

**Paraeducator Teletraining to Offer Opportunities to Communicate Choices to
Students with Complex Communication Needs (CCN) and Cortical Visual Impairment (CVI)**

Session #: 5515V

Tara V. McCarty, Doctoral Candidate, CCC-SLP & Dr. Janice Light, The Pennsylvania State University

**We have no relevant financial or nonfinancial relationship(s) within the products or services described, reviewed, evaluated, or compared in this presentation. Tara McCarty has been funded by the AAC Doctoral Leadership Project (U.S. Department of Education; Grant #H325D170024).*

Questions of Interest:	Study Specifics:
What	<p>Teletraining to instruct adult communication partners how to structure opportunities to communicate a choice to students with CCN + CVI (see page 2 for strategy taught)</p> <p>Why Choices?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicating choices is a potentially powerful way for beginning communicators to exercise control and self-determination in their day (Beukelman & Light, 2020) • Adult communication partner training has proven effective in helping to identify opportunities for children to communicate a choice in an inpatient medical setting (Gormley & Light, 2022)
Why	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with CCN who are presymbolic or early symbolic communicators → social engagement and participation may be challenging due to subtle or idiosyncratic communicative behaviors (Carter & Iacono, 2002) • CVI may impact a student's ability to use vision to look at novel items, to participate in complex sensory environments, or to look at the faces of other people (Roman-Lantzy, 2018) • Interacting with a student with CCN, CVI, and additional impairments, such as motor, may be challenging for communication partners • Multiple studies suggest that training communication partners can result in increased communication opportunities for students with CCN (e.g., Binger et al., 2010; Brock & Anderson, 2020; Douglas et al., 2013) • Parents of children with CVI and CCN report that their children continue to rely on unaided, body-based methods of communication (Blackstone et al., 2021) • Parents of children with CVI and CCN report that professional practice does not align with parent priorities such as quality of life experiences (e.g., social interaction, participation; McCarty & Light, 2022)
Who	<p>Successful recruitment of 4 adult-student dyads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students (n=4) with CVI, CCN(presymbolic or early symbolic communicators), and multiple disabilities (including motor impairments) • Adult educational communication partners (n=4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ 1 speech-language pathologist, 2 paraeducators, 1 mother
When/Where	<p>All phases of study conducted via Zoom during Spring and Summer 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants attended school in 4 different states and connected on Zoom while in educational setting
How	<p>Nonconcurrent multiple probe across participant design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants randomized to 5, 6, or 7 baseline probes (5-minute recordings over Zoom of typical adult-student interaction) • Two teletraining sessions over Zoom <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ 1st session: Average of 54 minutes; Shared screen to show presentation with checklist steps, video models, and discussion questions; Role play with researcher acting as student ◦ 2nd session: Average of 21 minutes; Adult practiced strategy with student in real time and received feedback from researcher • Participants completed 5 intervention/maintenance probes (5-minute recordings over Zoom of typical adult-student interactions)
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase from baseline → intervention for percentage of sub steps accurately implemented by all 4 adult partners • No overlap from baseline → intervention for percentage of sub steps accurately implemented by all 4 dyads • Students responded in 100% of opportunities presented once partner received the teletraining and if partner correctly used the strategy when student did not respond or rejected original offer

Communicating Choices Strategy Checklist- taught to adult educational communication partners in study

STEP 1- SET UP
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 1. Check student positioning○ 2. Gather meaningful and motivating materials○ 3. Tell child it is time to make a choice e.g., "What do you want to do next?"
STEP 2- OFFER CHOICE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 4. Show first object, label object, and pause○ 5. Show second object, label object, and pause○ 6. Ask "Do you want the (object 1 name) or the (object 2 name)?" e.g., "Do you want the ball or the truck?"
STEP 3- WAIT FOR RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 7. Remain silent and watch child expectantly for 5 seconds or until child responds
STEP 4- RESPOND TO CHILD
<p>A. If child picks object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 8. Describe child behavior that indicated choice.○ 9. Say "You want the _____"○ 10. Hand object to child e.g., "You turned towards the ball. You want the ball."
<p>B. If child rejects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 8. Describe child behavior that indicated rejection.○ 9. Say "You don't want the _____"○ 10. Present 2 different objects (start at step 2) e.g., "You pushed the truck and ball away. You don't want the truck or ball."
<p>C. If no response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 8. Describe child behavior that indicated no response.○ 9. Say "I don't know what you want"○ 10. Repeat offer with same 2 objects (start at step 2) e.g., "You didn't show me your choice. I don't know what you want."

References

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2022). *Telepractice*. American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. <https://www.asha.org/practice-portal/professional-issues/telepractice/>

Beukelman, D. R., & Light, J. C. (2020). *Augmentative & alternative communication: Supporting children and adults with complex communication needs*. Brookes Publishing. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/pensu/detail.action?docID=6229697>

Binger, C., Kent-Walsh, J., Ewing, C., & Taylor, S. (2010). Teaching educational assistants to facilitate the multisymbol message productions of young students who require augmentative and alternative communication. *American Journal of Speech - Language Pathology (Online)*, 19(2), 108–120. [https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360\(2009/09-0015\)](https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2009/09-0015))

Blackstone, S. W., Luo, F., Canchola, J., Wilkinson, K. M., & Roman-Lantzy, C. (2021). Children with cortical visual impairment and complex communication needs: Identifying gaps between needs and current practices. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*.

Boster, J. B., McCarthy, J. W., Brown, K., Spitzley, A. M., & Blackstone, S. W. (2021). Creating a path for systematic investigation of children with cortical visual impairment who use augmentative and alternative communication. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_AJSLP-20-00203

Brock, M., & Anderson, E. (2020). Training paraprofessionals who work with students with intellectual and developmental disabilities: What does the research say? *Psychology in the Schools*, 58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22386>

Carter, M., & Iacono, T. (2002). Professional judgments of the intentionality of communicative acts. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 18(3), 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07434610212331281261>

Chang, M. Y., & Borchert, M. S. (2020). Advances in the evaluation and management of cortical/cerebral visual impairment in children. *Survey of Ophthalmology*, 65(6), 708–724. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.survophthal.2020.03.001>

Douglas, S. N., Light, J. C., & McNaughton, D. B. (2013). Teaching paraeducators to support the communication of young children with complex communication needs. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 33(2), 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121412467074>

Gormley, J. & Light, J. (2022). *Supporting children with complex communication needs to communicate choices during an inpatient stay: Effect of a partner training on healthcare professionals* [Manuscript submitted for publication]. Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Pennsylvania State University.

Holyfield, C., Light, J., Drager, K., McNaughton, D., & Gormley, J. (2018). Effect of AAC partner training using video on peers' interpretation of the behaviors of presymbolic middle-schoolers with multiple disabilities*. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 34(4), 301–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07434618.2018.1508306>

Kent-Walsh, J., Binger, C., & Hasham, Z. (2010). Effects of parent instruction on the symbolic communication of children using augmentative and alternative communication during storybook reading. *American Journal of Speech - Language Pathology (Online)*, 19(2), 97–107. [https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/10.1044/1058-0360\(2010/09-0014\)](https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/10.1044/1058-0360(2010/09-0014))

Kent-Walsh, J., & McNaughton, D. (2005). Communication partner instruction in AAC: Present practices and future directions. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 21(3), 195–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07434610400006646>

Luo, F., Blackstone, S. W., Canchola, J., & Roman-Lantzy, C. (2022). Working with children with cortical visual impairment who use augmentative and alternative communication: Implications for improving current practice. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 0(0), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07434618.2022.2085622>

McCarty, T. V., & Light, J. C. (2021). Supporting peer interactions for students with complex communication needs in inclusive settings: Paraeducator roles. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 7(1), 229–244. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_PERSP-21-00141

McCarty, T. V., & Light, J. (2022). *"It's like a guessing game all the time": Parent insights on barriers supports, and priorities for children with cortical visual impairment & complex communication needs* [Manuscript submitted for publication]. Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Pennsylvania State University.

Roman-Lantzy, C. (2018). *Cortical visual impairment: An approach to assessment and intervention* (Second). American Foundation for the Blind.

Wilkinson, K. M., & Wolf, S. J. (2021). An in-depth case description of gaze patterns of an individual with cortical visual impairment to stimuli of varying complexity: Implications for augmentative and alternative communication design. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_PERSP-21-00111