the country are struggling to make appropriate AT decisions for students with high incidence disabilities for a number of reasons. As a result, students with these disabilities may not be provided with resources that foster access to the general education curriculum. A central barrier special education teachers face when helping an IEP team consider AT is the definition. Consider the following vignette.

Monique Hendrickson, a seventh-grade student with a learning disability, had recently moved to a new school from a neighboring state. Monique was placed in a fully inclusive setting with support room services during study hall, at her parents' request, while the school waited for her IEP. When Monique's file arrived, the special educator found that the IEP was poorly written. It would need to be rewritten to address state and district standards.

Kathy Stevens, a veteran special education teacher at the middle school, glanced at her IEP meeting agenda. It was 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and the team had been writing Monique's new IEP for more than an hour. Everyone was tired and ready to go home for the day, but Kathy needed to be sure they addressed one more item.

"The next question we need to answer is . . . Does Monique need assistive technology to be successful, and if so, what should it look like?" Monique's math teacher spoke up. "Monique doesn't need a computer to function in my class." Her language arts teacher interjected, "I don't think a computer is the only form of assistive technology we should consider . . . I think assistive technology can be just about anything we want it to be." Monique's father looked at Kathy. "What exactly is assistive technology?"

Defining Assistive Technology

A first step in improving AT services for students with high incidence disabilities is understanding the salient factors that hamper IEP teams' abilities to make appropriate decisions. As this vignette illustrates, the definition of AT is ambiguous. Recall the federal definition of AT as "any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve functional capabilities of a child with a disability" (P. L. No. 108-446). There are several terms in this definition that are open to interpretation.

First, an item is considered AT if it increases, maintains, or improves the functional capabilities of children. What is a functional capability? What did Monique's math teacher mean when he said that Monique did not need a computer to function in his class? Traditionally, a functional capability was thought of as applying to students with low incidence disabilities. AT for these students included items such as hearing aids, FM systems, or communication devices allowing them to "function" by communicating (Bryant & Bryant, 2003). However, when applied to students with high incidence disabilities, AT includes a continuum ranging from no tech devices (e.g., pencil grips and slant boards for writing) to high tech devices (e.g., spell checkers, calculators, portable keyboards, and text-to-speech systems). These devices provide students with the assistance needed to "function" by reading, writing, and completing mathematical computations more independently.

Blackhurst and Edyburn (2000) categorize functional abilities using seven domains. These include functions that sustain life, protect the person from bodily injury, promote communication, increase mobility, improve interaction with the environment, and allow the individual to participate in recreational or fitness related activities. Specific to the learning process, they identify "education and transition problems" (p. 34). This functional domain is particularly useful to special education teachers and IEP teams because it relates to the students' access, participation, and assessment in the general education curriculum. For example, the special education teacher might ask, "Would a calculator allow Monique to function more independently in math class?" To address this educational domain, Blackhurst and Edyburn suggest examining compensatory strategies such as adapted curricular materials, AT, and educational software. Special education teams can use these domains during the preassessment process (i.e., prior to the IEP meeting) to guide data collection, evaluation, and viability considerations. The data solicited during this period will provide baseline evidence for evaluating the efficacy of proposed interventions.

Special educators can provide members of an IEP team with information about the nuances of the term functional capabilities using the University of Kentucky Assistive Technology (UKAT) toolkit (Lahm et al., 2002). This toolkit includes a 12-page preassessment profile template that defines students' functional capabilities in terms of communication skills, academic abilities, cognitive abilities, vocational skills, and social/emotional level. The template provides IEP teams with specific criteria that can be used to ascertain the current functional capabilities and needs of students, prior to the development of the IEP. For example, under the reading subsection, the template requires team members to identify whether specific skills such as decoding, oral reading, letter identification, and comprehension are relative strengths or weaknesses for the student. The team must then describe concerns resulting from the discussion. This tool provides team members with the opportunity to document evidence on the students' current level of AT use and the observable out-

comes. This is a comprehensive document. From a practical standpoint, a special educator should plan a meeting just to complete this form, or provide a copy to team members well in advance of the meeting. The UKAT toolkit can be downloaded free of charge at http://edsrc.coe.uky. edu/www/ukatii.

As Monique's language arts teacher noted, many people believe that the definition of AT is open to interpretation. Although AT ranges from low-tech devices such as pencil grips to high-tech devices such as electronic books, the word "any" opens limitless possibilities that extend beyond the scope of FAPE. To address this issue and to provide concrete examples for IEP teams regarding what is and what is not AT, the Technology and Media Division (TAM) of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and the Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative (WATI) have developed an Assistive Technology Quick Wheel (AT Quick Wheel). This tool provides a continuum of items, organized by the level of technology they incorporate, that are considered AT. Examples include nonslip surfaces for chairs, talking word processors, and slant boards for writing. It is important to note that what is considered AT for one student may not be AT for another. In Monique's case, when a student moves from one district to another, what was considered AT in District A may not be considered AT in District B because in District B the technology is utilized by all students as part of the general curriculum. Appropriately, the AT Quick Wheel excludes examples of items that should not be considered AT. These items will vary based on students' individual needs. The AT Quick Wheel is useful when special education teachers must explain to other team members that AT does not equate to computer use. In the preceding vignette, Kathy could reference the AT Quick Wheel when discussing the types of items that may benefit Monique. The AT Quick Wheel is available in document format at: http://www.cec.sped.org/law_res/doc/resources/tam/index.html.

Another useful tool when identifying the types of AT that are available to students is WATI's Assistive Technology Checklist. This two-page checklist provides examples of AT devices that support students during reading, writing, math, studying, and communication activities. For example, under the writing header, 30 AT devices in three subheadings (writing mechanics, computer access, and written composition) are identified. The checklist provides examples of environmental supports that can be utilized by students with more severe disabilities as well (Reed & Walser, 2000). The checklist is available at: http://wati.org/loanlibrary/techchecklist.html.

AT Assessment Prior to the IEP

Raskind and Bryant (2002) point out that there are a myriad of factors that influence students' performance when using AT over time. These include (a) the individual's abilities, (b) the nature of the tasks a student completes, (c) the context in which the task will be performed, and (d) the type of AT device the student is using. Given this dynamic interplay, IEP teams must collect preliminary data using a systematic, multidimensional approach, prior to AT implementation, in order to establish the viability and efficacy of any AT intervention. Without data to drive the decision-making process, teams may be unable to have an effective conversation regarding AT. Consider the following vignette.

Kathy glanced at the clock, realizing she had spent valuable time facilitating a discussion about the definition of AT. The team needed to move forward and determine what AT Monique needed to be successful. She spoke up. "We need to decide if Monique needs assistive technology." Monique's language arts teacher chimed, "She has Cs and Ds in my class. I want her to perform better, but I've tried everything. She just can't do it." Her math teacher spoke up. "In math, she needs to do complicated equations. I don't know what else I can do for her. Maybe she needs to leave the room for my class." Monique's father exploded, "I want her in the classroom. You must not be teaching her right!" This was not what Kathy had in mind when she asked the question.

Kathy needed a way to begin the conversation in a constructive manner that would keep team members focused on Monique. "Let's slow down and focus on some questions." She began. "What are Monique's needs and what tools does she require to be successful?" The room fell silent. Kathy realized they had some work to do before deciding whether Monique needed AT.

IEP teams must collect preliminary data using a systematic, multidimensional approach, prior to AT implementation, in order to establish the viability and efficacy of any AT intervention.

Often in an IEP meeting, teachers feel defensive if it is determined that a student is not making appropriate progress in their class. Parents may react in an accusatory manner. Utilizing specific questions about the student throughout the discussion allows IEP team members to keep the conversation positive and focused on the student. Zabala (1995) outlines several questions to ask when considering the Student, Environment, Tasks, and assistive Technology tools (SETT). The SETT framework is constructed to help teams (a) consider a student's need for AT, (b) develop a system of tools for students that address those needs, and (c) connect AT assessment with the proposed intervention. Zabala (1996) proposed examining the student, the learning environment(s), and the tasks the student must complete before making AT recommendations. Examples of SETT questions that address these concerns can be accessed at: www.ldonline.org/ld_indepth/technology/zabalaSETT2.

The SETT framework provides broad questions that allow IEP teams to focus on individual student needs in multiple environments. For example, AT may be necessary across classrooms (e.g., in

Table 1. AT Questions That Focus the Conversation

- What are the student's needs and abilities?
- What materials are available to support the student?
- Is the physical arrangement of the learning environment conducive to student success?
- How will the environment need to change for the student to be successful?
- What activities must the student complete as an active member of the learning community?
- How do these activities relate to the curricular goals?
- Would assistive technology improve the student's ability to participate in the general education curriculum?
- What types of technology should be considered?

math and science but not in language arts) and/or across contexts (e.g., in the classroom, in the after school program, and at home). Each individual has unique needs that must be identified prior to and during AT consideration. Zabala (1996) points out that a student with a disability may not have the same goals during specific learning tasks as a student without disabilities. The team should ask, "How is assistive technology going to help this student participate and make progress toward his or her goals?"

The type of questions outlined in SETT provide a starting point to focus conversations about AT with students, teachers, parents, and support personnel. Numerous authors (e.g., Bowser & Reed, 1998; Edyburn, 2004; Pisano, 2002; Zabala, 1995) have identified questions that are pertinent to the AT discussion. Table 1 presents some examples of general questions that special educators can use to facilitate a conversation about assessing students' AT needs.

An additional resource for IEP teams to gather information on students' AT needs prior to the IEP is Raskind and Bryant's (2002) Functional Evaluation for Assistive Technology (FEAT). FEAT provides IEP teams with a systemic way to conduct multidimensional evaluations of an individual's AT needs, experiences, and progress when using AT. This tool provides longitudinal data in multiple contexts that can inform decisions regarding the viability and efficacy of AT interventions. There are five forms to complete. They include (a) the "contextual matching inventory" that identifies tasks the student is expected to perform, (b) the "checklist of strengths and limitations" that examines student performance across nine domains (e.g., listening, speaking, writing, memory, and behavior), (c) the "checklist of technology experiences" that details the types and level of AT a student has used previously (note that this has implications for AT training prior to implementation), (d) the "technology characteristics inventory" that rates the reliability of any proposed AT intervention, and (e) the "individual-technology evaluation scale" that is used to evaluate the effectiveness of the implemented AT.

The goal of FEAT is to make the evaluation process comprehensive and systemic. Various team members including teachers, family members, and the student complete each checklist. The "Summary and Recommendations Booklet" is used to synthesize assessment information, provide recommendations, and document student progress over time. FEAT is a comprehensive package that includes a 75-page examiner's manual with 81 references. It can be ordered online for approximately $130 at: www.psycho-educational.com/pages/804483/index.htm.

In the second vignette, Kathy could have used the SETT and FEAT frameworks to collect preliminary data prior to the IEP. This evidence would inform the team's collaborative decision regarding whether AT was appropriate for Monique. It could also lead to an enhanced discussion regarding AT viability, training, implementation, evaluation, and efficacy.

Recommending Effective Assistive Technologies

Once an assessment of the student's AT needs within the context of the learning environment is complete, IEP teams can recommend specific AT devices and services. To facilitate this discussion, special educators may benefit from a framework for developing AT recommendations. WATI's Assistive Technology Consideration Guide is a table that includes a list of tasks students may be expected to complete in school. Team members fill in the table, describing whether the student completes the tasks with special accommodations or AT devices. The team then documents new assistive technology the student will try. This table is available by accessing the Web site, scrolling to the bottom, and selecting "AT Consideration Guide." It can be found at: http://www.wati.org/bestpractices/consideration.html. Special educators who utilize this tool can use a scope and sequence chart to monitor the effectiveness and ensure evidence-based decisions are made when addressing future AT questions.

AT Training and Implementation

When a viable AT device has been identified, it is the special educator's responsibility, unless otherwise noted, to ensure fidelity of AT implementation. This means appropriate training for the student and others who will be using the technology. For example, if a student's teacher is responsible for using voice-to-text recognition software during lectures to help the student take notes, the teacher must be familiar with the software and have completed the preliminary steps necessary so that the recognition software will function properly. Conversely, the student must understand how to access the lecture text and options to convert the text to outline form. Appropriate training will diminish the chances that the student or

others will abandon the AT intervention.

Once the training is complete, meaning those involved have demonstrated competency using the AT, the special educator should document progress, outcomes, reliability issues, and concerns. It may be helpful to ask the student and others involved with the AT to keep a journal for the first few weeks that documents their experiences. This should include their perceptions of the AT and issues surrounding technical support. After the efficacy of the AT has been established, journal entries may be reduced to a weekly or biweekly entry depending on the student's level of progress. This documentation serves two purposes: (a) It provides longitudinal data regarding the viability and efficacy of the AT that can be used to inform future decisions and transition plans, and (b) It provides evidence regarding the AT's reliability and customer support that a special educator can use when considering the AT for other students.

Monitoring Progress

Collecting comprehensive longitudinal data regarding the effectiveness of AT is critical for ensuring student success. Bowser and Reed (1998) present Education Tech Points as a framework designed to focus IEP teams at six different points in the special education process. This guide identifies the need to discuss questions about AT throughout the entire special education process from referral to assessment to implementation and review. Education Tech Points include (a) initial referral, (b) evaluation, (c) extended assessment, (d) plan development, (e) implementation, and (f) periodic review questions. This framework helps IEP teams continue to discuss the efficacy of AT throughout the student's educational experiences, as opposed to reducing it to a limited conversation at the end of a meeting.

Another means of evaluating the effectiveness of AT is the University of Kentucky Assistive Technology (UKAT) toolkit (Lahm et al., 2002). The UKAT Toolkit is comprised of seven tools addressing preassessment, assessment, and implementation of AT. This toolkit utilizes a comprehensive approach to longitudinal assessment. For example, the assessment planning and data collection sheet includes a three-column chart that provides spaces to record what information teams need to know, which strategies are used, and what information is gathered. This organizer is straightforward and easy to follow, making it a valuable resource for teams during the AT assessment process. The UKAT toolkit is available at: http://edsrc.coe.uky.edu/www/ukatii/

Collecting comprehensive longitudinal data regarding the effectiveness of AT is critical for ensuring student success.

District Level AT Policy and Resources

Later that month, Kathy sat in her school district's special educator meeting wondering how her director would respond to her concerns about AT. She had e-mailed questions regarding the district's policy on how to address AT at IEP meetings after learning from colleagues that other schools in the district were disregarding the validity of AT use for students with high incidence disabilities.

There is a lack of AT specialists who assist schools and school districts with answering questions related to AT (Edyburn, 2004). This leaves special educators in a position where they must make decisions in relative isolation. The result can mean discontinuity in the level of AT special education services a student receives. For example, a student may receive comprehensive documentation and assessment of AT use in primary school, followed by diminished levels of AT consideration as he or she progresses through secondary school. This may affect the student's progress in the general education curriculum and/or transition planning. To circumvent this, school districts can develop a comprehensive approach to AT consideration that involves all stakeholders. To begin this process, special educators should ask pertinent questions based on personal experiences with students, colleagues, and parents. These questions should focus on the types of AT that are available at a district level, the types and levels of support that are in place for students and teachers, the procedure for accessing available resources, and the protocol for assessing student outcomes.

Reed and Lahm (2005) present a guide that answers many of these questions by addressing issues typically found in today's schools. It includes the types of AT and AT resources that are available to districts. This document also addresses copyright issues and AT law. Reed and Lahm ask and answer common questions such as "Does the school district need to buy assistive technology?" and "Does the district have to send assistive technology home?" (p. 3). Also provided is a list of AT Web sites, AT-related journal articles and books, resource manuals, videos, and AT vendors.

Another useful resource when developing a district level AT plan is the Quality Indicators for Assistive Technology (QIAT) Consortium Leadership Team (2005). This cohort developed a series of matrixes to rate school's involvement in AT use. These matrixes address issues of administrative support, AT consideration, implementation, assessment, AT needs, AT in the IEP, and AT effectiveness. The tool provides a framework for school systems to assess their AT practices on a continuum that ranges from unacceptable to promising practice. The QIAT matrixes are available by clicking on the "Printable Version–QIAT 2005 Self-Evaluation Matrix Variations" at: http://sweb.uky.edu/~jszaba0/QIAT.html

Special educators can ensure that their AT practice meets the promising practice criteria by asking their administrators the AT policy questions presented in Table 2.

Kathy Revisited

After her district meeting, Kathy reflected on her changing perceptions of AT.

Table 2. Questions to Ask Your District Level Special Education Director

- Does our district have guidelines for documenting AT needs in an IEP?
- How should I ensure that all team members are aware of the guidelines?
- Is there a protocol for clearly documenting the types of AT devices and services in the IEP?
- Is there a procedure for documenting how AT is used to help students achieve IEP goals and progress in the general education curriculum?
- How should the team document the data collection and assessment of AT devices?
- How should the team document the services that are needed to implement the AT?

She had acquired an understanding of how AT applied to students with high incidence disabilities. Her director had provided questions that would help her facilitate a constructive dialogue about AT with other members of the IEP team. Kathy had a protocol for documenting AT use, outcomes, and assessment that would be consistent as her students moved throughout the district. But would this equate to improvements in student access to the general education curriculum? Certainly improving the functional capabilities of students would increase the likelihood that they would be successful. But, Kathy reminded herself, students with special needs are individuals. AT was an addition to her personal toolkit. She opened Monique's file and started taking notes on how she would improve the next IEP meeting.

Conclusions

Federal law mandates the consideration of AT when writing a student's IEP. It is the special educator's responsibility to inform members of IEP teams about AT in the absence of trained AT specialists. How can special educators complete this task effectively? First, they can explain the definitional issues that surround AT and provide team members with concrete examples of AT that pertain to the student. Second, they should examine the student's current functional level. Third, they must identify available accommodations, modifications, and AT that promote access to the general education curriculum. Fourth, they should oversee the documentation, implementation, and assessment of AT. Finally, they need to advocate for the types of AT that meet the students' needs while providing the greatest potential for student success.

There are many resources available to special education teachers and IEP teams who are struggling to make AT decisions for students with high incidence disabilities. The articles, tools, and tables presented in this overview are meant to serve as a starting point for educators who wish to expand their knowledge of AT as it applies to students with high incidence disabilities. A list of Web sites referenced in this article, along with other resources, can be found in the box "Assistive Technology Resources." Each of the tools discussed provides benefits to an IEP team in the process of discussing and making decisions about the need for AT.

References

Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq*.

Assistive Technology Act of 1998, Pub. L. No. 105-394, 29 U.S.C. § 3001 *et seq*.

Blackhurst, A. E., & Edyburn, D. L. (2000). A brief history of special education technology [Electronic version]. *Special Education Technology Practice*, *2*(1), 21–36.

Bowser, G., & Reed, P. (1998). *Education tech points: A framework for assistive technology planning.* Retrieved October 24, 2005, from http://www.edtechpoints.org/manual.htm

Bryant, D. P., & Bryant, B. R. (2003). *Assistive technology for people with disabilities*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Cavanaugh, T. (2002). The need for assistive technology in educational technology. *Educational Technology Review, 10*(1). Retrieved March 24, 2005, from http://www.aace.org/pubs/etr/issue2/cavanaug.cfm

Edyburn, D. L. (2000). Assistive technology and students with mild disabilities, [Electronic version]. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *32*(9), 1–24. Retrieved March 24, 2005 from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3813/is_200005/ai_n8882618/print

Edyburn, D. L. (2004). Rethinking assistive technology. *Special Education Technology Practice, 5*(4), 16–23.

Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-476,20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et seq*.

Individuals With Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-446, Part A – General Provisions, Sec 602 – Definitions, pp. 11-12. (2004). Retrieved February 24, 2005, from http://edworkforce.house.gov/issues/108th/education/idea/conferencereport/confrept.htm

Lahm, E. A., Bell, J. K., Blackhurst, A. E., Abner, G., Bausch, M., Case, D. et. al. (2002). *UKAT Toolkit.* Retrieved June 5, 2005, from http://edsrc.coe.uky.edu/www/ukatii

Pisano, L. V. (2002). What happens when assistive technology doesn't work? The need for an integrated approach. *Learning Disabilities Online.* Retrieved October 16, 2005, from http://www.ldonline.org/ld_indepth/technology/assistive_technology_when_it_doesn't_work.html

Puckett, K. S. (2004). Project ACCESS: Field testing an assistive technology toolkit for students with mild disabilities. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, *19*(2), 5–17.

QIAT Consortium. (2005). *The QIAT self-evaluation matrices*. Retrieved March 24, 2005, from http://sweb.uky.edu/~jszaba0/QIAT.html

Raskind, M. H., & Bryant, B. R. (2002). *Functional evaluation for assistive technology: Examiners manual.* Austin, TX: Psycho-Educational Services.

Reed, P. R., & Lahm, E. A. (2005). *A resource guide for teachers and administrators about assistive technology* (General Edition). Retrieved September 4, 2005, from http://www.wati.org/materials.freematerials.html

Reed, P., & Walser, P. (2000), adapted from Lynch & Reed (1997). *Wisconsin assistive technology initiative assistive technology checklist.* Retrieved June 5, 2005, from http://www.wati.org/loanlibrary/techchecklist.html

Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, Pub. L. No. 105-220, 29 U.S.C. § 794d (1998).

Technology and Media Division of the Council for Exceptional Children and The Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative.

Assistive Technology Resources

Tool	Description	Access On the Web At:
UKAT Assistive Technology Toolkit	Defines functional capabilities	http://edsrc.coe.uky.edu/www/ukatii
Assistive Technology Quick Wheel	Assistive technology examples	www.cec.sped.org/law_res/doc/resources/tam/index.html
WATI Assistive Technology Checklist	Assistive technology devices	http://wati.org/loanlibrary/techchecklist.html
SETT Framework	Questions to ask about AT	http://www.ldonline.org/ld_indepth/technology/zabalaSETT2
Assistive Technology Consideration Guide	List of tasks students are expected to perform	http://www.wati.org/bestpractices/consideration.html
Education Tech Points	When to ask questions	www.edtechpoints.org/manual.htm
Resource Guide for Administrators	Addresses AT issues in the schools	http://www.wati.org/materials/freematerials.html
Quality Indicators for AT	Rates school involvement in AT use	http://sweb.uky.edu/~jszaba0/QIAT.html
Functional Evaluation for Assistive Technology (FEAT)	Provides a framework for multidimensional evaluations of an individual's AT needs, experiences, and progress	www.psycho-educational.com/pages/804483/index.htm

Other Resources:

Castellani, J., Reed, P., Zabalo, J., Dwyer, J., McPherson, S., & Rein, J. (2005). *Considering the need for assistive technology within the Individualized Education Program.* Arlington, VA: Center for Technology in Education and Technology and Media Division of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Technology and media for accessing the curriculum. (2005). Arlington, VA: Technology and Media Division of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Bowser, G., & Reed, P. (2004). *A school administrator's desktop guide to assistive technology.* Arlington, VA: Technology and Media Division of the Council for Exceptional Children.

(n.d.). *Assistive Technology Quick Wheel,* (Document format). Retrieved May 29, 2005, from http://www.cec.sped.org/law_res/doc/resources/tam/index.html

Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative's Assistive Technology Consideration Guide. (n.d.). Retrieved June 5, 2005, from http://www.wati.org/bestpractices/consideration.html

Zabala, J. (1998, October 1). Get SETT for the successful inclusion and transition. *Learning Disabilities Online.* Retrieved April 10, 2005, from http://www.ldonline.org/ld_indepth/technology/zabalaSETT2

Zabala, J. (1995, October). *The SETT framework: Critical areas to consider when making informed assistive technology decisions.* Paper presented at the Closing the Gap Conference on the Use of Assistive Technology in Special Education and Rehabilitation, Minneapolis, MN. Retrieved June 5, 2005, from http://sweb.uky.edu/~jszaba0/SETTintro.html

Zabala, J. (1996). Setting the stage for success: Building success through effective selection of assistive technology systems. *Learning Disabilities Online*. Retrieved February 22, 2006, from http://www.ldonline.org/ld_indepth/technology/zabalaSETT2

Matthew T. Marino *(CEC WA Federation), Assistant Professor, Department of Teaching and Learning, Washington State University, Pullman.* **Elizabeth C. Marino,** *Reading Specialist, Windsor Locks Connecticut Public Schools.* **Stan F. Shaw** *(CEC CT Federation), Professor, Department of Special Education, University of Connecticut.*

Address correspondence to Matthew Marino, Department of Teaching and Learning, P.O. Box 642132, Washington State University Pullman, WA 99164-2132 (e-mail: matthewmarino@wsu.edu).

TEACHING Exceptional Children, *Vol. 38, No. 6, pp. 18–25.*