

**AN EXAMINATION OF TRANSITION PLANNING  
AND SERVICES  
FOR SECONDARY STUDENTS  
IN SPECIAL EDUCATION  
IN THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Submitted to:  
Joe Fulcher, Chief Student Services Officer  
San Diego Unified School District  
4100 Normal Street  
San Diego, CA 92103

Submitted by:  
Jason M. Naranjo, Ph.D.  
San Diego State University

July 31, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Acknowledgements .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | vi  |
| Executive Summary.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | vii |
| CHAPTER 1. Introduction .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 1   |
| Overview of the Study.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 1   |
| Organization of the Report.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 2   |
| CHAPTER 2. Findings of the Study to Determine the Extent to Which Student<br>ITP/IEP Documents Meet the Requirements of Federal Indicator 13.....                                                                                                                                           | 3   |
| Sample and Methods.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 3   |
| Sample .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 3   |
| Methods .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 6   |
| Findings.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 7   |
| Educational Training .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 7   |
| Employment .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 10  |
| Independent Living .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 13  |
| Summary .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 16  |
| Recommendations.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 16  |
| CHAPTER 3. Findings of the Study to Examine the Extent to Which Evidence-<br>Based Transition Predictors for Improving Postschool Outcomes for Students<br>with Disabilities Are Included in the Services Received by Youth Who Are Served<br>by the San Diego Unified School District..... | 18  |
| Sample and Methods.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 18  |
| Sample .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 18  |
| Methods .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 21  |
| Findings.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 22  |
| Career Awareness .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 22  |
| Community Experience.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 22  |
| Exit Exam Requirements/High School Diploma Status .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 23  |
| Inclusion in General Education.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 23  |
| Interagency Collaboration .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 24  |
| Occupational Course .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 24  |
| Paid Employment/Work Experience.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 25  |
| Parent Involvement.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 25  |
| Program of Study .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 26  |
| Self-advocacy/Self-determination.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 26  |
| Self-care/Independent Living Skills.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 27  |
| Social Skills .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 27  |
| Student Support.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 28  |
| Transition Program .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 28  |
| Vocational Education.....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 29  |

|                       |    |
|-----------------------|----|
| Work Study .....      | 29 |
| Summary .....         | 30 |
| Recommendations ..... | 30 |
| References .....      | 31 |
| Appendix A.....       | 32 |
| Appendix B.....       | 33 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1. Working population, Sample and Weights.....                                                                                                                                                                            | 4  |
| Table 2. Comparison of Demographic Characteristics for Working Population to Stratified Sample.....                                                                                                                             | 5  |
| Table 3. Is there an appropriate measurable goal or goals in this area?.....                                                                                                                                                    | 7  |
| Table 4. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually? .....                                                                                                                                                             | 7  |
| Table 5. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment? .....                                                                                                 | 8  |
| Table 6. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?.....                                                                                        | 8  |
| Table 7. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?.....                                                                             | 8  |
| Table 8. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student’s transition services needs? .....                                                                                                                            | 9  |
| Table 9. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed? .....                                                                                                 | 9  |
| Table 10. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of the majority?..... | 9  |
| Table 11. Is there an appropriate measurable goal or goals in this area? .....                                                                                                                                                  | 10 |
| Table 12. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually?.....                                                                                                                                                             | 10 |
| Table 13. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment? .....                                                                                                | 11 |
| Table 14. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?.....                                                                                       | 11 |
| Table 15. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?.....                                                                            | 11 |
| Table 16. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student’s transition services needs? .....                                                                                                                           | 12 |
| Table 17. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed? .....                                                                                                | 12 |
| Table 18. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of the majority?..... | 12 |
| Table 19. Is there an appropriate measurable goal or goals in this area? .....                                                                                                                                                  | 13 |
| Table 20. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually?.....                                                                                                                                                             | 14 |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 21. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment? .....                                                                                                | 14 |
| Table 22. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)? .....                                                                                      | 14 |
| Table 23. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?.....                                                                            | 15 |
| Table 24. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student’s transition services needs? .....                                                                                                                           | 15 |
| Table 25. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed? .....                                                                                                | 15 |
| Table 26. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of the majority?..... | 16 |
| Table 27. Working population, Sample and Weights.....                                                                                                                                                                           | 19 |
| Table 28. Comparison of Demographic Characteristics for Working Population to Stratified Sample.....                                                                                                                            | 20 |
| Table 29. Career Awareness.....                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 22 |
| Table 30. Community Experience .....                                                                                                                                                                                            | 22 |
| Table 31. Exit Exam Requirements/High School Diploma Status .....                                                                                                                                                               | 23 |
| Table 32. Inclusion in General Education .....                                                                                                                                                                                  | 23 |
| Table 33. Interagency Collaboration.....                                                                                                                                                                                        | 24 |
| Table 34. Occupational Course .....                                                                                                                                                                                             | 24 |
| Table 35. Paid Employment/Work Experience .....                                                                                                                                                                                 | 25 |
| Table 36. Parent Involvement.....                                                                                                                                                                                               | 25 |
| Table 37. Program of Study.....                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 26 |
| Table 38. Self-advocacy/Self-determination .....                                                                                                                                                                                | 26 |
| Table 39. Self-care/Independent Living Skills .....                                                                                                                                                                             | 27 |
| Table 40. Social Skills.....                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 27 |
| Table 41. Student Support.....                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 28 |
| Table 42. Transition Program.....                                                                                                                                                                                               | 28 |
| Table 43. Vocational Education .....                                                                                                                                                                                            | 29 |
| Table 44. Work Study .....                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 29 |

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Superintendent Bill Kowba, the Board of Education, Dr. Joe Fulcher, and Susan Martinez for their support of this work. Thanks also to the Special Education staff and the staff in the Research and Reporting Department in the District's central office for their assistance with data retrieval and transfer. I would also like to express my gratitude for the assistance provided by my research team.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overarching purpose of this two-part study was to examine the quality of the transition planning and related service provision for secondary students with disabilities who are served by the San Diego Unified School District. This summary provides the findings of this study organized by the guiding research questions.

### ***RQ1: To what extent do student ITP/IEP documents meet the requirements of federal Indicator 13?***

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the Individualized Transition Plans (ITP) and Individualized Education Programs (IEP) of secondary special education students ages 16 to 22 met the requirements of federal Indicator 13 (I-13). More specifically, 1,257 cases were systematically examined. Determinations were made regarding the presence of appropriate planning procedures and related service provision in the postsecondary goal areas of (a) educational training, (b) employment, and (c) independent living.

None of the 1,257 ITP/IEP documents that were reviewed met the requirements of I-13. Specifically, pronounced deficits were found in appropriate transition planning and related service provision across the postschool domains of educational training, employment, and independent living for secondary school students with disabilities who are served by the district. In addition 40 IEP documents were found to be lacking ITPs, indicating that no appropriate transition planning had taken place in accordance with IDEA for these individuals.

Procedural safeguards, such as the annual updating of IEP/ITP goals and student participation/invitation to the IEP meeting where transition services are discussed, were found to be in place for the vast majority of students.

### *Recommendations*

- The district should take immediate action regarding the 40 cases that did not have ITPs.
- The district should thoroughly examine the source(s) of its deficits in the provision of appropriate transition planning and services at the organization, school, and personnel levels.
- The district should make certain that explicit policies and procedures exist to clearly define the responsibilities that secondary school personnel have in documenting and delivering appropriate transition planning and services to students with disabilities.
- The district should ensure that all personnel charged with the provision of educational and related services to secondary school students with disabilities are provided with comprehensive and ongoing training and

professional development activities related to transition planning and services.

- The district should formulate a strategic plan that is designed to ensure that all students with disabilities served at the secondary school level have ITP/IEP documents that meet federal I-13 requirements.

***RQ2: To what extent are evidence-based transition predictors for improving the postschool outcomes of students with disabilities included as part of the special education transition services offered by the district?***

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which evidence-based transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes were included as part of the special education services students ages 16 to 22 receive at the secondary level. Current research suggests that students who participate in specific experiences and receive certain services while in high school enjoy improved postschool outcomes in the areas of education, employment, and independent living (Test et al., 2009). Not all experiences and services promote improved postschool outcomes equally. For example, while receipt of paid employment/work experience has been shown to contribute to enhanced postschool outcomes in all three outcome areas, meeting exit exam/high school graduation requirements has been shown only to be correlated with enhanced outcomes related to employment. This study examined the extent to which these 16 evidence-based transition predictors were included in 1,257 ITP/IEP documents of students in special education who have been served by the San Diego Unified School District.

The district is providing a small number of students with opportunities to be engaged in experiences related to three of the four predictors (i.e., paid employment/work experience, self-care/independent living skills, student support) that are correlated with successful postschool outcomes in the areas of educational training, employment, and independent living. Regarding the fourth predictor (i.e., inclusion in general education), student ITP/IEP documents indicate that approximately 60% of individuals are included in the general education setting for 50% or more of the time that they are at school.

Findings vary with regard to the remaining twelve predictors; however the vast majority of the documents reviewed suggest that the district is not adequately ensuring that students have opportunities to be engaged in these experiences and services. The lack of opportunity to be more fully engaged in these sixteen evidence-based experiences and services may lead to diminished postschool outcomes for secondary school students served by the district.



## *Recommendations*

- The district should make certain that secondary school students with disabilities have the opportunity to be engaged at least in the four evidence-based experiences and services (i.e., inclusion in general education, paid employment/work experience, self-care/independent living skills, student support) that are correlated with successful postschool outcomes for educational training, employment, and independent living. Full access to the remaining twelve areas is also recommended, as these may further promote positive postschool adjustment.
- The district should ensure that the providers of secondary special education and transition services are knowledgeable and skilled in the delivery of evidence-based practices that are associated with successful postschool outcomes.

The findings from parts one and two of this study are descriptive in nature. The source(s) of the observed phenomena cannot be directly attributed to discrete organizational functions or the behavior of specific school personnel.

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

During the 2010-2011 academic year, Dr. Naranjo conducted a study of the transition planning process for secondary students with disabilities who were served by special education in the San Diego Unified School District.

The San Diego Unified School District serves approximately 5,000 students with disabilities at the secondary level. Understanding how educational and related services are planned and delivered is critical to ensuring that these students are provided opportunities to learn the knowledge and skills necessary for school completion and positive postschool outcomes in the areas of post-secondary education, employment, and independent living.

Results from this study will inform district policy related to special education and transition by providing information related to the quality of student Individualized Transition Plans (ITP) and Individualized Education Programs (IEP). This information can then be used to formulate a comprehensive strategic plan for policy articulation and personnel training and development.

### **Overview of the Study**

This two-part study examined (1) the extent to which student ITP/IEP documents met the requirements of federal Indicator 13, and (2) the extent to which evidence-based transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes are included in the services received by students who are served by the district in special education.

In 2004 the federal government reauthorized the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The reauthorization prompted the U.S. Department of Education in coordination with the Office of Special Education Programs to formulate 20 performance indicators related to the quality of special education services delivered by states and subsequently school districts to students with disabilities. Indicator 13 relates to transition planning and related services for students at the secondary level.

The specific measurement language for Indicator 13 is as follows:

*“Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.” (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))*

Current research in the field of special education suggests that the provision of certain experiences and specific services for secondary students with disabilities are correlated with improved postschool outcomes in the areas of post-secondary education, employment, and independent living (Test, et al, 2009). Research suggests that school districts should ensure that programs provide students with the opportunities to be engaged in these experiences and services during their involvement with special education at the secondary level (Test, et al, 2009). These experiences and services are associated with 16 different predictors, four of which (i.e., inclusion in general education, paid employment/work experience, self-care/independent living skills, student support) are correlated with enhanced postschool outcomes in all three areas (Test, et al., 2009). Part two of this study examined the extent to which evidence-based predictors were formally included as part of the transition planning and services offered by the district to secondary students with disabilities.

This two-part study was guided by two research questions. These questions were:

1. To what extent do student ITP/IEP documents meet the requirements of federal Indicator 13?
2. To what extent are evidence-based transition predictors for improving the postschool outcomes of students with disabilities included as part of the special education transition services offered by the district?

### **Organization of the Report**

This report is organized around the research questions addressed. The research methodology for each study is presented and findings are organized in tabular form. Following the presentation of findings, summary statements and recommendations are made.

## CHAPTER 2. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH STUDENT ITP/IEP DOCUMENTS MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL INDICATOR 13

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the ITPs and IEPs of secondary special education students ages 16 to 22 met the requirements of federal Indicator 13 (I-13). More specifically, 1,257 documents were systematically examined and determinations were made regarding the presence of appropriate planning procedures and service provision in the postsecondary goal areas of (a) educational training, (b) employment, and (c) independent living. The sections that follow provide a description of the sample and methods used to answer the research question and address the findings, summary, and recommendations.

### **Sample and Methods**

#### ***Sample***

The overall sampling frame or working population for the study comprised students between the ages of 16 and 22 with disabilities currently served by the San Diego Unified School District (N=3,331) and the unit of analysis is the student.

The students were first separated into mutually exclusive groups or strata based on their disability type (see “Working Population” columns in Table 1). For each strata a random sample of cases was selected with a 95% confidence interval with a +/- 5% margin of error specified. Some disability groups lacked a sufficient number of cases to ensure the +/- 5% rate (multiple, TBI, VI, and Deaf/Blind). For those categories all of the cases were selected. The “Actual” column in Table 1 shows how many cases were randomly selected from each disability strata. The resulting random stratified sample was 1,264 students.

The stratification results in an overall sample that is skewed towards the disability types with smaller number of students. A weighting adjustment was required to make certain that the total sample is a proportionate representation of the sampling frame rather than a summation of the disproportionately sampled disability groups within the sample frame. For example, in Table 1 the proportion of students in the working population with autism is 6.4%. With a sample size of 1,264 one would expect, with simple random sampling, 81 students with autism to be selected ( $1,264 \times 6.4\%$ ), whereas with stratified random sampling 137 were sampled. The primary purpose of weighting the stratified random sample is to make certain that each disability group is represented by an adequate sample size in order to analyze the groups both separately and as part of the total population.

The final analytical sample for this study was 1,257 students. There were 7 cases for which student records (eg. ITP/IEP documents) did not exist and were subsequently excluded from the analyses.

Table 1. Working population, Sample and Weights

| Disability Category | Working Population |              | Actual Sampled | Expected to be Sampled | Weights |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------------|---------|
|                     | N                  | %            | N              | N                      |         |
| SLD                 | 1,737              | 52.1         | 315            | 659                    | 2.09    |
| OHI                 | 447                | 13.4         | 207            | 170                    | 0.82    |
| ED                  | 343                | 10.3         | 181            | 130                    | 0.72    |
| MR/ID               | 293                | 8.8          | 166            | 111                    | 0.67    |
| Autism              | 214                | 6.4          | 137            | 81                     | 0.59    |
| OI                  | 90                 | 2.7          | 73             | 34                     | 0.47    |
| SLI                 | 63                 | 1.9          | 54             | 24                     | 0.44    |
| HofH                | 45                 | 1.4          | 39             | 17                     | 0.44    |
| Deaf                | 35                 | 1.1          | 31             | 13                     | 0.43    |
| Multiple            | 32                 | 1.0          | 30             | 12                     | 0.40    |
| TBI                 | 19                 | 0.6          | 18             | 7                      | 0.40    |
| VI                  | 10                 | 0.3          | 10             | 4                      | 0.38    |
| Deaf/Blind          | 3                  | 0.1          | 3              | 1                      | 0.38    |
| <i>Total</i>        | <i>3,331</i>       | <i>100.0</i> | <i>1,264</i>   | <i>1,264</i>           |         |

*Representativeness of the Stratified Random Sample*

The demographic characteristics available in the data set were used to compare the entire sample of 3,331 students to the stratified random sample of 1,264 students. The means and proportions listed below for the stratified sample were computed using the STATA software program so that the sampling characteristics (strata, weights) could be correctly applied. None of the proportions shown in Table 2 significantly differ (at  $p < .05$ ) between the working sample and the stratified sample indicating the stratified random sample is representative of the working population.

Table 2. Comparison of Demographic Characteristics for Working Population to Stratified Sample

|                   | Working Population<br>(N=3,331) | Stratified Sample<br>(n=1,264) |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                   | %                               | %                              |
| Gender (% female) | 32.8                            | 33.4                           |
| Grade             |                                 |                                |
| 8-9               | 6.8                             | 7.0                            |
| 10                | 18.6                            | 18.8                           |
| 11                | 28.7                            | 26.7                           |
| 12                | 45.9                            | 47.5                           |
| Race/Ethnicity    |                                 |                                |
| African American  | 20.4                            | 19.1                           |
| Asian             | 1.2                             | 1.1                            |
| Filipino          | 3.1                             | 3.6                            |
| Hispanic          | 47.5                            | 47.4                           |
| Indochina         | 3.0                             | 2.5                            |
| Native American   | 0.8                             | 0.6                            |
| Pacific Islander  | 0.6                             | 0.9                            |
| White             | 23.4                            | 24.8                           |
| School Type       |                                 |                                |
| Alternative       | 7.0                             | 7.1                            |
| Atypical          | 1.5                             | 0.9                            |
| HSDP              | 1.2                             | 1.2                            |
| Senior High       | 61.5                            | 62.4                           |
| Special Ed        | 28.9                            | 28.3                           |

## **Methods**

### *Data Collection*

Once the sample was generated, personnel from the district's special education central office accessed and printed hard copies of students' ITP/IEP documents (n = 1,264). The documents were then transferred to Dr. Naranjo and his team for examination and processing.

### *Measures*

The measure used in this study was the federal Indicator 13B (I-13B) checklist for ITP/IEP quality (see Appendix A). It was developed by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center and has been approved for use in states by the Office of Special Education Programs. This measure is widely used throughout the country by state offices of education as well as school districts to assess the quality of transition planning practices for youth with disabilities. The measure is comprised of nine dichotomously scored (e.g., Yes, No) items. These items are then subdivided into three domain areas: educational training, employment, and independent living. The requirements of I-13 are met when 100% of the items indicate that appropriate planning is implemented.

### *Procedures*

Over the course of a six-month period Dr. Naranjo and two trained graduate research assistants hand-scored each ITP/IEP document using the I-13B checklist. Data was entered on optical scan forms that were specially designed for the purpose of this study. Once complete, the forms were then scanned into a database that was created for this project.

To ensure that the coding process maintained a high level of reliability, 7% (n = 94) of the documents were randomly selected and triple coded using the following item-by-item formula for calculating interobserver reliability:

Formula: (# checklist items agreed upon by both observers/total # of items) X 100 = *checklist item-by-checklist item reliability (%)*

This procedure resulted in an interobserver reliability rate of 90. This means that 90% of the time all three observers scored the sampled documents (n = 94) identically. Acceptable interobserver reliability percentages range between 80%-100%. The interobserver reliability rate for this study is exceptionally high, indicating that the data collected are sufficiently reliable to produce valid findings.

### *Design and Data Analysis*

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which student ITP/IEP documents met the requirements of I-13; therefore, the research design selected

is descriptive in nature. Data were analyzed using a cross tabulation procedure to produce counts and percentages. Please note that *n* is the observed count and percents account for sampling weights.

## Findings

The findings in this section are organized by questions 1 through 8 from the I-13B measure. For example, under the heading for *educational training*, tables display data related to items 1 through 8 that correspond to the postsecondary domain of educational training. None of the 1,257 documents reviewed met the requirements of I-13.

### Educational Training

Tables 3 through 10 present the results of the cross tabulations between items 1 through 8 on the I-13B measure and student disability type for the postschool domain of educational training. With the exception of updating goals annually (*n* = 1,143, 92%) and student attendance at ITP/IEP meetings (*n* = 1,090, 90%), two-thirds or less of ITP/IEP documents met I-13 requirements in this area. This suggests a serious need for the improvement of transition planning for students as it relates to preparation for postschool educational training.

Table 3. Is there an appropriate measurable goal or goals in this area?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT           | TBI          | Total          |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 26<br>(15.76)  | 33<br>(84.62) | 17<br>(54.84) | 38<br>(73.08) | 6<br>(60.00) | 115<br>(63.89) | 24<br>(32.88) | 134<br>(65.37) | 212<br>(67.30) | -          | 9<br>(30.00)  | 44<br>(32.35) | 9<br>(50.00) | 667<br>(58.67) |
| No    | 139<br>(84.24) | 6<br>(15.38)  | 14<br>(45.16) | 14<br>(26.92) | 4<br>(40.00) | 65<br>(36.11)  | 49<br>(67.12) | 71<br>(34.63)  | 103<br>(32.70) | 3<br>(100) | 21<br>(70.00) | 92<br>(67.65) | 9<br>(50.00) | 590<br>(41.33) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)  | 1,257<br>(100) |

Table 4. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI          | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI         | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)       | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 151<br>(91.52) | 37<br>(94.87) | 27<br>(87.10) | 39<br>(75.00) | 10<br>(100) | 161<br>(89.44) | 67<br>(91.78) | 179<br>(87.32) | 295<br>(93.65) | 3<br>(100) | 28<br>(93.33) | 128<br>(94.12) | 18<br>(100) | 1,143<br>(91.83) |
| No    | 14<br>(8.48)   | 2<br>(5.13)   | 4<br>(12.90)  | 13<br>(25.00) | -           | 19<br>(10.56)  | 6<br>(8.22)   | 26<br>(12.68)  | 20<br>(6.35)   | -          | 2<br>(6.67)   | 8<br>(5.88)    | -           | 114<br>(8.17)    |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100) | 1,257<br>(100)   |



Table 5. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment?

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED            | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT           | TBI          | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 83<br>(50.30) | 19<br>(48.72) | 24<br>(77.42) | 26<br>(50.00) | 5<br>(50.00) | 90<br>(50.00) | 47<br>(64.38) | 124<br>(60.49) | 183<br>(58.10) | 3<br>(100) | 15<br>(50.00) | 69<br>(50.74) | 9<br>(50.00) | 697<br>(56.42) |
| No    | 82<br>(49.70) | 20<br>(51.28) | 7<br>(22.58)  | 26<br>(50.00) | 5<br>(50.00) | 90<br>(50.00) | 26<br>(35.62) | 81<br>(39.51)  | 132<br>(41.92) | -          | 15<br>(50.00) | 67<br>(49.26) | 9<br>(50.00) | 560<br>(43.58) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)  | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)  | 1,257<br>(100) |

Table 6. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 32<br>(19.39)  | 8<br>(20.51)  | 6<br>(19.35)  | 5<br>(9.62)   | 4<br>(40.00) | 24<br>(13.33)  | 15<br>(20.55) | 27<br>(13.17)  | 53<br>(16.83)  | -          | 8<br>(26.67)  | 24<br>(17.65)  | 5<br>(27.78)  | 211<br>(16.51)   |
| No    | 133<br>(80.61) | 31<br>(79.49) | 25<br>(80.65) | 47<br>(90.38) | 6<br>(60.00) | 156<br>(86.67) | 58<br>(79.45) | 178<br>(86.83) | 262<br>(83.17) | 3<br>(100) | 22<br>(73.33) | 112<br>(82.35) | 13<br>(72.22) | 1,046<br>(83.49) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 7. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi       | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 2<br>(1.21)    | 1<br>(2.56)   | 3<br>(9.68)   | 2<br>(3.85)   | 1<br>(10.00) | 4<br>(2.22)    | 1<br>(1.37)   | 7<br>(3.41)    | 13<br>(4.13)   | -          | -           | 6<br>(4.41)    | 1<br>(5.56)   | 41<br>(3.54)     |
| No    | 163<br>(98.79) | 38<br>(97.44) | 28<br>(90.32) | 50<br>(96.15) | 9<br>(90.00) | 176<br>(97.78) | 72<br>(98.63) | 198<br>(96.59) | 302<br>(95.87) | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100) | 130<br>(95.59) | 17<br>(94.44) | 1,216<br>(96.46) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100) | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 8. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student’s transition services needs?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI         | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 11<br>(6.67)   | 2<br>(5.13)   | 1<br>(3.23)   | -           | 1<br>(10.00) | 18<br>(10.00)  | 5<br>(6.85)   | 16<br>(7.80)   | 19<br>(6.03)   | -          | 1<br>(3.33)   | 10<br>(7.35)   | 2<br>(11.11)  | 86<br>(6.70)     |
| No    | 154<br>(93.33) | 37<br>(94.87) | 30<br>(96.77) | 52<br>(100) | 9<br>(90.00) | 162<br>(90.00) | 68<br>(93.15) | 189<br>(92.20) | 296<br>(93.97) | 3<br>(100) | 29<br>(96.67) | 126<br>(92.65) | 16<br>(88.89) | 1,171<br>(93.30) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100) | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 9. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI          | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 141<br>(85.45) | 38<br>(97.44) | 28<br>(90.32) | 41<br>(78.85) | 10<br>(100) | 160<br>(88.89) | 45<br>(61.64) | 183<br>(89.27) | 296<br>(93.97) | -          | 25<br>(83.33) | 106<br>(77.94) | 17<br>(94.44) | 1,090<br>(89.74) |
| No    | 24<br>(14.55)  | 1<br>(2.56)   | 3<br>(9.68)   | 11<br>(21.15) | -           | 20<br>(11.11)  | 28<br>(38.36) | 22<br>(10.73)  | 19<br>(6.03)   | 3<br>(100) | 5<br>(16.67)  | 30<br>(22.06)  | 1<br>(5.56)   | 167<br>(10.26)   |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 10. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of the majority?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI         | VI           | ED           | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT            | TBI         | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)        | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)       | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 21<br>(12.73)  | 1<br>(2.56)   | 2<br>(6.45)   | -           | 3<br>(30.00) | -            | 5<br>(6.85)   | 8<br>(3.90)    | 6<br>(1.90)    | 1<br>(33.33) | 2<br>(6.67)   | 14<br>(10.29)  | -           | 63<br>(3.77)     |
| No    | 144<br>(87.27) | 38<br>(97.44) | 29<br>(93.55) | 52<br>(100) | 7<br>(70.00) | 180<br>(100) | 68<br>(93.15) | 197<br>(96.10) | 309<br>(98.10) | 2<br>(66.67) | 28<br>(93.33) | 122<br>(89.71) | 18<br>(100) | 1,194<br>(96.23) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100) | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100) | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100) | 1,257<br>(100)   |

## Employment

Tables 11 through 18 show the results of the cross tabulations between items 1 through 8 on the I-13B measure and student disability type for the postschool domain of employment. Nearly 80% (n = 894) of documents had an appropriate measurable postschool goal(s) in this area. The vast majority (n = 1,146, 92%) of documents provided evidence that some type of measurement was used to establish postschool goals as they relate to employment. Documents indicate that 66% (n = 797) of individuals did not receive transition services related to employment, and only 17% (n = 273) had annual IEP goals that were associated with employment. These findings suggest a significant need for enhanced transition planning and service delivery as they relate to employment for secondary school students with disabilities who are served by the district.

Table 11. Is there an appropriate measurable goal or goals in this area?

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n             | n             | n             | n             | n            | n              | n             | n              | n              | n            | n             | n             | n             | n              |
|       | (%)           | (%)           | (%)           | (%)           | (%)          | (%)            | (%)           | (%)            | (%)            | (%)          | (%)           | (%)           | (%)           | (%)            |
| Yes   | 82<br>(49)    | 30<br>(76.92) | 28<br>(90.32) | 33<br>(63.46) | 5<br>(50.00) | 143<br>(79.44) | 23<br>(31.51) | 166<br>(80.98) | 282<br>(89.52) | 2<br>(66.67) | 18<br>(60.00) | 71<br>(52.21) | 11<br>(61.11) | 894<br>(78.66) |
| No    | 83<br>(50.30) | 9<br>(23.08)  | 3<br>(9.68)   | 19<br>(36.54) | 5<br>(50.00) | 37<br>(20.56)  | 50<br>(68.49) | 39<br>(19.02)  | 33<br>(10.48)  | 1<br>(33.33) | 12<br>(40.00) | 65<br>(47.79) | 7<br>(38.89)  | 363<br>(21.34) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

Table 12. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI          | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI         | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
|       | n              | n             | n             | n             | n           | n              | n             | n              | n              | n          | n             | n              | n           | n                |
|       | (%)            | (%)           | (%)           | (%)           | (%)         | (%)            | (%)           | (%)            | (%)            | (%)        | (%)           | (%)            | (%)         | (%)              |
| Yes   | 151<br>(91.52) | 37<br>(94.87) | 27<br>(87.10) | 39<br>(75.00) | 10<br>(100) | 161<br>(89.44) | 67<br>(91.78) | 179<br>(87.32) | 295<br>(93.65) | 3<br>(100) | 28<br>(93.33) | 128<br>(94.12) | 18<br>(100) | 1,143<br>(91.83) |
| No    | 14<br>(8.48)   | 2<br>(5.13)   | 4<br>(12.90)  | 13<br>(25.00) | -           | 19<br>(10.56)  | 6<br>(8.22)   | 26<br>(12.68)  | 20<br>(6.35)   | -          | 2<br>(6.67)   | 8<br>(5.88)    | -           | 114<br>(8.17)    |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100) | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 13. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 152<br>(92.12) | 37<br>(94.87) | 27<br>(87.10) | 41<br>(78.85) | 9<br>(90.00) | 159<br>(88.33) | 68<br>(93.15) | 190<br>(92.68) | 294<br>(93.33) | 3<br>(100) | 28<br>(93.33) | 121<br>(88.97) | 17<br>(94.44) | 1,146<br>(92.04) |
| No    | 13<br>(7.88)   | 2<br>(5.13)   | 4<br>(12.90)  | 11<br>(21.15) | 1<br>(10.00) | 21<br>(11.67)  | 5<br>(6.85)   | 15<br>(7.32)   | 21<br>(6.67)   | -          | 2<br>(6.67)   | 15<br>(11.03)  | 1<br>(5.56)   | 111<br>(7.96)    |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 14. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 97<br>(58.79) | 18<br>(46.15) | 16<br>(51.61) | 9<br>(17.31)  | 3<br>(30.00) | 43<br>(23.89)  | 27<br>(36.99) | 60<br>(29.27)  | 96<br>(30.48)  | 1<br>(33.33) | 19<br>(63.33) | 64<br>(47.06) | 7<br>(38.89)  | 460<br>(33.92) |
| No    | 68<br>(41.21) | 21<br>(53.85) | 15<br>(48.39) | 43<br>(82.69) | 7<br>(70.00) | 137<br>(76.11) | 46<br>(63.01) | 145<br>(70.73) | 219<br>(69.52) | 2<br>(66.67) | 11<br>(36.67) | 72<br>(52.94) | 11<br>(61.11) | 797<br>(66.08) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

Table 15. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI         | VI          | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 6<br>(3.64)    | 3<br>(7.69)   | 3<br>(9.68)   | -           | -           | 9<br>(5.00)    | 5<br>(6.85)   | 22<br>(10.73)  | 22<br>(6.98)   | 1<br>(33.33) | 3<br>(10.00)  | 6<br>(4.41)    | 2<br>(11.11)  | 82<br>(6.78)     |
| No    | 159<br>(96.36) | 36<br>(92.31) | 28<br>(90.32) | 52<br>(100) | 10<br>(100) | 171<br>(95.00) | 68<br>(93.15) | 183<br>(89.27) | 293<br>(93.02) | 2<br>(66.67) | 27<br>(90.00) | 130<br>(95.59) | 16<br>(88.89) | 1,175<br>(93.22) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100) | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 16. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student’s transition services needs?

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 84<br>(50.91) | 5<br>(12.82)  | 6<br>(19.35)  | 6<br>(11.54)  | 4<br>(40.00) | 30<br>(16.67)  | 19<br>(26.03) | 22<br>(10.73)  | 33<br>(10.48)  | 1<br>(33.33) | 15<br>(50.00) | 45<br>(33.09) | 3<br>(16.67)  | 273<br>(17.23) |
| No    | 81<br>(49.09) | 34<br>(87.18) | 25<br>(80.65) | 46<br>(88.46) | 6<br>(60.00) | 150<br>(83.33) | 54<br>(73.97) | 183<br>(89.27) | 282<br>(89.52) | 2<br>(89.52) | 15<br>(50.00) | 91<br>(66.91) | 15<br>(83.33) | 984<br>(82.77) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

Table 17. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI          | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 141<br>(85.45) | 38<br>(97.44) | 28<br>(90.32) | 41<br>(78.85) | 10<br>(100) | 160<br>(88.89) | 45<br>(61.64) | 183<br>(89.27) | 296<br>(93.97) | -          | 25<br>(83.33) | 106<br>(77.94) | 17<br>(94.44) | 1,090<br>(89.74) |
| No    | 24<br>(14.55)  | 1<br>(2.56)   | 3<br>(9.68)   | 11<br>(21.15) | -           | 20<br>(11.11)  | 28<br>(38.36) | 22<br>(10.73)  | 19<br>(6.03)   | 3<br>(100) | 5<br>(16.67)  | 30<br>(22.06)  | 1<br>(5.56)   | 167<br>(10.26)   |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 18. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of the majority?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT            | TBI         | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)       | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 25<br>(15.15)  | 3<br>(7.69)   | 5<br>(16.13)  | 1<br>(1.92)   | 5<br>(50.00) | 4<br>(2.22)    | 5<br>(6.85)   | 7<br>(3.41)    | 7<br>(2.22)    | 1<br>(33.33) | 2<br>(6.67)   | 14<br>(10.29)  | -           | 79<br>(4.58)     |
| No    | 140<br>(84.85) | 36<br>(92.31) | 26<br>(83.87) | 51<br>(98.08) | 5<br>(50.00) | 176<br>(97.78) | 68<br>(93.15) | 198<br>(96.59) | 308<br>(97.78) | 2<br>(66.67) | 28<br>(93.33) | 122<br>(89.71) | 18<br>(100) | 1,178<br>(95.42) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100) | 1,257<br>(100)   |

## Independent Living

Tables 19 through 26 show the results of the cross tabulations between items 1 through 8 on the I-13B measure and student disability type for the postschool domain of independent living. Tasks and activities associated with independent living range from being able to care for one’s self in domestic situations to meeting one’s mobility and transportation needs in the community. Although the acquisition of knowledge and skills in this broad area is most often considered vital for students with moderate to severe disabilities, the majority of secondary students served by special education can benefit from increased knowledge and ability in this area. Virtually all, 99% (n = 1,244) of the documents reviewed did not provide evidence that courses of study were included as part of transition services designed to reasonably enable a student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s) in this area. The bulk of documents (n = 961, 83%) reviewed did not include annual IEP goal(s) as they relate to students’ transition service needs in the area of independent living. More than 80% (n = 986) of ITP/IEP documents did not provide transition services in the IEP that would reasonably enable the students to meet their postsecondary goal(s) this area. These findings suggest an explicit need for the district to improve the provision of transition planning and services in the postschool domain of independent living for the secondary school students that it serves in special education.

Table 19. Is there an appropriate measurable goal or goals in this area?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf        | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT          | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n<br>(%)       | n<br>(%)      | n<br>(%)    | n<br>(%)      | n<br>(%)     | n<br>(%)       | n<br>(%)      | n<br>(%)       | n<br>(%)       | n<br>(%)     | n<br>(%)      | n<br>(%)     | n<br>(%)      | n<br>(%)         |
| Yes   | 6<br>(3.64)    | 1<br>(2.56)   | -           | 3<br>(5.77)   | 1<br>(10.00) | 8<br>(4.44)    | 1<br>(1.37)   | 11<br>(5.37)   | 15<br>(4.76)   | 1<br>(33.33) | 3<br>(10.00)  | -            | 1<br>(5.56)   | 51<br>(4.35)     |
| No    | 159<br>(96.36) | 38<br>(97.44) | 31<br>(100) | 49<br>(94.23) | 9<br>(90.00) | 172<br>(95.56) | 72<br>(98.63) | 192<br>(93.66) | 299<br>(94.92) | 2<br>(66.67) | 27<br>(90.00) | 136<br>(100) | 17<br>(94.44) | 1,203<br>(95.35) |
| N/A   | -              | -             | -           | -             | -            | -              | -             | 2<br>(0.98)    | 1<br>(0.32)    | -            | -             | -            | -             | 3<br>(0.3)       |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100) | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100) | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 20. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI          | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI         | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)       | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 149<br>(90.85) | 37<br>(94.87) | 27<br>(87.10) | 39<br>(75.00) | 10<br>(100) | 161<br>(89.44) | 67<br>(91.78) | 178<br>(86.83) | 295<br>(93.65) | 3<br>(100) | 27<br>(90.00) | 128<br>(94.12) | 18<br>(100) | 1,139<br>(91.67) |
| No    | 15<br>(9.15)   | 2<br>(5.13)   | 4<br>(12.90)  | 13<br>(25.00) | -           | 19<br>(10.56)  | 6<br>(8.22)   | 26<br>(12.68)  | 20<br>(6.35)   | -          | 3<br>(10.00)  | 8<br>(5.88)    | -           | 116<br>(8.26)    |
| N/A   | -              | -             | -             | -             | -           | -              | -             | 1<br>(0.49)    | -              | -          | -             | -              | -           | 1<br>(.00065)    |
| Obs.n | 164<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100) | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 21. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment?

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED            | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT           | TBI          | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 86<br>(52.12) | 19<br>(48.72) | 24<br>(77.42) | 26<br>(50.00) | 5<br>(50.00) | 88<br>(48.89) | 47<br>(64.38) | 120<br>(58.54) | 182<br>(57.78) | 3<br>(100) | 13<br>(43.33) | 67<br>(49.26) | 9<br>(50.00) | 689<br>(55.88) |
| No    | 79<br>(47.88) | 20<br>(51.28) | 7<br>(22.58)  | 26<br>(50.00) | 5<br>(50.00) | 92<br>(51.11) | 26<br>(35.62) | 84<br>(40.98)  | 133<br>(42.22) | -          | 17<br>(56.67) | 69<br>(50.74) | 9<br>(50.00) | 567<br>(44.05) |
| N/A   | -             | -             | -             | -             | -            | -             | -             | 1<br>(0.49)    | -              | -          | -             | -             | -            | 1<br>(.00065)  |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)  | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)  | 1,257<br>(100) |

Table 22. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 83<br>(50.30) | 4<br>(10.26)  | 11<br>(35.48) | 3<br>(5.77)   | 4<br>(40.00) | 14<br>(7.78)   | 30<br>(41.10) | 21<br>(10.24)  | 29<br>(9.21)   | 1<br>(33.33) | 15<br>(50.00) | 53<br>(38.97) | 2<br>(11.11)  | 270<br>(16.32) |
| No    | 82<br>(49.70) | 35<br>(89.74) | 20<br>(64.52) | 49<br>(94.23) | 6<br>(60.00) | 166<br>(92.22) | 43<br>(58.90) | 183<br>(89.27) | 286<br>(90.79) | 2<br>(66.67) | 15<br>(50.00) | 83<br>(61.03) | 16<br>(88.89) | 986<br>(83.62) |
| N/A   | -             | -             | -             | -             | -            | -              | -             | 1<br>(0.49)    | -              | -            | -             | -             | -             | 1<br>(.00065)  |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

Table 23. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?

|       | ID             | HofH        | Deaf          | SLI         | VI          | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD          | Deaf/Bli     | Multi       | AUT            | TBI         | Total            |
|-------|----------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)       | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)        | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)       | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 3<br>(1.82)    | -           | 1<br>(3.23)   | -           | -           | 1<br>(0.56)    | 1<br>(1.37)   | -              | -            | 1<br>(33.33) | -           | 4<br>(2.94)    | -           | 11<br>(0.51)     |
| No    | 162<br>(98.18) | 39<br>(100) | 30<br>(96.77) | 52<br>(100) | 10<br>(100) | 179<br>(99.44) | 72<br>(98.63) | 204<br>(99.51) | 315<br>(100) | 2<br>(66.67) | 30<br>(100) | 131<br>(96.32) | 18<br>(100) | 1,244<br>(99.38) |
| N/A   | -              | -           | -             | -           | -           | -              | -             | 1<br>(0.49)    | -            | -            | -           | 1<br>(0.74)    | -           | 2<br>(0.11)      |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100) | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100) | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100) | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100) | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100) | 1,257<br>(100)   |

Table 24. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student's transition services needs?

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 92<br>(55.76) | 7<br>(17.95)  | 5<br>(16.13)  | 3<br>(5.77)   | 7<br>(70.00) | 26<br>(14.44)  | 31<br>(42.47) | 23<br>(11.22)  | 24<br>(7.62)   | 3<br>(100) | 14<br>(46.67) | 56<br>(41.18) | 4<br>(22.22)  | 295<br>(17.05) |
| No    | 73<br>(44.24) | 32<br>(82.05) | 26<br>(83.87) | 49<br>(94.23) | 3<br>(30.00) | 154<br>(85.56) | 42<br>(57.53) | 181<br>(88.29) | 291<br>(92.38) | -          | 16<br>(53.33) | 80<br>(58.82) | 14<br>(77.78) | 961<br>(82.89) |
| N/A   | -             | -             | -             | -             | -            | -              | -             | 1<br>(0.49)    | -              | -          | -             | -             | -             | 1<br>(.00065)  |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

Table 25. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI          | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 141<br>(85.45) | 38<br>(97.44) | 28<br>(90.32) | 41<br>(78.85) | 10<br>(100) | 161<br>(89.44) | 46<br>(63.01) | 182<br>(88.78) | 296<br>(93.97) | -          | 25<br>(83.33) | 106<br>(77.94) | 17<br>(94.44) | 1,091<br>(89.76) |
| No    | 24<br>(14.55)  | 1<br>(2.56)   | 3<br>(9.68)   | 11<br>(21.15) | -           | 19<br>(10.56)  | 27<br>(36.99) | 22<br>(10.73)  | 19<br>(6.03)   | 3<br>(100) | 5<br>(16.67)  | 30<br>(22.06)  | 1<br>(5.56)   | 165<br>(10.17)   |
| N/A   | -              | -             | -             | -             | -           | -              | -             | 1<br>(0.49)    | -              | -          | -             | -              | -             | 1<br>(.00065)    |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |



Table 26. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of the majority?

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED            | OI            | OHI           | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 53<br>(32.12)  | -             | 4<br>(12.90)  | 1<br>(1.92)   | 4<br>(40.00) | 41<br>(22.78) | 18<br>(24.66) | 23<br>(11.22) | 14<br>(4.44)   | 2<br>(66.67) | 7<br>(23.33)  | 27<br>(19.85) | -             | 194<br>(11.50) |
| No    | 103<br>(62.42) | 17<br>(43.59) | 17<br>(54.84) | 33<br>(63.46) | 4<br>(40.00) | 86<br>(47.78) | 47<br>(64.38) | 96<br>(46.83) | 129<br>(40.95) | 1<br>(33.33) | 19<br>(63.33) | 94<br>(69.12) | 11<br>(61.11) | 657<br>(47.67) |
| N/A   | 9<br>(5.45)    | 22<br>(56.41) | 10<br>(32.26) | 18<br>(34.62) | 2<br>(20.00) | 53<br>(29.44) | 8<br>(10.96)  | 86<br>(41.95) | 172<br>(54.60) | -            | 4<br>(13.33)  | 15<br>(11.03) | 7<br>(38.89)  | 406<br>(40.83) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)  | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)  | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

### Summary

None of the 1,257 ITP/IEP documents that were reviewed met the requirements of I-13. In addition 40 IEP documents did not contain transition plans. As demonstrated by the findings above, there are pronounced deficits in appropriate transition planning and related service provision across the postschool domains of educational training, employment, and independent living for secondary school students with disabilities who are served by the district.

Procedural safeguards, such as the annual updating of IEP/ITP goals and student participation/invitation to the IEP meeting where transition services are discussed, were found to be in place for the vast majority of students.

These findings are descriptive in nature and the source(s) of the observed phenomena cannot be directly attributed to discrete organizational functions or the behavior of specific school personnel.

### Recommendations

- The district should take immediate action regarding the 40 cases that did not have ITPs.
- The district should thoroughly examine the source(s) of its deficits in the provision of appropriate transition planning and services at the organization, school, and personnel levels.
- The district should make certain that explicit policies and procedures exist to clearly define the responsibilities that secondary school personnel have in documenting and delivering appropriate transition planning and related services to students with disabilities.

- The district should ensure that all personnel charged with the provision of educational and related services to secondary school students with disabilities are provided with comprehensive and ongoing training and professional development activities related to transition planning and services.
- The district should formulate a strategic plan that is designed to ensure that all students with disabilities served at the secondary school level have ITP/IEP documents that meet federal I-13 requirements.

## CHAPTER 3. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY TO EXAMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH EVIDENCE-BASED TRANSITION PREDICTORS FOR IMPROVING POSTSCHOOL OUTCOMES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ARE INCLUDED IN THE SERVICES RECEIVED BY YOUTH WHO ARE SERVED BY THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which evidence-based transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes were included as part of the special education services students ages 16 to 22 received at the secondary level. Current research suggests that students who participate in specific experiences and receive certain services while in high school enjoy improved postschool outcomes in the areas of education, employment, and independent living (Test et al., 2009). Not all experiences and services promote improved postschool outcomes equally. For example, while receipt of paid employment/work experience has been shown to contribute to enhanced postschool outcomes in all three outcome areas, meeting exit exam/high school graduation requirements have been shown only to be correlated with enhanced outcomes related to employment. This study examines the extent to which these 16 evidence-based transition predictors were included in the 1,257 ITP/IEP documents of students in special education who were served by the San Diego Unified School District. The sections that follow present the sample and methods, findings, summary, and recommendations from this study.

### **Sample and Methods**

#### ***Sample***

The overall sampling frame or working population for the study comprises students between the ages of 16 and 22 with disabilities currently served by the San Diego school district (N=3,331). The unit of analysis is the student.

The students were first separated into mutually exclusive groups or strata based on their disability code (see “Working Population” columns in Table 27). For each strata a random sample of cases was selected with a 95% confidence interval with a +/- 5% margin of error specified. Some disability groups lacked a sufficient number of cases to ensure the +/- 5% rate (multiple, TBI, VI, and deaf/blind). For those categories all of the cases were selected. The “Actual” column in Table 27 shows how many cases were randomly selected from each disability strata. The resulting random stratified sample was 1,264 students.

The stratification results in an overall sample that is skewed towards the disability types with smaller number of students. A weighting adjustment was required to make certain that the total sample is a proportionate representation of the sampling frame rather than a summation of the disproportionately sampled disability groups within the sample frame. For example, in Table 27 the proportion of students in the working population with autism is 6.4%. With a sample size of 1,264 one would expect, with simple random sampling, 81 students with autism to be selected ( $1,264 \times 6.4\%$ ), whereas with stratified random sampling 137 were sampled. The primary purpose of weighting this

stratified random sample is to make certain that each disability group is represented by an adequate sample size in order to analyze the groups both separately and as part of the total population.

The final analytical sample was 1,257 students. There were 7 cases for which student records (eg. IEP/ITP documents) did not exist and were subsequently excluded from the analyses.

Table 27. Working population, Sample and Weights

| Disability Category | Working Population |              | Actual Sampled | Expected to be Sampled | Weights |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------------|---------|
|                     | N                  | %            | N              | N                      |         |
| SLD                 | 1,737              | 52.1         | 315            | 659                    | 2.09    |
| OHI                 | 447                | 13.4         | 207            | 170                    | 0.82    |
| ED                  | 343                | 10.3         | 181            | 130                    | 0.72    |
| MR/ID               | 293                | 8.8          | 166            | 111                    | 0.67    |
| Autism              | 214                | 6.4          | 137            | 81                     | 0.59    |
| OI                  | 90                 | 2.7          | 73             | 34                     | 0.47    |
| SLI                 | 63                 | 1.9          | 54             | 24                     | 0.44    |
| HofH                | 45                 | 1.4          | 39             | 17                     | 0.44    |
| Deaf                | 35                 | 1.1          | 31             | 13                     | 0.43    |
| Multiple            | 32                 | 1.0          | 30             | 12                     | 0.40    |
| TBI                 | 19                 | 0.6          | 18             | 7                      | 0.40    |
| VI                  | 10                 | 0.3          | 10             | 4                      | 0.38    |
| Deaf/Blind          | 3                  | 0.1          | 3              | 1                      | 0.38    |
| <i>Total</i>        | <i>3,331</i>       | <i>100.0</i> | <i>1,264</i>   | <i>1,264</i>           |         |

*Representativeness of the Stratified Random Sample*

The demographic characteristics available in the data set were used to compare the entire sample of 3,331 students to the stratified random sample of 1,264 students. The means and proportions listed below for the stratified sample were computed using the STATA software program so that the sampling characteristics (strata, weights) could be correctly applied. None of the proportions shown in Table 28 significantly differ (at  $p < .05$ ) between the working sample and the stratified sample indicating the stratified random sample is representative of the working population

Table 28. Comparison of Demographic Characteristics for Working Population to Stratified Sample

|                   | Working Population<br>(N=3,331) | Stratified Sample<br>(n=1,264) |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                   | %                               | %                              |
| Gender (% female) | 32.8                            | 33.4                           |
| Grade             |                                 |                                |
| 8-9               | 6.8                             | 7.0                            |
| 10                | 18.6                            | 18.8                           |
| 11                | 28.7                            | 26.7                           |
| 12                | 45.9                            | 47.5                           |
| Race/Ethnicity    |                                 |                                |
| African American  | 20.4                            | 19.1                           |
| Asian             | 1.2                             | 1.1                            |
| Filipino          | 3.1                             | 3.6                            |
| Hispanic          | 47.5                            | 47.4                           |
| Indochina         | 3.0                             | 2.5                            |
| Native American   | 0.8                             | 0.6                            |
| Pacific Islander  | 0.6                             | 0.9                            |
| White             | 23.4                            | 24.8                           |
| School Type       |                                 |                                |
| Alternative       | 7.0                             | 7.1                            |
| Atypical          | 1.5                             | 0.9                            |
| HSDP              | 1.2                             | 1.2                            |
| Senior High       | 61.5                            | 62.4                           |
| Special Ed        | 28.9                            | 28.3                           |

## **Methods**

### *Data Collection*

Once the sample was generated, personnel from the district's special education central office accessed and printed hard copies of students' ITP/IEP documents (n = 1,257). The documents were then transferred to Dr. Naranjo and his team for examination and processing.

### *Measures*

The measure used in this study was comprised of a checklist containing 16 items scored dichotomously (e.g., Yes/No) (see Appendix B). The 16 items in the checklist correspond to the 16 evidence-based transition predictors that have been shown to enhance postschool outcomes for youth with disabilities in the areas of education, employment and independent living. Documents were reviewed and evidence of the presence of these predictors was noted.

### *Procedures*

Over the course of a six-month period Dr. Naranjo and two trained graduate research assistants hand scored each ITP/IEP document using a checklist comprised of the 16 predictor variables that have been shown to contribute to positive postschool outcomes in the areas of educational training, employment and independent living. Data was entered on optical scan forms that were specially designed for the purpose of this study. Once complete, forms were then scanned into a database that was created for this project.

To ensure that the coding process maintained a high level of reliability, 7% (n = 94) of the documents were randomly selected and triple coded using the following item-by-item formula for calculating interobserver reliability:

Formula: (# checklist items agreed upon by both observers/total # of items) X 100 = *checklist item-by-checklist item reliability (%)*

This procedure resulted in an interobserver reliability rate of 86. This means that 86% of the time all three observers scored the sampled documents (n = 94) identically. Acceptable interobserver reliability percentages range between 80%-100%. The interobserver reliability rate for this study is exceptionally high, indicating that the data collected are sufficiently reliable to produce valid findings.

### *Design and Data Analysis*

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which evidence-based transition experiences and services that are predicted to improve postschool outcome for students with disabilities were included in the services received by youth with disabilities who are served by the San Diego Unified School District; therefore, the research design selected is descriptive in nature. Data were

analyzed using a cross tabulation procedure to produce counts and percentages. Please note that *n* is the observed count and percents account for sampling weights.

## Findings

This section presents the findings from this study. The 16 evidence-based predictors examined in the study organize the findings. For example, findings that correspond to the *career awareness* variable are found under that heading.

### Career Awareness

Table 29 shows that, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents, approximately 85% (*n* = 1,042) of students were not receiving services or participating in experiences that have been shown to promote career awareness.

Table 29. Career Awareness

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 55<br>(33.33)  | 5<br>(12.82)  | 8<br>(25.81)  | 2<br>(3.85)   | 2<br>(20.00) | 26<br>(14.44)  | 11<br>(15.07) | 34<br>(16.59)  | 35<br>(11.11)  | -          | 7<br>(23.33)  | 28<br>(20.59)  | 2<br>(11.11)  | 215<br>(15.03)   |
| No    | 110<br>(66.67) | 34<br>(87.18) | 23<br>(74.19) | 50<br>(96.15) | 8<br>(80.00) | 154<br>(85.56) | 62<br>(84.93) | 171<br>(83.41) | 280<br>(88.89) | 3<br>(100) | 23<br>(76.67) | 108<br>(79.41) | 16<br>(88.89) | 1,042<br>(84.97) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

### Community Experience

Table 30 shows that less than 50% (*n* = 646) of students were engaged in experiences in the community, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 30. Community Experience

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 125<br>(75.76) | 29<br>(74.36) | 20<br>(64.52) | 16<br>(30.77) | 7<br>(70.00) | 75<br>(41.67)  | 31<br>(42.47) | 90<br>(43.90)  | 137<br>(43.49) | 3<br>(100) | 16<br>(53.33) | 86<br>(63.24) | 11<br>(61.11) | 646<br>(48.16) |
| No    | 40<br>(24.24)  | 10<br>(25.64) | 11<br>(35.48) | 36<br>(69.23) | 3<br>(30.00) | 105<br>(58.33) | 42<br>(57.53) | 115<br>(56.10) | 178<br>(56.51) | -          | 14<br>(46.67) | 50<br>(36.76) | 7<br>(38.89)  | 611<br>(51.84) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

**Exit Exam Requirements/High School Diploma Status**

Table 31 shows that 86% (n = 1,102) of students had not met the district’s high school exit exam requirements, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 31. Exit Exam Requirements/High School Diploma Status

|       | ID           | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   |              | 14<br>(35.90) | 1<br>(3.23)   | 14<br>(26.92) | 4<br>(40.00) | 20<br>(11.11)  | 4<br>(5.48)   | 38<br>(18.54)  | 50<br>(15.87)  | -          | 1<br>(3.33)   | 6<br>(4.41)    | 3<br>(16.67)  | 155<br>(13.61)   |
| No    | 165<br>(100) | 25<br>(64.10) | 30<br>(95.77) | 38<br>(73.08) | 6<br>(60.00) | 160<br>(88.89) | 69<br>(94.52) | 167<br>(81.46) | 265<br>(84.13) | 3<br>(100) | 29<br>(96.67) | 130<br>(95.59) | 15<br>(83.33) | 1,102<br>(86.39) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100) | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

**Inclusion in General Education**

Table 32 shows that nearly two-thirds (n = 638, 60%) of students were included in general education for 50% or more of their educational placement, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 32. Inclusion in General Education

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI            | ED             | OI            | OHI           | SLD            | Deaf/Bli       | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total          |                |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          |                |
| Yes   |                | 22<br>(13.33) | 36<br>(92.31) | 15<br>(48.39) | 37<br>(71.15) | 7<br>(70.00)   | 75<br>(41.67) | 17<br>(23.29) | 143<br>(69.76) | 237<br>(75.24) | -             | 3<br>(10.00)   | 35<br>(25.74) | 11<br>(61.11)  | 638<br>(60.13) |
| No    | 143<br>(86.67) | 3<br>(7.69)   | 16<br>(51.61) | 15<br>(28.85) | 3<br>(30.00)  | 105<br>(58.33) | 56<br>(76.71) | 62<br>(30.24) | 78<br>(24.76)  | 3<br>(100)     | 27<br>(90.00) | 101<br>(74.26) | 7<br>(38.89)  | 619<br>(39.87) |                |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)   | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)  | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)     | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |                |



### **Interagency Collaboration**

Table 33 shows that approximately 78% (n = 888) of ITP/IEP documents did not provide evidence of interagency collaboration, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 33. Interagency Collaboration

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 99<br>(60.00) | 5<br>(12.82)  | 10<br>(32.26) | 3<br>(5.77)   | 7<br>(70.00) | 65<br>(36.11)  | 39<br>(53.42) | 36<br>(17.56)  | 32<br>(10.16)  | 2<br>(66.67) | 13<br>(43.33) | 55<br>(40.44) | 3<br>(16.67)  | 369<br>(22.08) |
| No    | 66<br>(40.00) | 34<br>(87.18) | 21<br>(67.74) | 49<br>(94.23) | 3<br>(30.00) | 115<br>(63.89) | 34<br>(46.58) | 169<br>(82.44) | 283<br>(89.84) | 1<br>(33.33) | 17<br>(56.67) | 81<br>(59.56) | 15<br>(83.33) | 888<br>(77.92) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

### **Occupational Course**

Table 34 shows that only 15% (n =187) of students were enrolled in an occupational course as part of their studies, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 34. Occupational Course

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI          | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 17<br>(10.30)  | 10<br>(25.64) | 11<br>(35.48) | 6<br>(11.54)  | -           | 24<br>(13.33)  | 8<br>(10.96)  | 34<br>(16.59)  | 50<br>(15.87)  | 1<br>(33.33) | 4<br>(13.33)  | 16<br>(11.76)  | 6<br>(33.33)  | 187<br>(15.13)   |
| No    | 148<br>(89.70) | 29<br>(74.36) | 20<br>(64.52) | 46<br>(88.46) | 10<br>(100) | 156<br>(86.67) | 65<br>(89.04) | 171<br>(83.41) | 265<br>(84.13) | 2<br>(66.67) | 26<br>(86.67) | 120<br>(88.24) | 12<br>(66.67) | 1,070<br>(84.87) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

***Paid Employment/Work Experience***

Table 35 shows that nearly 30% (n =387) of students were involved in paid employment/work experience as evidenced by their IEP/ITP documents.

Table 35. Paid Employment/Work Experience

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 84<br>(50.91) | 10<br>(25.64) | 15<br>(48.39) | 8<br>(15.38)  | 4<br>(40.00) | 47<br>(26.11)  | 19<br>(26.03) | 51<br>(24.88)  | 78<br>(24.76)  | 3<br>(100) | 9<br>(30.00)  | 51<br>(37.50) | 8<br>(44.44)  | 387<br>(28.43) |
| No    | 81<br>(49.09) | 29<br>(74.36) | 16<br>(51.61) | 44<br>(84.62) | 6<br>(60.00) | 133<br>(73.89) | 54<br>(73.97) | 154<br>(75.12) | 237<br>(75.24) | -          | 21<br>(70.00) | 85<br>(62.50) | 10<br>(55.56) | 870<br>(71.57) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

***Parent Involvement***

Table 36 shows that the bulk (n = 1,069, 83%) of student ITP/IEP documents provided evidence of parent involvement in the special education planning process at the secondary level.

Table 36. Parent Involvement

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 151<br>(91.52) | 35<br>(89.74) | 25<br>(80.65) | 44<br>(84.62) | 9<br>(90.00) | 139<br>(77.22) | 66<br>(90.41) | 181<br>(88.29) | 250<br>(79.37) | 3<br>(100) | 27<br>(90.00) | 125<br>(91.91) | 14<br>(77.78) | 1,069<br>(82.90) |
| No    | 14<br>(8.48)   | 4<br>(10.26)  | 6<br>(19.35)  | 8<br>(15.38)  | 1<br>(10.00) | 41<br>(22.78)  | 7<br>(9.59)   | 24<br>(11.71)  | 65<br>(20.63)  | -          | 3<br>(10.00)  | 11<br>(8.09)   | 4<br>(22.22)  | 188<br>(17.10)   |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

**Program of Study**

Table 37 shows that only 4% (n = 44) of students had clearly defined programs of study, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 37. Program of Study

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi       | AUT            | TBI         | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)       | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 4<br>(2.42)    | 1<br>(2.56)   | 1<br>(3.23)   | 1<br>(1.92)   | 1<br>(10.00) | 3<br>(1.67)    | 2<br>(2.74)   | 9<br>(4.39)    | 15<br>(4.76)   | -          | -           | 7<br>(5.15)    | -           | 44<br>(4.00)     |
| No    | 161<br>(97.58) | 38<br>(97.44) | 30<br>(96.77) | 51<br>(98.08) | 9<br>(90.00) | 177<br>(98.33) | 71<br>(97.26) | 196<br>(95.61) | 300<br>(95.24) | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100) | 129<br>(94.85) | 18<br>(100) | 1,213<br>(96.00) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100) | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100) | 1,257<br>(100)   |

**Self-advocacy/Self-determination**

Table 38 shows that approximately 66% (n = 834) of students did not receive services or instruction related to self-advocacy/self-determination, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 38. Self-advocacy/Self-determination

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 37<br>(22.42)  | 25<br>(64.10) | 12<br>(38.71) | 18<br>(34.62) | 8<br>(80.00) | 51<br>(28.33)  | 24<br>(32.88) | 77<br>(37.56)  | 113<br>(35.87) | 1<br>(33.33) | 7<br>(23.33)  | 44<br>(32.35) | 6<br>(33.33)  | 423<br>(34.22) |
| No    | 128<br>(77.58) | 14<br>(35.90) | 19<br>(61.29) | 34<br>(65.38) | 2<br>(20.00) | 129<br>(71.67) | 49<br>(67.12) | 128<br>(62.44) | 202<br>(64.13) | 2<br>(66.67) | 23<br>(76.67) | 92<br>(67.65) | 12<br>(66.67) | 834<br>(65.78) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

### **Self-care/Independent Living Skills**

Table 39 shows that approximately 21% (n = 353) of students received services or instruction related to self-care/independent living, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 39. Self-care/Independent Living Skills

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 107<br>(64.85) | 10<br>(25.64) | 4<br>(12.90)  | 2<br>(3.85)   | 8<br>(80.00) | 36<br>(20.00)  | 41<br>(56.16) | 30<br>(14.63)  | 32<br>(10.16)  | 2<br>(66.67) | 16<br>(53.33) | 59<br>(43.38) | 6<br>(33.33)  | 353<br>(20.88) |
| No    | 58<br>(35.15)  | 29<br>(74.36) | 27<br>(87.10) | 50<br>(96.15) | 2<br>(20.00) | 144<br>(80.00) | 32<br>(43.84) | 175<br>(85.37) | 283<br>(89.84) | 1<br>(33.33) | 14<br>(46.67) | 77<br>(56.62) | 12<br>(66.67) | 904<br>(79.12) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

### **Social Skills**

Table 40 shows that nearly 50% (n = 667) of students received services or instruction related to social skills, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 40. Social Skills

|       | ID            | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT           | TBI           | Total          |
|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|       | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)          |
| Yes   | 87<br>(52.73) | 14<br>(35.90) | 14<br>(45.16) | 28<br>(53.85) | 4<br>(40.00) | 115<br>(63.89) | 47<br>(64.38) | 114<br>(55.61) | 119<br>(37.78) | 3<br>(100) | 19<br>(63.38) | 93<br>(68.38) | 10<br>(55.56) | 667<br>(47.59) |
| No    | 78<br>(47.27) | 25<br>(64.10) | 17<br>(54.84) | 24<br>(46.15) | 6<br>(60.00) | 65<br>(36.11)  | 26<br>(35.62) | 91<br>(44.39)  | 196<br>(62.22) | -          | 11<br>(36.67) | 43<br>(31.62) | 8<br>(44.44)  | 590<br>(52.41) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)  | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)  | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100) |

## **Student Support**

Table 41 shows that 95% (n =1,189) did not receive support from their extended social network in finding work or participating in employment related experiences, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 41. Student Support

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI          | ED             | OI          | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)       | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 9<br>(5.45)    | 4<br>(10.26)  | 1<br>(3.23)   | 6<br>(11.54)  | -           | 15<br>(8.33)   | -           | 12<br>(5.85)   | 12<br>(3.81)   | -          | 2<br>(6.67)   | 6<br>(4.41)    | 1<br>(5.56)   | 68<br>(4.87)     |
| No    | 156<br>(94.55) | 35<br>(89.74) | 30<br>(96.77) | 46<br>(88.46) | 10<br>(100) | 165<br>(91.67) | 73<br>(100) | 193<br>(94.15) | 303<br>(96.19) | 3<br>(100) | 28<br>(93.33) | 130<br>(95.59) | 17<br>(94.44) | 1,189<br>(95.13) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100) | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100) | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

## **Transition Program**

Table 42 shows that 16% (n = 225) of students were engaged in a program specifically designed to deliver transition related services, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 42. Transition Program

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 65<br>(39.39)  | 2<br>(5.13)   | 4<br>(12.90)  | 1<br>(1.92)   | 2<br>(20.00) | 28<br>(15.56)  | 22<br>(30.14) | 23<br>(11.22)  | 38<br>(12.06)  | 1<br>(33.33) | 10<br>(33.33) | 26<br>(19.12)  | 3<br>(16.67)  | 225<br>(15.66)   |
| No    | 100<br>(60.61) | 37<br>(94.87) | 27<br>(87.10) | 51<br>(98.08) | 8<br>(80.00) | 152<br>(84.44) | 51<br>(69.86) | 182<br>(88.78) | 277<br>(87.94) | 2<br>(66.67) | 20<br>(66.67) | 110<br>(80.88) | 15<br>(83.33) | 1,032<br>(84.34) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

### **Vocational Education**

Table 43 shows that 87% (n = 1,074) of students did not participate in vocational education, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 43. Vocational Education

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli   | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)      | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 41<br>(24.85)  | 7<br>(17.95)  | 5<br>(16.13)  | 4<br>(7.69)   | 1<br>(10.00) | 18<br>(10.00)  | 11<br>(15.07) | 27<br>(13.17)  | 33<br>(10.48)  | -          | 9<br>(30.00)  | 22<br>(16.18)  | 5<br>(27.78)  | 183<br>(12.92)   |
| No    | 124<br>(75.15) | 32<br>(82.05) | 26<br>(83.87) | 48<br>(92.31) | 9<br>(90.00) | 162<br>(90.00) | 62<br>(84.93) | 178<br>(86.83) | 282<br>(89.52) | 3<br>(100) | 21<br>(70.00) | 114<br>(83.82) | 13<br>(72.22) | 1,074<br>(87.08) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100) | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

### **Work Study**

Table 44 shows that 10% (n = 160) of students participated in work study, as evidenced by their ITP/IEP documents.

Table 44. Work Study

|       | ID             | HofH          | Deaf          | SLI           | VI           | ED             | OI            | OHI            | SLD            | Deaf/Bli     | Multi         | AUT            | TBI           | Total            |
|-------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
|       | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)         | n (%)        | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)          | n (%)        | n (%)         | n (%)          | n (%)         | n (%)            |
| Yes   | 43<br>(26.06)  | 3<br>(7.69)   | 9<br>(29.03)  | 1<br>(1.92)   | 2<br>(20.00) | 13<br>(7.22)   | 11<br>(15.07) | 14<br>(6.83)   | 22<br>(6.98)   | 1<br>(33.33) | 8<br>(26.67)  | 31<br>(22.79)  | 2<br>(11.11)  | 160<br>(10.32)   |
| No    | 122<br>(73.94) | 36<br>(92.31) | 22<br>(70.97) | 51<br>(98.08) | 8<br>(80.00) | 167<br>(92.78) | 62<br>(84.93) | 191<br>(93.17) | 293<br>(93.02) | 2<br>(66.67) | 22<br>(73.33) | 105<br>(77.21) | 16<br>(88.89) | 1,097<br>(89.68) |
| Obs.n | 165<br>(100)   | 39<br>(100)   | 31<br>(100)   | 52<br>(100)   | 10<br>(100)  | 180<br>(100)   | 73<br>(100)   | 205<br>(100)   | 315<br>(100)   | 3<br>(100)   | 30<br>(100)   | 136<br>(100)   | 18<br>(100)   | 1,257<br>(100)   |

## **Summary**

The district is providing a small number of students with opportunities to be engaged in experiences related to three of the four predictors (i.e., paid employment/work experience, self-care/independent living skills, student support) that are correlated with successful postschool outcomes in the areas of educational training, employment, and independent living. Regarding the fourth predictor (i.e., inclusion in general education), student ITP/IEP documents indicate that approximately 60% of individuals are included in the general education setting for 50% or more of the time that they are at school.

Findings vary with regard to the remaining fourteen predictors; however, the vast majority of the documents reviewed suggest that the district is not adequately ensuring that all secondary students with disabilities have opportunities to be engaged in these experiences and services. The lack of opportunity to be more fully engaged in these sixteen evidence-based predictors experiences and services may lead to diminished postschool outcomes for secondary school students served by the district.

These findings are descriptive in nature. The source(s) of the observed phenomena cannot be directly attributed to discrete organizational functions or the behavior of specific school personnel.

## **Recommendations**

- The district should make certain that secondary school students with disabilities have the opportunity to be engaged in at least the four evidence-based experiences and services (i.e., inclusion in general education, paid employment/work experience, self-care/independent living skills, student support) that are correlated with successful postschool outcomes for educational training, employment, and independent living. Full access to the remaining experiences and services predictive of successful postschool outcomes is also recommended, as these may further promote positive postschool adjustment.
- The district should ensure that the providers of secondary special education and transition services are knowledgeable and skilled in the delivery of evidence-based predictors and practices that are associated with successful postschool outcomes.

## REFERENCES

- Test, D. R., Mazzotti, V. L., Mustian, A. L., Fowler, C. H., Kortering, L., & Kohler, P. (2009). Evidence-based secondary transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes for students with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 32(3), 160-181. doi: 10.1177/0885728809346960



## Appendix A

# IEP/ITP Review

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

63709

Coder:  1     2     3     4

Seq 1: 1

SID: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

| Questions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Postsecondary Goals                                   |                                                       |                                                                                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Educational Training                                  | Employment                                            | Independent Living                                                             |
| 1. Is there an appropriate measurable postsecondary goal or goals in this area?<br><br>Can the goal(s) be counted?<br>Will the goal(s) occur after the student graduates from school?<br>Based on the information available about this student, does (do) the postsecondary goal(s) seem appropriate for this student?<br>* If yes to all three, then bubble Y OR if a postsecondary goal(s) is (are) <i>not</i> stated, bubble N                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1a <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 1b <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 1c <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> NA |
| 2. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually?<br><br>Was (were) the postsecondary goal(s) addressed/updated in conjunction with the development of the current IEP?<br>* If yes, then bubble Y OR if the postsecondary goal(s) was (were) not updated with the current IEP, bubble N                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 2a <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 2b <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 2c <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> NA |
| 3. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment?<br><br>Is the use of transition assessment(s) for the postsecondary goal(s) mentioned in the IEP or evident in the student's file?<br>* If yes, then bubble Y OR if no, then bubble N                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 3a <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 3b <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 3c <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> NA |
| 4. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?<br><br>Is a type of instruction, related to service, community experience, or development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives, and if appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills, and provision of a functional vocational evaluation listed in association with meeting the postsecondary goal(s)?<br>* If yes, then bubble Y OR if no, then bubble N                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 4a <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 4b <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 4c <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> NA |
| 5. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)?<br><br>Do the transition services include courses of study that align with the student's postsecondary goal(s)?<br>* If yes, then bubble Y OR if no, then bubble N                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 5a <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 5b <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 5c <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> NA |
| 6. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student's transition services needs?<br><br>Is (are) an annual goal(s) included in the IEP that is/are related to the student's transition services needs?<br>* If yes, then bubble Y OR if no, then bubble N                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 6a <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 6b <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 6c <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> NA |
| 7. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed?<br><br>For the current year, is there documented evidence in the IEP or cumulative folder that the student was invited to attend the IEP Team meeting?<br>* If yes, then bubble Y OR if no, then bubble N                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 7a <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 7b <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 7c <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> NA |
| 8. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority?<br><br>For the current year, is there evidence in the IEP that representatives of any of the following agencies/services were invited to participate in the IEP development including but not limited to: <i>postsecondary education, vocational education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living or community participation</i> for this post-secondary goal?<br>Was consent obtained from the parent (or student, for a student the age of majority)?<br>* If yes to both, then bubble Y<br>* If no invitation is evident and a participating agency is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services and there was consent to invite them to the IEP meeting, then bubble N<br>* If it is too early to determine if the student will need outside agency involvement, or no agency is likely to provide or pay for transition services, bubble NA<br>* If parent or individual student consent (when appropriate) was <i>not</i> provided, bubble NA | 8a <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 8b <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | 8c <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> NA |
| 9. Does the IEP meet the requirements of Indicator 13? (Bubble Y or N)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No    |                                                       |                                                                                |

Yes (all Ys or NAs for each item [1-8] on the checklist included in the IEP are bubbled) or No (one or more Ns bubbled)

## Appendix B



63709

- 10. Career Awareness .....  Yes  No
- 11. Community Experience .....  Yes  No
- 12. Exit Exam Requirements/High School Diploma Status .....  Yes  No
- 13. Inclusion in General Education .....  Yes  No
- 14. Interagency Collaboration .....  Yes  No
- 15. Occupational Course .....  Yes  No
- 16. Paid Employment/Work Experience .....  Yes  No
- 17. Parent Involvement .....  Yes  No
- 18. Program of Study.....  Yes  No
- 19. Self-advocacy/Self-determination .....  Yes  No
- 20. Self-care/Independent Living Skills .....  Yes  No
- 21. Social Skills .....  Yes  No
- 22. Student Support .....  Yes  No
- 23. Transition Program .....  Yes  No
- 24. Vocational Education .....  Yes  No
- 25. Work Study .....  Yes  No