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ABSTRACT

This investigation identified the perceptions of Ohio students with intellectual disabilities on the transition process when exiting high school. The study re-examined the findings from the data on the Ohio Longitudinal Study (Baer, Daviso, & McMahan Queen, 2009). The study took data upon exiting an Ohio high school, and with one, and three and, five year intervals. The following questions were explored:

- What critical courses of study or experiences do students with intellectual disabilities identify as unavailable?
- What experiences did they rate as the most valuable during the transition process? What fields of work did they anticipate working in, compared to what they are currently working in?
- What are the participants’ reported reasons for unemployment?

The top tier of services and activities that were unavailable surround a theme relative to employment and employability training. When identifying the highest rated experiences; the top tier of service and activity rating also involved a theme surrounding employment and employability training. Students top choices were paid work on own, and career and technical education, or in school job. The top five anticipated and actual fields of work for the African American and the white populations were identified. While looking at the reasons for not working by gender, the most prevalent factors to consider are the bleak economic conditions and how that would impact employment opportunities. The majority
of the responses indicated that they could not find any job. The difference among genders for the question cannot find any job was a $p$ value of .038 demonstrating a significant difference between male and female genders. An area for future research is the amount of career investigation and exposure that is needed for students to choose an appropriate field of employment. Implications for educational practices indicated by the findings demonstrate the need to offer many employment experiences and apprenticeships at an early age to provide educated employment choices and preparation.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

The United States Department of Education states in the report called *Condition of Education* (2008) that 396,857 students with disabilities exited United States high schools in the 2005-2006 school year, which would include students with various disabilities including intellectual disabilities. These students are supposed to be prepared appropriately for life. The post-school outcomes of the students with disabilities are not what the students and their stakeholders expected. Further study needs to take place in the state of Ohio to analyze whether the national data on transition is consistent with the state level data. The information obtained from the study will identify the compliance on a state level to the mandates of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004 (IDEA). This investigation aimed to identify whether the necessary coursework and experiences were provided for Ohio students with intellectual disabilities.

National Studies

According to a report on the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 (NLTS2), Wagner, Newman, Cameto, and Levine (2005) identified data which showed there was an increase over time in the graduation rate of youth with disabilities. Wagner et al. stated
that the proportion of those who left school receiving a high school diploma or certificate of completion increased from 54% to 70% between 1987 and 2003. The authors also recognized that the percentage of students leaving high school without finishing had declined from 46% to 30%. These findings are at least in part due to the fact that many more youth represented in NLTS 2 were at the appropriate grade level than those represented in the NLTS. They further report the grades of youth with disabilities improved over time (Wagner et al., 2005).

Wagner et al. discussed the findings in the NLTS 2 showing students with intellectual disabilities had a 24.8% employment rate (2005). Goldbach (1991) stated within a report of a five-year follow up of intellectually disabled school completers, that the post-school placement rate for the 1990 completers was 66% compared to 55% for the 1991 cohort. According to Wagner et al. (2005), 41.5% of students with intellectual disabilities had worked for pay since leaving high school and 25.2% currently worked for pay, as compared to 78.5% of students with learning disabilities who had worked for pay since leaving high school and 44.6% who currently worked for pay in 2003. This demonstrates a large discrepancy of employment among graduates with intellectual disabilities versus graduates with learning disabilities. According to Auld, Kewal Ramani and Frohlich’s 2011 report of the findings from the National Center for Education Statistics, the labor force participation of young males and females between ages 16 and 19 declined between 1980 and 2010. The percentage of young males participating in the labor force had declined from 61% to 35% and young females from 53% to 35% from 1980 to 2010.
Students with intellectual disabilities currently have two classroom setting options in grades 6-10. The state recognizes the two settings by the percentage of time spent in the regular classroom. The first setting is that the student is in the academic courses of the general education peers more than 60% of the time. The next setting is when the student is in the academic coursework of the general education peers less than 60% of the time. From grades 6-10, the CTE programs aren’t available and classes are either general education classes or resource room classes. When the students are in 11th grade, they have the option of attending the vocational coursework available through the CTE. This does not give the students much time to determine the type of work that they are suited for and therefore to be trained for that work. The outcome of individuals with intellectual disabilities must be examined to determine if legislation needs to be implemented for change in practice. The National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities (NICCY, 1999) stated that with the support and involvement of the student’s family and transition team, each student should learn more about the wide variety of careers that exist, meet with a school counselor to talk about interests and capabilities, take part in vocational assessment activities, and identify training needs and options.

Prior Ohio Transitional Studies

In a report on the Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study the four years of findings from exit and follow-up interview information provided by students, parents, and professionals demonstrated that 34% of students with disabilities weren’t employed, and 36% stated not being able to find a job that matched their skills (Baer, Daviso, & McMahan Queen, 2009). The data from the prior study focused on the learning
disabilities population (Daviso, 2006). Baer et al. further reported that the following sub-population members were participants in the study: Learning Disabilities, 416; Mental Retardation, 179; Other Health Impaired, 42; Emotional Disability, 28; Hearing Impairments, 15; Multiple Disabilities, 11; Visual Impairment, 9; Autism, 5; Orthopedic Impairment, 5; Traumatic Brain Injury, 5; Speech and Language Impaired, 3; and Deaf Blindness, 1.

The questions that were answered from the report of the prior data collection provided an overview of all students with disabilities in Ohio. The reports are run for each of the 16 state support teams in Ohio and individual school districts upon request. The participants with the prior study were gathered from a stratified random sampling procedure. This was implemented to produce 741 students who were randomly selected from the population of Ohio special education students who graduated in 2004 from the Local Education Agency (LEA) in the five State Support Team offices. The LEAs were recruited to represent a cross-section of rural, suburban, and urban areas in Ohio (Daviso, 2006). The federal government only reports data on all students with disabilities (IDEA, 2004). The prior studies investigated the outcomes of students with learning disabilities and answered questions regarding their outcomes. This study is identifying outcomes of students with intellectual disabilities.

The following questions were investigated for the population of students with learning disabilities: What were the employment and postsecondary education goals and courses of study of individuals with learning disabilities exiting secondary education in Ohio? How well did the students’ courses of study and demographic variables predict students’ employment and postsecondary education goals? What did students perceive as
the most helpful in meeting their transition goals at the time of high school exit? What factors best predicted successful employment and postsecondary education outcomes one year after high school exit? (Daviso, 2006).

In their Annual State Report, Baer et al. (2009) described the study as a survey given to IEP students from information prior to exiting high school and then one year following. The exit surveys identified postsecondary goals and how IEP students rated their high school. The follow-up surveys looked at the actual goals being met one year later. The authors further specify that IDEA requires the states to develop a State Performance Plan (Baer et al., 2009). The State Performance Plan evaluates the performance of 20 indicators with measurable goals and timelines for data collection and needed school outcomes of students’ with disabilities no longer in secondary school (Baer et al., 2009).

The purpose of the OLTS is to report school outcomes of students with disabilities in Ohio exiting secondary school. The OLTS was funded by the Office of Exceptional Children and Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. It was a cooperative effort between the Center for Innovation in Transition and Employment, the OEC and one of Ohio’s former Special Education Regional Resource Centers who developed and refined the survey (Baer et al., 2008).

**Proposed Study of Ohio Students With Intellectual Disabilities**

The OLTS provides an overview of the outcomes of all students with disabilities in the State of Ohio. The population of students with learning disabilities has been given further study looking at specific questions related to their outcomes. The research
questions in this study were designed to investigate the population of students with intellectual disabilities from findings in the OLTS. Currently in the State of Ohio, there are no specific investigations into the disability groups with the exception of learning disabilities. This investigation aimed to identify if the necessary coursework and experiences are being provided for students with intellectual disabilities. For the purposes of this study, the only population from the intellectual disabilities category investigated was the group formerly identified as mentally retarded.

The need to examine this target population was based upon both policy and practice. It is policy to implement legislative change with respect to the exposure to job opportunities in the formative years. The importance of this investigation was to provide unique information from this population of students with intellectual disabilities within the State of Ohio and identify what services are working and what services the state needs to improve upon.

The data were derived from the most recent wave of results from the Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study. This study has provided data on the following disabilities: Autism, Mental Retardation, Multiple Disabilities, Orthopedic, Severe Emotional Disturbance, Specific Learning Disability, Speech/Language, Traumatic Brain Injury, Visual Impairments, Hearing Impairments, Deaf-Blindness and Other Health Impaired.

The Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study is concluding the first six-year cycle of data collection. In 2010, 5,120 exit surveys were collected, and these students will be followed up in Spring 2011. This represents one of the largest post-school outcomes study in the nation (National Post-School Outcomes Center, 2010). Twelve thousand one hundred eighty-eight students in Ohio were surveyed, and the intellectual disabilities
population includes 2,100 students. The data from the 5,120 surveys collected in 2010 have yet to be explored, with the expectation of an additional 2,500 follow-up surveys in the summer of 2011 to be examined.

The students exiting Ohio high schools with intellectual disabilities are sharing their perceptions of their experiences as provided from the Educational Resource Centers pool of interviewers all over the state of Ohio. The information that these students are sharing covers their fields of work (current and anticipated), the course of study and experiences that were unavailable, and the reasons for unemployment.

The projected graduation of this group of students with this disability type was identified, as well as the gender and ethnicity examined. The career/technical education program was addressed, along with the transition services received. The ratings were reviewed, identifying the helpfulness of services in high school in preparation for life after graduation. The high school courses or activities that they were not able to take that would have better prepared them for life after graduation along with the rating of the school preparation to get a job or go on to further study were identified.

This study demonstrated the ratings of services and identified the expected and actual outcomes as measured by their employment status and level of independence throughout all environments, as indicated from their responses on the OLTS outcomes of individuals with intellectual disabilities. Through the process of statistical analysis, the findings demonstrated the effectiveness of State of Ohio high schools with preparing students for transition into the community.
Transition Coursework and the IEP

The students with intellectual disabilities may be placed in a regular school setting with Individual Education Plans (IEP). Individual Education Plans include a Present Level of Performance (PLOP). It is in this area of the IEP where the student’s academic strengths and weaknesses are discussed. It also includes the placement of the child with regards to the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). Incorporated into the IEP for students who are at least 14 years of age is a transition plan to look at their future plans.

These plans would include academic goals during the preliminary stages and then at 16 years of age, looking more specifically at identifying goals for the transition into the community. These goals can address work-related skills, independent living skills, or postsecondary education goals. Ohio requires students to have a transition plan after the age of 14. This plan is written into the IEP and states the goals for the student’s future. While in the middle school these goals primarily focus upon the successful completion of the coursework in the middle school. At the age of 16 the transition goals need to address community integration, employment, and postsecondary education plans.

All transition plans address what the student needs to do for successful transition into the community. The State of Ohio (2010) Procedural Safeguards: *Whose IDEA Is This*, defines transition services as:

A coordinated set of activities for a child at age 16 or younger that is focused on improving the academic achievement of the child with a disability. Transition services support the child in moving from school to adult life, including higher education; job training; employment; continuing and adult education; adult services; and independent living or community participation. Transition services are based on the individual child’s needs, taking into account the child’s strengths, preferences, and interests. Transition services can include instruction; related services; community experiences; and the development of employment and other adult living objectives, and if appropriate, developing daily living skills and
providing a functional vocational evaluation. For a child age 14 or younger, if it is determined appropriate by the IEP team, transition services can focus on the student’s courses of study. (p. 61)

The importance of employment for adolescents with disabilities is demonstrated by federal legislation to provide pre-employment education. This legislation includes the School-to-Work Opportunities Act (Public Law [P. L.] 103-239), Goals 2000: Educate America Act (P.L. 103-227), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (P.L. 105-17), and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) Amendments of 2004, P.L. 108-446 (Section 602). IDEIA focuses on the importance of the student’s school program (including career-technical education) being coordinated to reinforce the mastery of the identified Individual Education Program (IEP) goals. The IEP goals should move the student towards his/her postsecondary vision.

**Transition and Students With Intellectual Disabilities**

This study examined data under the disability type of students with mental retardation. This same category is now labeled Intellectual Disabilities by The American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD). They define intellectual disability as a disability characterized by significant limitations both in intellectual functioning (reasoning, learning, problem solving) and in adaptive behavior, which covers a range of everyday social and practical skills. This disability originates before the age of 18 (American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 2010).

The AAIDD further states that developmental disability is an umbrella term that includes intellectual disability but also includes physical disabilities. Some
developmental disabilities can be strictly physical, such as blindness from birth. Some individuals have both physical and intellectual disabilities stemming from genetic or other physical causes (e.g., Down Syndrome, Fetal Alcohol Syndrome). Sometimes intellectual disabilities can stem from nonphysical causes, such as the level of child stimulation and adult responsiveness (2010).

While investigating successful transition programs, Phillips et al. (2008) stated that with exposure to employment and customized transition programs, successful transition is more possible. They further recognized that customized transition programs involving the special education staff, occupational therapists, and vocational rehabilitation therapists collaborate to provide services to students who graduate with meaningful jobs (Phillips et al., 2008).

Neubert and Alvarez Redd (2008) recognized the perceptions of students with intellectual disabilities and their stakeholders from a community college setting. The following 10 recommended transition practices emerged and they are as follows: community-based instruction, employment experience, campus inclusion, self-determination, functional academics, social skills, independent living skills, career education and assessment, parental involvement, and collaboration (Neubert & Alvarez Redd, 2008). These practices would insure sufficient exposure to job choices to make an informed decision as to what is suitable work when leaving high school.

While recognizing the area of intellectual disabilities and the scant information aimed towards identifying their unique needs and success, the comparison of the perceptions of the transition process by Ohio students with intellectual disabilities investigation gave a voice of these students exiting Ohio’s high schools. The input of
Ohio students with intellectual disabilities displayed what is working and the evidence-based practices that have been implemented to improve their outcomes after high school and beyond. This population has needs for individualized coursework, collaboration, and implementation of more supports to provide them with the appropriate provisions for success.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to identify critical issues and determine the efficacy of the transition programs as perceived by individuals with intellectual disabilities in the state of Ohio. This analysis also demonstrated a rank order of services received by the students, thus displaying services which are most essential and nonessential to their success after graduation. If individuals with intellectual disabilities can participate in productive, functional, and meaningful lives, they will have more autonomy and independence. With this increased independence, individuals can better participate in mainstream life activities within their community (Neubert & Alvarez Redd, 2008; Phillips et al., 2008).

With these findings, the answers to whether Target Indicator 14 of the State Performance Plan (SPP) measuring the school outcomes of students with disabilities no longer in secondary school has been achieved for students with intellectual disabilities. This investigation provided verification that compliance with IDEA 2004 looking at the successful outcomes of students with disabilities. This study is significant in the field by providing data identifying where transition stands in the state of Ohio with students identified as having intellectual disabilities. It showed what experiences and courses
students desired, what they felt was most valuable, what field of work they are employed in and why they are unemployed.

**Research Questions**

1. What critical courses of study or experiences do students with intellectual disabilities identify as unavailable?

2. What experiences did they rate as the most valuable during the transition process?

3. What fields of work did they anticipate working in, compared to what they are currently working in?

4. What are the participants’ reported reasons for unemployment?

The information for research question one was obtained from demographic data found in the Education Management Information System (EMIS) Record Review through the OLTS In-School Transition Survey. This system of data collection for the State of Ohio is a state operated data management system that gives identification of disability types, services, least restrictive environment placement, and school code.

To investigate research question two the OLTS In-School Transition Survey Interview was used. The findings of research question three were found through answering the OLTS In-School Transition Survey and the Post-School Data Collection Survey. To find the information for research question four the Post-School Data Collection Survey was used.
Statement of the Problem

Students with intellectual disabilities exit Ohio’s high schools and have not been given enough job experiences and life skills experience to make appropriate job choices and function in the community (Hogansen, Powers, Geenen, Gil-Kashiwabara, & Powers, 2008). These individuals have not been able to give input to identify how things did or did not work and what Ohio schools can improve upon. The data collected from the students with intellectual disabilities in Ohio have not been investigated to determine if they are being served appropriately. By asking key questions these individuals voiced their opinion on services for life skills and employability training.

If the OLTS information in the data is disaggregated, it will clarify the quality of transition preparation in the state of Ohio for individuals with mental retardation. The overview of data from the initial wave of the OLTS did not provide clear, specific answers relative to this population. If the outcomes for these specific individuals with their unique needs are not recognized, the state of Ohio cannot remediate programmatic and policy change. If students are given appropriate transition services and transition plans, they are prepared for life after high school. If they don’t do well after high school they have not been provided with adequate services.

This study recognized the input of Ohio students with intellectual disabilities to determine the effectiveness of transition planning while looking at the individual holistically within all of his/her environments. With this information, the researcher then knew the areas to be addressed. This facilitated and/or accommodated needed programmatic changes as well as address the compliance with regards to Ohio Indicator 14, and IDEA mandates. Whenever the individual with intellectual disabilities is able to
transition into community, seek and maintain meaningful employment, and have autonomy over the course of his/her life, the appropriate transition plans have been carried out (Neubert & Alvarez Redd, 2008; Phillips et al., 2008).

The students with intellectual disabilities are able to have more successful lives after graduation from appropriate transition training and opportunities (Neubert & Alvarez Redd, 2008; Phillips et al., 2008). Through the proper assessment, training, and experiences students are prepared to become employed and live more productive lives which is necessary for transition into life after graduation from high school (Neubert & Alvarez Redd, 2008). Properly administered transition programs offer the opportunity to provide meaningful jobs for students who graduate with intellectual disabilities (Phillips et al., 2008). These cannot be achieved without accurate information on what specific needs are for the target disability group. Most importantly, documenting their perceptions and needs provided a forum for autonomy and empowered the studied group.

Assumptions

Several assumptions were made in the process of this study. The first assumption was that all respondents are honest and that all information gathered reflect their perceptions of challenges encountered and support given during the transition process. There would also be differences among the respective participants of the study. Some participants who are reporting might not have the same perceptions of responses. With the following limitations noted, the researcher states that the students who are satisfied with their transition services will most likely have more successful transitions in the community.
**Delimitations of the Study**

There are several delimitations in this study. The employment of individuals with intellectual disabilities is dismal due to the economy. It should also be recognized that the participants would be self-reporting, and that some individuals might have biases based upon their experience while working. This information could be skewed based upon preference towards a work place or may be related to job conditions or possible issues with employers.

**Operational Definitions**

*Annual Goals* - Statement on your child’s IEP that describe what he or she can be expected to accomplish in one year

*Assessment* - Methods or tools used for measuring: current academic performance educational needs, eligibility for services, progress toward achieving goals, and category of disability.

*Assistive Technology Device* - Any piece of equipment or product that is used to increase, maintain, or improve the capabilities of your child with a disability. The term does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted, or the replacement of such service.

*Assistive Technology Service* - Any service that directly assists your child with a disability in the selection, acquisition, or use of an assistive technology device including: evaluation of your child’s needs, providing assistive technology devices for children with disabilities, coordinating and using other therapies or services with assistive technology devices, training or technical assistance for a child with a disability; or, if appropriate, for
a child with a disability, or, if appropriate, that child’s family, and training or technical assistance for professionals who are involved in the major life functions of the child.

*Autism* - A developmental disability significantly affecting verbal and nonverbal communications and social interaction, generally evident before age 3 that adversely affects a child’s educational performance. Other characteristics often associated with autism are engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements, resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines and unusual responses to sensory experiences. The term does not apply if a child’s educational performance is adversely affected primarily because the child has a serious emotional disturbance. A child who manifests the characteristics of autism after age 3 could be identified as having autism if the requirements of the first two sentences of this definition are satisfied.

*Child with a Disability* - Either: a child who has a disability which meets the definition of a disability term included in the section “Definitions of a Disability Terms;” or at the school district’s choice; a child with a developmental delay who needs special education and related services.

*Cognitive Disability* - Significantly below-average general intellectual capability that exists along with deficits in adaptive behavior (in other words, lack of ability to adapt). It is demonstrated during the child’s developmental period and negatively affects a child’s educational performance.

*Evaluation* - Procedures used to determine whether your child has a disability and the special education and related services that your child needs.

*Evaluation Team* - A child’s IEP team and other qualified professionals considered necessary.
Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) - Special education and related services provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and at no cost to parents. These services must meet the standards of the Ohio Department of Education, must include an appropriate preschool, elementary school, or secondary school education in the state, and must be based on your child’s IEP.

Functional Vocational Evaluation - A process used to identify the student’s work characteristics and training and support needs in relation to actual job requirements. Functional assessment information is gathered so that the best job match can be determined for a student.

General Curriculum - The same curriculum that is taught to children who do not have disabilities.


Individualized Education Program (IEP) - A written statement for your child that is developed reviewed and revised in accordance with federal and state regulations.

Individual Education Program (IEP) Team - A group of individuals responsible for developing, reviewing, or revising an IEP for child with a disability.

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) - As much as possible, children with disabilities (including children in public or nonpublic schools or other care facilities) are educated with children who do not have disabilities. A child with a disability is removed from the regular environment only when the child’s disability is severe enough that the child cannot be educated in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services.
Modification - Any change that is made in your child’s school, work, or environment to meet his or her individual educational needs.

Objective - A smaller, more manageable learning task that your child must master as a step toward achieving an annual goal. Objectives break the skills described in the annual goal into separate components that, when mastered, allow your child to meet the goal.

Placement - Includes the services provided to a child with a disability, the location of the services and the providers of those services.

Present Levels of Performance - Statements developed from information about a child. This information includes the child’s progress on the current IEP, the evaluation team report, input from you and your child, interventions, assessments, observations, and special factors. This information provides a “picture” of a child including his or her strengths and needs.

Procedural Safeguards - Procedures established in federal and state law and regulations that protect the rights of children with disabilities and their parents in regard to a child receiving a free appropriate public education.

Special Education - Specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability, including instruction conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and institutions and in other settings; and instruction in physical education, and includes the terms specified in the federal regulation at 34 C.F.R. 300.39.

Supplementary Aids and Services - These are aids, services, and other supports that are provided in regular education classes, other education-related settings and in
extracurricular and nonacademic settings. These are intended to enable children with disabilities to be educated as much as possible with children who do not have disabilities.

*Transition Services* - A coordinated set of activities for a child at age 16 or younger that is focused on improving the academic achievement of the child with a disability. Transition services support the child in moving from school to adult life, including higher education; job training; employment; continuing and adult education; adult services; and independent living or community participation. Transition services are based on the individual child’s needs, taking into account the child’s strengths, preferences and interests. Transition services can include instruction; related services; community experiences; and the development of employment and other adult living objectives, and if appropriate, developing daily living skills and providing a functional vocational evaluation. For a child age 14 or younger, if it is determined appropriate by the IEP team, transition services can focus on the student’s courses of study.

**Summary**

IDEA (2004) has impacted the educational process for students with disabilities, and the outcomes of these students are the best indicators to demonstrate how effectively they have moved from high school to life in the community (Yell et al., 2006). The federal government is addressing the efficacy of transition programming in the United States by seeing that all students with disabilities are given sufficient preparation for life after graduation. The individual states have been required to look at Target Indicator 14 to identify outcomes for students with disabilities. This study sought the answers
identifying the information that collectively paints a picture of how an individual with intellectual disabilities in the state of Ohio perceives their transition after high school.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Legislation

In the last two decades transition planning has been studied to identify promising practices. Successful transition into adulthood, the world of work, and into the community provides greater assurance that individuals will lead quality lives. This area of study is one that deserves recognition for implementing research-based practice.

Currently the student’s interests and abilities are written in page 2 of the IEP. Within the IEP students are given a transition plan beginning at age 14 in Ohio. The transition plan should be tailored to the student, their interests, and abilities. To better understand the progress of the laws related to transition planning, we need to examine the history of special education laws leading to this point. With that history one is able to see the changes that have gone from just providing equal access to an education to a personal approach to the individual and their education.

The early 1900s brought about recognition for the training of veterans with disabilities. This began with Public Law (P.L.) 64-347 by providing vocational rehabilitation for veterans with disabilities. In the year following P.L. 65-178 provided more funding supporting veterans with disabilities. P.L. 66-236 provided for vocational
training of civilians with disabilities. With P.L. 77-113 civilians with physical disabilities and mental retardation were provided vocational training (Stodden, 1998).

The primary goal of the 1910 White House Conference on Children was to define and establish remedial programs for children with disabilities or special needs (Yell, 2006). This conference affected the way children with disabilities were educated. Instead of being institutionalized, they were placed into segregated public school classrooms, thus moving from inclusion to segregation among other students with special needs (Yell, 2006). Segregation into classrooms with only disabled children was thought to be beneficial to the youths.

From the 1910 White House Conference to the 1930s, there was a shift from an increase in special education programs and teaching to a decrease after many students in the special education programs dropped out or were excluded from school or were considered unteachable (Yell, 2006). As late as 1958 and 1969, legislation that excluded students who school officials judged would not benefit from public education or who might be disruptive to other students, was being upheld by the courts, despite compulsory attendance laws that were meant to be inclusive (Yell, 2006).

With the implementation of P.L. 83-565 in 1954 funding became available for the training and research of professionals and expanding vocational education and rehabilitation. In 1963 P.L. 88-210 expanded the services for people with disabilities. In the same year P.L. 99-164 provided the funding for creating programs for persons with mental retardation in the community. The remaining years of the 1960s built upon the foundations of the training programs but also gave designation to provide support for state programs. The P.L. 89-750 created a federal Bureau of Education of the
handicapped and gave support of the state programs. While P.L. 90-576 set aside funding for special populations which included students with disabilities and students with academic and economic challenges, P.L. 90-99 and 90-391 provided increased funding for training and research (Stodden, 1998).

The Education of the Handicapped Act was enacted in 1975 and became the basic framework of legislation that was to follow (Yell, 2006). In the years to come, advocacy for individuals with disabilities gained momentum and legislation which was enacted to benefit them was due largely to the perseverance and dedication of the individuals with disabilities and their parents. The impetus of this movement was through the passage of P.L. 93-112 named the Rehabilitation Act. This act mandated that people with disabilities be given equal access to all programs receiving federal funding. It should be noted that the act was written in 1973 but wasn’t really imposed until after the late 1970s following a sit-in at the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Flexer, Simmons, Luft, & Baer, 2005). P.L. 93-380 of 1974 required each state receiving federal special education funding establish a goal of providing full educational opportunities for all children with disabilities (Yell, 2006).

With the 1970s came legislation in Public Law 94-142, titled the Education for All Handicapped Children’s Act, to recognize the importance of education for personal and career development (Flexer et al., 2005). Public Law 94-142 of 1975 mandated Multifactored Evaluations (MFE), Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), and the Individualized Education Program (IEP). With P.L. 94-482 students with special needs had access to regular vocational education. This
law also provided funding for support services and vocational assessment for students
with special needs (Stodden, 1998)

Flexer et al. (2005) recognized that legislation during the 1980s funded transition
practices and models. The focus of staff training and implementation of programs were
the primary goals at this time. With the passage of the Individuals with Disabilities Act
(IDEA) of 1990 allowing the incorporation of life training into the IEP the School-to-
Work Opportunities Act (P.L. 103-239), Goals 2000: Educate America Act (P.L. 103-
227), and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (P.L. 105-17), you see changes
addressing the focus on the training and employability of the disabled.

IDEA focused on the importance of the student’s school program (including
career-technical education) being coordinated to reinforce the mastery of the identified
Individual Education Program (IEP) goals. The IEP goals should move the student
towards his/her postsecondary vision. IDEA 1990 required that transition planning be
included in the IEPs of students with disabilities who were 16 years of age or older (Yell,
2006). Transition services refer to a

Coordinated set of activities for a student, designed within an outcome-oriented
process, that promotes movement from school to post-school activities, including
postsecondary education, vocational training, [and] integrated employment
(including supported employment, continuing and adult education, adult services,
independent living, or community participation). (IDEA Regulations, 34 C. F. R.
§ 300.18 et seq.; Yell, 2006, p. 297)

IDEA 1997 went further by requiring that the IEP include

At age 14 or earlier, a statement of transition service needs that focus on the
student’s courses of study (such as participation in advanced placement courses or
vocational education programs). The IEP must also include, beginning at age 16
or younger, a statement of needed transition services and interagency
responsibilities or any needed linkages. (Johnson, Stodden, Emanuel, Luecking, &
Mack, 2002, p. 520)
Furthermore, IDEA 1997 regulations, as Johnson et al. (2002) explained, are explicit and require that all special education students age 14 and older are to be invited to their IEP meeting when transition is being discussed. The IDEA 1990 and 1997 amendments have also required that the parents be notified and encouraged to participate in IEP meetings where transition is being discussed (Johnson et al., 2002).

The implementation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was a step to increase accountability through testing and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the education system as a whole and with NCLB a large increase in federal involvement was seen. Yell (2006) stated that NCLB dramatically increased federal mandates and requirements on states, school districts, and public schools. NCLB also increased federal funding to states by almost 25% from the previous year (Yell, 2006).

Wakeman, Browder, Meier, and McColl (2007) discussed the implications of NCLB on students with developmental disabilities. They suggested that NCLB reinforced the inclusion of students with disabilities in standards-based reform as a subgroup of scores that counted towards the adequate yearly progress (AYP) of state accountability systems for grades 3-8 (Wakeman et al., 2007). Prior to this requirement, students with disabilities were not included in the required testing or their scores. The authors stated that many students with developmental disabilities participate in large scale assessments and recognize that only 1% of the students with significant cognitive disabilities may participate in alternate assessments.

Wakeman et al. further stipulated that the 1% of those students are judged against alternate achievement standards in computing AYP (2007). They also shared that in order for these students to be fairly assessed on these standards they need the opportunity to
learn this content (Wakeman et al., 2007). Whether this standards-based reform is appropriate for students with significant cognitive disabilities is still under debate. Parents and stakeholders of students with disabilities support higher standards but are unsure of how that should be achieved (Wakeman et al., 2007).

The appropriation of time spent on teaching to academic standards versus functional skills and its impact remain to be seen. Wakeman et al. (2007) stated the unanswered question is the long-term impact of relegating some time previously allocated to functional skills to academic learning. They further shared that future research is needed to determine the extent to which this population is learning academic skills and how this impacts transition into adult living (Wakeman et al., 2007).

When addressing the position of educators when dealing with the conflicting mandates, Lynch and Adams (2008) shared that it is difficult to maintain a balance. The state teachers and IEP teams serving students with significant disabilities are confronted with the challenge of designing programs that assure access to the general curriculum, while at the same time providing instruction that is responsive to highly individualized and varied needs (Lynch & Adams, 2008).

Yell, Shriner, and Katsiyannis (2006) examined IDEIA and its implications for educators, administrators, and teacher trainers. When addressing the issue of compliancy-based approach to teaching, there is no room for flexibility. Yell et al. (2006) stated that inflexibility means that educators and local districts are unable to adjust instruction or policy to benefit the individual needs of each student because the regulations require them to follow a distinct set of rules that apply to special education across the board. They further suggested that emphasis on individual needs rather than on a compliance-
based model will produce far greater achievement results that the one-size fits-all
approach (Yell et al., 2006).

NCLB reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which
must be reauthorized every five or six years. ESEA appropriated federal money to states
to improve educational opportunities for disadvantaged children (Yell, 2006). ESEA Title
I developed formulas to determine which schools would be Title I schools. These schools
would receive federal monies to supplement existing services paid for by local funds
(Yell, 2006). This was a marked step in the increased involvement of the federal
government in the education system.

NCLB built upon the Improving America’s Schools Act of 2004 (IASA), which
continued the trend of federal involvement in the education system (Yell, 2006). Yell
further stated IASA was a reauthorization and revision of the ESEA, and its central
purpose was to implement standards-based education throughout the nation. IASA
created the framework for the federal government to provide aid to schools serving
economically disadvantage students as well as extending support to state and local
standards based reform (Yell, 2006). The foundation laid by IASA allowed the
groundwork for NCLB and the requirement that all public schools bring every public
student up to state standards in reading and math within a certain period of time, thus
closing the achievement gap based on race, ethnicity, and language (Yell, 2006).

The primary goals of NCLB are:

1. All students will achieve high academic standards by attaining proficiency or
   better in reading and mathematics by the 2013-2014 school year.

2. Highly qualified teachers will teach all students by the 2005-2006 school year.
3. All students will be educated in schools and classrooms that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

4. All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English.

5. All students will graduate from high school (Yell, 2006).

These goals include special education students.

Rebel and Wolf (2008) offered that the NCLB signed into law in 2002 created a situation like running a great race. The likelihood of winning the race through having all students being proficient by 2014 is not realistic. They further contended that Congress has largely ignored the reality of the inequities related to poverty and race and the enormous impact they have on children, families, and schools. These inequities produce disadvantages and hardships that profoundly influence children’s opportunities and ability to learn. There are a number of “pathways” through which these inequities exact their toll on children’s academic achievement (pp. 203-225).

In 2004 IDEA 2004 was signed into law. The primary goal of IDEA 2004 was to bring IDEA and NCLB into alignment (Yell, 2006). Yell further explained that IDEA 2004 includes measures to increase academic results for students with disabilities such as requiring the use of scientifically-based practices. The law also defines highly qualified teachers in line with the definition in NCLB.

Thompson, Lazarus, Clapper, and Thurlow (2006) discussed competencies for teachers in compliance with NCLB and IDEIA. The authors discussed that with the need to meet AYP states, districts and schools are charged with finding ways to assist students with disabilities in the achievement of proficiency on grade-level academic content standards (Thompson et al., 2006). These stringent requirements put a new responsibility
on state departments of education and institutions of higher education to guarantee that all teachers (special educators included) are knowledgeable of academic content standards, achievement standards and grade level standards.

According to Brady and Rosenberg (2002), if people with employment challenges are to receive the benefits of supported employment, attention needs to be paid to the continued development and delivery of supports. Objective systems of evaluation are needed that are sensitive to the unique arrangement of the various supported employment models. The Jobs Observation and Behavior Scale (JOBS) is one such instrument.

JOBS has the potential to help educators, employment professionals, and employers to base their decisions on objective data involving the quality of a worker’s performance, given the nature of support provided on the job. JOBS subscales and item summaries include work required daily living which consists of attendance, punctuality, personal hygiene and grooming, travel, verbal communication, nonverbal communication, money, reading, math, self identification, work schedule, personal schedule, and work facilities (Brady & Rosenberg, 2002).

The next subscale is work-required behavior which consists of stress tolerance, interpersonal work interactions, interpersonal social interactions, changes in routines, honesty, reaction to criticism, work initiative, and work endurance. The last subscale is work-required job duties which consist of quality of work, quantity of work, speed of learning new tasks, performance on previously learned tasks, multiple task performance, organization of work tasks, safety procedures, cleanliness of work environment, and employee motivation (Brady & Rosenberg, 2002).
This assessment can enable employment training to be more individualized, recognize the person’s strengths and weaknesses, while tailoring employment opportunities to the individual with intellectual disabilities unique needs and support necessary. The appropriate transition of students with ID requires preparation for employment in order to increase the opportunities for employability. Thorough training and assessment practices increase placement. The Jobs Observation and Behavior Scale can perform an evaluation based upon objective criteria of employment preparedness (Brady & Rosenberg, 2002).

**Cognitive/Intellectual Disabilities**

Causton-Theohariz, Ashby, and DeClouette (2009) investigated two programs in Central New York that provide support to students identified with significant disabilities (i.e., traumatic brain injury, cognitive disabilities, intellectual disabilities, and autism) to enable students to attend college classes during or after high school in the traditional setting. The authors interviewed stakeholders looking at the obstacles and benefits of the process. Their findings from qualitative data gathered from in-depth interviewing provided the following information: Program benefits were the inclusion process, natural interaction, benefits to college classmates, planning for instruction, walking the talk, obstacles to implementation, institutional and logistical obstacles, pretend services, course selection and auditing, and paraprofessional. Other logistical obstacles were attitudinal obstacles: faculty resistance, arranged marriages, and regulating friendships. The authors found questions should be raised regarding roles of the university regarding
meritocracy and gate keeping. They further stated that individuals with these varied levels of intelligence would require differing modalities of instruction.

Neubert and Alvarez Redd (2008) discussed the findings of a case study examining students with intellectual disabilities receiving services in their last years of high school on a community college campus. The findings demonstrated how one public school program implemented transition practices on a community college campus setting and the manner in which the students with intellectual disabilities and their families perceived the program’s practices.

The method involved the use of data collection from an eastern school district with 100,000 students with 12% receiving specialized services. The program called the Transition Program (TrP) was housed at a community college and data were collected from key informants, students and parents implementing multiple methods to access information (focus groups, interviews, document summary, observations). The data collection was implemented to clarify the process with practices and policies of the TrP.

During a six-month period 16 students were interviewed, observed, or participated in focus groups to clarify the perceptions of the TrP, along with their anticipated goals. The content analysis determined themes through tracking reoccurrences of certain phenomena. When addressing the trustworthiness of the data, evidence was gathered to confirm or negate test themes from the findings. The process of the triangulation of data through sources and methods confirmed the consistency of findings.

Neubert and Alvarez Redd (2008) shared those TrP themes which surfaced through data analysis along with the perceptions of students with ID and their stakeholders. Neubert and Alvarez Redd (2008) shared the following themes identified
and addressed developers and normalization, resources, rehabilitation program transition coordinator, operation, evening roles, and sustainability.

The following 10 recommended transition practices emerged: community-based instruction, employment experiences, campus inclusion, self-determination, functional academics, social skills, independent living skills, career education and assessment, parental involvement, and collaboration. The TrP staff thoroughly managed many responsibilities and roles with little administrative supervision from the school system and college, while the input from the family and students was favorable regarding their experiences (Neubert & Alvarez Redd, 2008).

Phillips et al. (2009) discussed a study involving the use of customization to aid in transition. The authors observed six students from a rural school setting over a 10-year period who received services combining special education and vocational rehabilitation. Through compiling a discovery profile for the students they implemented individualized job placements.

The authors suggested that work experiences, job development, and customized employment are a good start to prevent difficulties. Phillips et al. (2009) demonstrated customized transition programs through involvement of special education staff, occupational therapists, and vocational rehabilitation therapist’s collaboration to provide services to students who graduate with meaningful jobs.

The program was funded by both special education and vocational rehabilitation through providing staff to students beginning in the middle school. The students are involved in academics and vocational programming while they participate within work experiences around community and in school. The occupational therapist uses various
prompts to redirect and physically prompt to encourage on-task work behavior. Each worksite experience is around two hours a week and lasts until the student has completed learning new tasks with the job.

Phillips et al. (2009) stated the process of customized transition matches skills and preferences of student's with job tasks. They further shared the discovery process involves using a collaborative effect from teachers, professors, parents, and counselors observing with great detail the student throughout all environments. The authors found if a collaborative system of supports is in place before graduation that the rate of success is improved. Phillips et al. further went on to suggest that with the No Child Left Behind push for academics, functional skills training, career education, and community-based instruction have been eliminated.

Certo et al. (2008) stated that with the amendments to IDEIA in 2004 acknowledged the importance of producing real postsecondary education, employment, and independent living outcomes. The authors recognized that three public systems are responsible for transition for individuals with severe intellectual disabilities. They include the developmental disabilities system, the rehabilitation system, and the public school system.

Certo et al. (2008) recognized that there is a need for strengthening of IDEIA to provide follow-up supports for enabling school systems to contract with post-school services to enable a seamless transition. They further postulated that changes need to take place with the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act to accommodate services for adults. Certo et al. stated that funding needs to be provided for long-term support possibly through the Rehabilitation Act.
The authors suggested that this population suffers from being marginalized and securing and maintaining employment isn’t possible without more supports. Certo et al. (2008) contended an alternative delivery system for transition would provide services from all agencies within the high school before graduation to provide beneficial collaboration and positive work outcomes.

**Longitudinal Transition Studies**

The United States Department of Education sponsored a study to review the outcomes of students with The National Longitudinal Transition Study. The findings from the second wave of the study as reported by Wagner et al. (2005) indicated changes from the wave 1 and wave 2 results. In comparisons of the data of the early post-school experiences of youth with disabilities who had been out of secondary school up to two years, the following areas demonstrate change: secondary school completion status and timing; living arrangements and social involvement; education after high school including enrollment in high school degree completion programs by dropouts, and participation in two-year or four-year colleges, or postsecondary vocational business or technical schools; employment rates and job characteristics; and overall engagement in the community through participation in school, work, or preparation for work.

The NLTS and NLTS2 samples for the studies were drawn from a stratified random sample from the universe of Local Education Agencies (LEA) (Wagner et al., 2005). The stratification was to increase the precision of estimates, the low frequency types of LEAs had been adequately represented in the sample. Wagner et al. (2005) stated
the process improved the comparisons of other research findings and made students responsive to concerns voiced in policy debate.

Wagner et al. (2005) confirmed that the target student sample was about 14,000 for the NLTS, and for the NLTS2 the population was 12,000 students. The authors documented the extent and direction of change for out-of-school youth with disabilities as a whole and for youth in the nine disability categories that were in use in both 1987 and 2001. Their findings further demonstrated changes described for youth with disabilities who differed in their school-exit status, age, gender, household income, and race/ethnicity when significant.

The information that this report provided demonstrates areas of growth and areas of deficits for further research-based practices within transition. The number of students with mental retardation in Cohort 1 was 139,827 and 149,400 for Cohort 2, respectively. Wagner et al. (2005) reported the difference between groups demonstrates only differences that are statistically significant with at least 95% confidence (denoted as $p < .05$). The tests involved the development of standard error using the effect sample size.

While the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 identified statistics within our nation, The Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study (OLTS) looks at outcomes of students within the State of Ohio. Baer et al. (2008) stated in an annual report of the Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study (OLTS) that IDEIA requires the states to develop a State Performance Plan. The State Performance Plan evaluates the performance of 20 indicators with measurable goals and timelines for data collection and needed improvements specifically concentrating on Target Indicator 14. This indicator focuses
on measuring the school outcomes of students with disabilities who are no longer in secondary school.

The purpose of the OLTS was to report school outcomes of students with disabilities in Ohio exiting secondary school. The OLTS was funded by the Office of Exceptional Children and Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. It was a cooperative effort between the Center for Innovation in Transition and Employment, the OEC, and one of Ohio’s former Special Education Regional Resource Centers who developed and refined the survey (Baer et al., 2009).

In their *Annual State Report*, Baer et al. (2009) described the study as a survey given to IEP students from information prior to them exiting high school and then 1, 3, and 5 years following. The exit surveys identified postsecondary goals and how they rated their high school. The follow-up surveys looked at the actual goals being met one year later. According to their report, the four years of findings from exit and follow-up interview information provided by students, parents, and professionals demonstrated that 34% of students weren’t employed, 36% stated not being able to find a job that matched their skills, and a barrier to employment was the transportation and benefit worries.

The OLTS sponsored by the Office for Exceptional Children and the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services is to track and identify school and post-school outcomes of students with disabilities. It was to be used for continuous improvement and promoting of secondary education programs. The study had two phases: initial research design and follow-up interviews.

The first phase of the study began by formulating the research design while working with The Office for Exceptional Children. The policy makers and researchers
collaborated to form recommendations for continuous improvement of secondary
education programs and transitions services. With the second phase of the study the focus
was on the actual outcomes of the students.

Carter and Wehby (2003) addressed the job performance of transition age youth
with emotional and behavioral disorders. The immediate employment supervisors and
adolescents give ratings of importance on task-related social behavior. Substantial
discrepancies were found between the adolescents’ and the immediate supervisors’
ratings based on the importance of different work behaviors and their ratings of the
adolescents’ performance of those same behaviors (Carter & Wehby, 2003). The
adolescents’ ratings of job satisfaction were positively correlated with their pay. The
authors further found that poor performance of work behaviors which were judged to be
important can result in negative consequences consisting of job frustration, lack of
promotion, or termination (Carter & Wehby, 2003.)

When performing this study the authors used repeated-measures MANOVA. The
test indicated a significant multivariate effect for the respondent, \( F(1, 46) = 4.87, p =
.032, \eta^2 = 0.10 \). Follow-up paired-samples \( t \) tests displayed that supervisors’ ratings of
importance were significantly higher than the students’ ratings on the task-related social
behaviors domain, \( t(46) = 2.39, p = .021, d = .50 \), and work performance behavior
domain, \( t(46) = 2.74, p = .009, d = .57 \). No significant differences were shown on the
non-task related social behaviors (\( d = .35 \)) and general work behavior domains (\( d = .24 \))
(Carter & Wehby, 2003).

When evaluating the use of technology-based assistance, Davies, Stock, and
Wehmeyer (2002) performed a beta test on the utility of a Windows CE-based
multimedia palmtop handheld pc computer program (Visual Assistant). This program provides support to individuals with mental retardation (MR) to allow more independently complete community-referenced vocational skills. The study participants were volunteers with MR receiving community-based vocational support from a local agency and through a school district’s community-based program for students with mental retardation ages 18-21.

The study compared the outcomes for all participants with MR who engaged in the vocational tasks with and without support using the training and support provided with the Visual Assistant prototype (Davies et al., 2002). Data were collected from the independence measured from the number of prompts for each step and the accuracy measured by the amount of errors on each task. Paired comparisons t-tests findings demonstrated that the average errors per task when participants used the Visual Assistant were 0.75, with a standard deviation of 0.83. The amount of average errors per task when participants did not use the Visual Assistant prototype were 2.25 with a standard deviation of 2.05. The observed mean difference of errors per task was statistically significant \( (p < .006) \).

Davies et al. (2002) also recorded the number of requests for assistance during the testing session. It was found that the participants made a limited number of requests for help. The average prompts per task with the use of the Visual Assistant were 1.05, with a standard deviation of 1.19. The average prompts per task when individuals did not use the Visual Assistant prototype were 2.40 with a standard deviation of 2.56. The observed mean difference for errors per task was statistically significant \( (p, .032) \). The findings
suggest that the use of multimedia training with a palmtop PC can improve independence for adults with MR in performing community-based vocational skills.

When evaluating the factors associated with students dropping out of school with learning disabilities and mental retardation, helpfulness of a class, and a helpful person were among those stated in a study by Dunn, Chambers, and Rabren (2004). The study participants were former students in the Alabama Transition Initiative (ATI), which is the state’s systems change project. The ATI provided funds and assistance to enhance the transition programs for its sites. ATI implements best transition practices which consist of functional curriculum, a community transition team, and a self-advocacy program.

Dunn et al. (2004) affirmed that students were more likely to continue in school if the coursework was preparing them for the future, giving consideration to keeping functional curriculum and job acquisition and retention skills. Students answered the following questions: Was there one class that prepared you to work and live in the community? Was there a class or activity that you were not able to take that would have helped you work and live in the community? Was there one person at your school who was most helpful in preparing you to live and work in the community? Did school prepare you for what you wanted to do after leaving school? Did school prepare you to get a job? Did you have a paying job at the time you left high school? The major findings are related to the relationship between dropout status and the following four factors: disability status, the identification of a helpful class, the identification of a helpful person, and the belief that school was preparing them for the future (Dunn et al., 2004).

Ellerd, Morgan, and Salzburg (2002) performed a comparison study using digital video recordings to examine the effects of presenting motion video stimuli as job choice
response options in single and paired-choice formats. The study involved the presentation of job videos to four adults with disabilities. Participants were able to gather useful information on community jobs from the video. The findings suggest this is a useful tool for presentation of job tasks to make judgment(s) about their acceptability in job placement.

Garey (2003) recognized essential transition issues in a study involving students with deafness. The study investigated perceptions of students with deafness to identify key services and experiences that enabled their successful transition from secondary and postsecondary education into adult life and employment. The study was conducted through online and face-to-face interviews involving 69 students. The analysis of the information from the study indicates that student participation is crucial; teachers must involve families in the transition process; teachers need to be aware of the feelings of parent; transition planning should start in middle school; transition planning must be sensitive to cultural factors; and transition planning must be comprehensive.

Garcia-Iriarte, Balcazar, and Taylor-Ritzler (2007) analyzed the employment-related supports provided by case managers in a transition program for minority youth with disabilities. Their study utilized data from the Bridges program in Chicago. This program, which is part of a nationwide community-based competitive employment program operated by the Marriott Foundation for People with Disabilities, provides case manager support for youth with disabilities.

A data analysis was performed on case notes, using chi-squares, t tests, and hierarchical linear multiple regressions incorporating the provision of support and its relationship with the severity of the participants disability and employment outcomes.
Garcia-Iriarte et al. (2007) found that people with less severe disabilities, the provision of job specific, $F(26,6) = 4.81, p < 0.05$, and off site work supports, $(F(20,12) = 3.32, p, 0.05$, significantly contributed to higher employment retention.

In a qualitative case study by Gerber, Price, Mulligan, and Shessel (2004), a comparison of the employment experiences of American and Canadian adults with learning disabilities found that there are no major differences to highlight in the data. The findings suggest that the issue of self-disclosure is important for the interviewees. They also suggest that the individuals who participated did not know about the laws regarding the advantages of being proactive with regards to disability rights. The authors felt that the good news is that adults with learning disabilities are making their way into the workplace.

Vreeburg Izzo and Kochhar-Bryant (2006) performed two case studies implementing the Summary of Performance (SOP) for effective transition. The authors presented and discussed the important components of the SOP for two students – one with a learning disability with a postsecondary goal of college and the other with a cognitive disability with a postsecondary goal of supported employment. Their reasoning for the need for an effective SOP was that it provides important data such as transition assessment and documentation as well as accommodations, modifications, and assistive technology that would assist in a successful transition beyond high school. The SOP contains five parts which are background information, student’s postsecondary goals, summary of performance, recommendation to assist student in meeting postsecondary goals, and student perspective.
The case study was based on a student named Tykiah, who was planning on going to a four-year college for a business or communication degree. Because she was planning on college the most important part of her SOP was the “Academic Content Area” which described the present levels of essential accommodations and assistive technology utilized in high school. She had extended time on exams, note takers for classes with lecture, the use of an MP3 player for auditory presentation of reading material, the use of a talking calculator for math, assistive technology such as Read and Write Gold or Wynn for written expression needs, and self-determination for coordinating her own accommodations (Vreeburg Izzo & Kochhar-Bryant, 2006).

The case study based on a student named Steve whose SOP postsecondary goal was supported employment provided a way to organize the information Steve’s teacher had already provided to adult service providers. These providers worked toward ensuring smooth transition from school to adult life. The information included Steve’s emergency contact information, “Authorization to Disclose Information” (p. 101-107) form, probate status, physical limitations, health information and psychological profile, social history, copy of current Individual Education Plan and Individualized Plan for Employment Plan, as well as assessment information (Vreeburg Izzo & Kochhar-Bryant, 2006).

With “Recommendations to Assist Steve in Meeting His Postsecondary Goals”, the focus was on employment where he would benefit from a job coaching program. This would help Steve and the employer understand the expectations for work productivity and behavior in the workplace. It would also help his supervisor understand Steve’s limitations and use effective job training techniques. Another important area of this SOP was independent living addressing having assistance with handling his finances, having a
health-care caseworker to help him with health issues and living close to his immediate family for assistance with daily living skills. The last area addressed was community participation where it was suggested to have him join recreation clubs or groups in the neighborhood, church, or workplace or volunteering in community activities along with him having a good network of friends. The authors stated that secondary personnel must involve students more actively in their transition planning and assessment process and in the development of their SOP. They further noted that student, family members, and professionals agree that developing quality SOPs that can be used to facilitate effective transitions from high school to adult life are extremely valuable (Vreeburg Izzo & Kochhar-Bryant, 2006).

Carter et al. (2010) examined the summer employment experiences of transition age youth with severe disabilities. The authors looked specifically at identifying what work-related experience individuals with severe disabilities encounter over summer months. The information obtained from this study helped in the identification of factors that contribute to the gaining and maintaining employment as well as achieving transition goals.

Carter et al. (2010) looked at the summer employment and community experience of 136 youths with severe disabilities. To be included in this study the students had to be receiving special education services under the disability category of cognitive disability, autism, or multiple disabilities to be eligible for alternative assessment and to provide assent as well as having parental consent.

Of the participants in the study more than half were male (52.9%), 11.8% were African-American, 2.9% other races, and 85.3% were European-American. The ages of
the participants ranged from 13.9 to 21.8; (m = 18.2; SD = 1.8). With regards to the socio-economic status, 28.8% were eligible for free lunch. The large percentage of youths (85.3%) had a primary disability category of cognitive disabilities. The next category was autism (10.3%), and finally orthopedic impairments (4.4%). The study involved working with project liaisons at 29 high schools. Of the 140 youths who had permission, 136 youths were the resulting sample size (Carter et al., 2010).

The assessment was performed by the teachers during the spring and during the summer parents and youth provided information. Among the youths who worked different jobs over the summer months the data were analyzed by the employment characteristics such as paid, unpaid, and sheltered. With the participants working at one job at both interview time points, the information about work schedule, job duties, supports information used to find and maintain employment and transportation were compiled and aggregated over time points. The participant’s pay as well as hours worked was averaged across time points when working the same jobs (Carter et al., 2010).

Carter et al. (2010) stated that during the summer months 38.2% of the youth with severe disabilities participated in at least one type of job experience. They also found that in the first model the age of the participants was positively associated with summer employment outcomes. When looking into the participation of other activities and work status at the beginning of the summer, there was a significant difference between the non-working and working participants and their activities. The average number of activity types reported by youth who had participated in some type of work experience was significantly higher than the average number reported by youth who had not participated in some type of work experience. Finally Carter et al. (2010) stated the satisfaction rating
from the parents and youth was reported to be 90% overall for how the youth spent their summer months.

Angell, Stoner, and Fulk (2010) shared the stories of 10 adults with physical disabilities who were interviewed about the school and family experiences that promoted or hindered their practice or development of self-determination skills. These individuals’ experiences provided perspective on the ways to promote and foster self-determination. They further addressed different definitions of self-determination by various authors. Angell et al. (2010) identified the goal of self-determination as an outcome that should be measurable and correlated with success in adulthood. The statistics relating transition outcomes demonstrated challenges in the actual transition outcomes as compared to their non-disabled peers.

In a paper presented by Grünke (2006), a supported employment program was implemented upon 172 students with severe learning difficulties between 14 and 18 years of age in their last year of school. In the project, 60 university students were trained as job coaches and taught skills essential to gaining employment. The students with learning difficulties received training to foster inductive reasoning or training to enhance job-related self-efficacy. The project’s success was demonstrated by a percentage of the young people who were able to start an apprenticeship in the open labor market compared to the usual success rate of vocational integration.

**Transition Assessments**

According to Brady and Rosenberg (2002), if people with employment challenges are to receive the benefits of supported employment, attention needs to be paid to the
continued development and delivery of supports. Objective systems of evaluation are needed that are sensitive to the unique arrangement of the various supported employment models. The Jobs Observation and Behavior scale (JOBS) is one such instrument.

JOBS has the potential to help educators, employment professionals, and employers to base their decisions on objective data involving the quality of a worker’s performance, given the nature of support provided on the job. JOBS subscales and item summaries include work required daily living which consists of attendance, punctuality, personal hygiene and grooming, travel, verbal communication, nonverbal communication, money, reading math, self identification, work schedule, personal schedule, and work facilities.

The next subscale is work-required behavior which consists of stress tolerance, interpersonal work interactions, interpersonal social interactions, changes in routines, honesty, reaction to criticism, work initiative, and work endurance. The last subscale is work-required job duties which consist of quality of work, quantity of work, speed of learning new tasks, performance on previously learned tasks, multiple task performance, organization of work tasks, safety procedures, cleanliness of work environment, and employee motivation.

Wolk (2004) acknowledged that we need to address the individual’s strengths and that we should think outside the box. He stated that there are important questions we should ask and they are: How do we guide our kids through their very challenging formative years so that they emerge as responsible young adults with the skills and attitudes they need to function and thrive in a rapidly changing world? What do we want every child to achieve?
Wolk (2004) related a story of a 16-year-old named Jesse who was bored in school and intent on dropping out. His principal knew that Jesse liked to work so he made him a deal to attend classes in the mornings and work as a janitor for $5 an hour in the afternoons. Jesse worked hard and improved the appearance of the school grounds doing landscaping. This young man’s future is more promising because his principal was flexible and allowed Jesse to work. He did not drop out and learned a sense of self-worth and pride in one’s work. With recognizing the individual strengths and needs of our students with special needs the thinking types approach helps guide educators. Transition planning of individuals with disabilities requires appropriate training. The implementation of assessments can guide training for employment while recognizing the thinking types.

Grandin (2006) postulated three thinking types:

*Visual Thinkers*—good with hands on work and think in pictures.

*Pattern Thinkers*—good at music and math. They think in patterns and relationships between number instead of pictures and they are often good at chess. They think in patterns instead of specific photographic images.

*Word Specialists*—usually poor at visual thinking but will know every sport or weather statistic. Their favorite subjects in school are often history and foreign language. These three types of thinkers have so much to offer the community workplace. If we could identify the thinking style of the student, we could then identify work environments and activities (pp. 231-232).
The Clifton Youth StrengthsExplorer, developed by the Gallup Organization, is a measurement that is being used to help youth build upon their talents. The Clifton Youth StrengthsExplorer goals are:

- Help youths identify their positive characteristics
- Help youths improve their understanding of self
- Help youths develop from their areas of greatest talent
- Improve parents’/instructors’ understanding of their children/students
- Provide an opportunity for an important kind of communication between parents and their children (i.e., discussion of one’s unique nature, the positive characteristics/gifts that one has, and how those can be developed)
- Provide the theme-based language that youths and parents/instructors could use to discover and describe positive characteristics (Gallup Organization, 2006).

The instrument provides measures of talent in presence, confidence, competing, relating, achieving, future thinker, caring, discoverer, organizer, and dependability.

With the talent-based approach educators can help youth achieve their maximum potential. The Gallup Organization (2006) recognizes that addressing deficits and challenges is not sufficient to help youth become healthy, fully functioning individuals. They feel in order to have healthier outcomes that educators must develop a positive psychological focus on the identified talents and build upon them (Gallup Organization, 2006). They have provided a sound measurement to identify and capitalize on the talents of our youths.
Coursework in Preparation for Employment

Grandin (2006) recognized the importance of electives in schools when addressing autism disorders. She stated that it is a concern when music, woodshop, auto mechanics, and electives aren’t offered in schools. With these courses students with uneven skills will do well and become employable in the community. Grandin (2006) related that the way a high school measures its success is through outcomes. For the students who will not go to college a good outcome would be gaining and maintaining employment that will provide a comfortable standard of living.

Scanlon and Mellard (2002) interviewed 270 young adults with and without Learning Disabilities/Emotional Behavior Disorders (LD/EBD) inquiring about their post-dropout experiences following exiting school. Those students who were interviewed said that they were not satisfied with their own preparation for independence. The participants completed an interview via telephone or in person; descriptive studies identified demographics and frequencies were given for responses. Many students lacked self-confidence in work or academic skills, control of their lives, or self-esteem (Scanlon & Mellard, 2002).

Wolk (2004) stated that we should have parallel schools and that they should offer curricula that are personalized by advisors, parents, and student. He stated that the students could participate in apprenticeships and internships with adult mentors in businesses, hospitals, government agencies, and other employers to experience the need for punctuality, teamwork, and attention to detail. Wolk suggested that students be able to do service learning in hospitals and other human service positions to see democratic processes and politics at work. Hogansen, Powers, Geenen, Gil-Kashiwabara, and Powers
(2008) suggested when addressing the sources of support and impediments to a successful transition to adulthood, female students with disabilities stated that employment chances would increase if given more exposure to job training opportunities and paid work experience in their areas of interest.

Ping Xin, Grasso, Dipipi-Hoy, and Jitendra (2005) examined the effects of purchasing skill instruction on individuals with developmental disabilities. They found that purchasing skills were necessary for the transition of students into the real world; however, they felt that these skills should be taught in the elementary grades to increase functional competence in the later years. The trend is towards inclusion in the general academic curriculum for students with developmental disabilities. With that in consideration, the authors further concluded that functional life skills are important and can be built upon basic academic skills.

Johnson et al. (2002) addressed the current challenges facing secondary education and transition services. Based upon the research they have identified key issues influencing implementation of the federal transition requirements of the IDEA Amendments of 1997. Their findings suggested that students should be allowed to have access to general education curriculum but also to develop essential adult-life skills. They further reflected that the students should not only have general education curriculum, but that they should have community-based work experience, vocational education, dropout prevention and reentry programs, and independent living skills programs.

In a commentary by Feretti and Eisenman (2010) they stated federal policies’ purpose is to promote educational equality through the use of state accommodation methods. In this process the states have increased efforts towards positive outcomes for
students with disabilities. This has occurred through focusing their concentration upon the individual outcomes for these students. All efforts should be on removing the achievement gap. The authors argued that local cultures on teaching practices and decision making have the first impact on learning experiences, and in order to improve the outcomes of students with disabilities we need to examine the cultural and social issues and the way policy is interpreted as to local practices.

The authors identified with the technical difficulties of engaging effective practice and the limited funds for individual service needs. They felt progress is being made towards uniformly providing best practices with the monetary support provided while diversity and complexity are inherent into the progress of all learner. Feretti and Eisenman (2010) stated the question still exists if students with individual needs do not meet achievement benchmarks or if individual students do not meet post-school IEP goals, have the schools provided Free Appropriate Public Education. Currently the courts are leaning toward defining FAPE as whereby some meaningful measurable benefit is displayed; however, the targeted outcomes are not guaranteed.

**Collaboration**

Wynn, Stewart, Law, Burke-Gaffney, and Moning (2006) discussed creating connections with a Community Capacity-Building project for parents and youth with disabilities in transition to adulthood. The participants in the project filled out a community inventory to investigate individuals’ awareness of the community assets identified and additional community assets that may not have been previously identified. The results from the inventories revealed that there was a diverse range of community
resources that youth with disabilities and their families were accessing in the Hamilton community.

Rutkowski, Daston, Van Kuiken, and Riehle (2006) demonstrated a demand side model of high school transition in Project SEARCH, which is an employer-based intervention for high school students with significant disabilities whose main goal is competitive employment. The program combines real-life work experience with training in employability and independent living skills. Individualized placement assistance is provided as an integral part of the program.

The hallmark of this demand side model is complete immersion in the workplace. This facilitates a seamless integration of classroom instruction and on-the-job training and support that cannot be achieved with occasional workplace visits or simulated work environments. The program also demonstrates a novel collaborative approach that brings the education system, employers, and rehabilitation services together in unique ways to create a productive and comprehensive transition experience (Rutkowski et al., 2006).

The skills necessary for these students to be accepted are to be willing to access independent transportation options, to exhibit basic communication skills, to demonstrate appropriate social, grooming, and hygiene skills, and to have independent toileting and feeding skills. The students who are accepted into the program are given rotations in different jobs where they will learn and perform in the positions of filing, food service, building maintenance, and grounds keeping (Rutkowski et al., 2006).

Rutkowski et al. (2006) stated this program implements ongoing dynamic student assessment that begins with the application process and continues throughout worksite rotations and job placement. These include checklists for employability skills,
information regarding attendance, discipline, career experiences, first community jobs, and volunteer activities. Written communication skills are assessed as well as interest inventories and vocational checklists that are customized to the specific workplace. The instructor synthesizes all this information to adapt the curriculum and plan worksite experiences to match specific student needs and skills.

The curriculum in the classroom consists of working responsibly, communicating effectively, solving problems and thinking skillfully, planning and managing a career, applying technology, and managing resources. Nutrition, budgeting, and workplace attitude are examples of topics covered. The beginning of the year lessons are focused on general skills needed to function in the workplace; that is, learning the layout and how to travel independently within the facility. Each student will acquire work skills in specific areas such as filing, computer work, stocking, etc. that will lead to employment (Rutkowski et al., 2006).

Garey (2003) recognized essential transition issues in a study involving deaf students. The study investigated perceptions of deaf students to identify key services and experiences that enabled their successful transition from secondary and postsecondary education into adult life and employment. The study was conducted through online and face-to-face interviews involving 69 students. The analysis of the information from the study indicated that student participation is crucial, teachers must involve families in the transition process, teachers need to be aware of the feelings of parents, transition planning should start in middle school, transition planning must be sensitive to cultural factors, and transition planning must be comprehensive.
Rutkowski et al. (2002) stated Project SEARCH staff implements linkages with their students to community resources and routinely assists students in accessing the services they need. All students are linked with a Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor; this association permits partial funding for the job-coaching and job placement services received through the program. Other examples of linkages include the local board of Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities (MRDD), psychological services, travel training, or special services related to a student’s specific disability. Additional linkages to appropriate community services are made as the need arises.

Wynn et al. (2006) discussed creating connections with a Community Capacity-Building project for parents and youth with disabilities in transition to adulthood. The participants in the project filled out a community inventory to investigate individual’s awareness of the community assets identified and additional community assets that may not have been previously identified. The results from the inventories revealed that there was a diverse range of community resources that youth with disabilities and their families were accessing in the Hamilton community.

Benz and Lindstrom (1999) recognized that helping youth with disabilities negotiate from school to work and community life requires innovative, effective, and enduring partnerships among a variety of key stakeholders. The vocational rehabilitation system is identified consistently as a fundamental partner in collaborative transition effort because of its ability to help youth develop vocational skills, obtain employment, and advance the opportunity to live independently.

Systematic efforts must be undertaken to address the barriers that historically prevented school and VR staff from working together effectively on behalf of youth with
disabilities and their families. The youth transition program is a nationally recognized school-to-work transition model that has been operated collaboratively by schools and vocational rehabilitation agencies in communities throughout Oregon for the past nine years. The program’s interagency model of service delivery collaboration developed to address the school to work transition needs of school leavers with disabilities.

Evaluation information the on the employment outcomes achieved by YTP students is very encouraging. Benz and Lindstrom (1999) found that YTP youth experienced better employment outcomes that comparison groups of school leavers with disabilities and transition-age VR clients in Oregon who had not participated in YTP. The findings also demonstrated that these positive employment outcomes hold steady for two years following completion of the program.

Lindstrom, Doren, Metheny, Johnson, and Zane (2007) examined the role of the family in career development and post-school outcomes for a purposefully selected sample of young adults. Their study conducted from 59 in-depth interviews looking at family role in the career development and shaping of the career outcomes of these young women with learning disabilities. The role of family members in the student’s lives plays an important factor in the goals and aspirations of the student. In the case of this study the positive post-school outcomes of students were achieved with the parent’s involvement.

When the parent is actively involved, the student will aspire to have success in their future. The authors suggested that parents need more opportunities for engaging in career exploration, job search and post-school planning activities.

Johnson et al. (2002) identified the challenges in promoting transition while addressing the changes for better outcomes for youths with disabilities. They share that
the effective use of interagency collaboration and cooperation to address transition needs of youth with disabilities has been difficult to achieve due to widely varying factors which include lack of shared information on students across agencies, making it virtually impossible to develop integrated service plans that support individuals in achieving school and post-school results; lack of follow-up data on program recipients that could be used to improve service effectiveness; lack of adequate attention in IEPS to health insurance, transportation, and other aspects of adult living; lack of systematic transition planning with those agencies that would assume responsibility for post-school service needs; ineffectual interagency agreements; difficulties in anticipating needed post-school services; and inefficient and ineffective management practices of for establishing interagency teams.

**Educational Research Methods**

Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) stated that ex-post facto research is used for investigating possible cause and effect relationships by observing on existing conditions or state of affairs and searching back in time for possible causal factors. The authors further speculated that ex post facto research has two kinds of designs, the correlational and the criterion group design. The correlational design is referred to as causal research and criterion groups are referred to as causal comparative research. The ex-post facto research method is useful by identifying what goes with what and under what conditions, looking at the nature of the phenomenon.

While identifying the types of ex-post facto and the purposes of pre-existing data, Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) identified the ex-post facto research method as a design that
depends on the observations on relationships between naturally occurring variation in the presumed variables. The ex-post facto research method is used in educational research with data collected for other purposes.

Franco (2006) used an ex-post facto research design while controlling for alternative hypothesis in analyzing the relationships among school/non-school factors and grade level/content value added scores in Ohio. The investigation used EMIS data and the Ohio Proficiency Test and Ohio Achievement Test scores of grades 3, 5, and 8 math and reading sections. Franco implemented paired $t$ tests and descriptive statistics to determine the difference between means with each subtest between charter schools and traditional schools. The traditional schools outperformed the charter schools in reading and math. Franco demonstrated the use of pre-existing data with controlling for an alternative hypothesis.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

The information provided in this chapter demonstrated the project design, the participants involved in the investigation, the instrument with which to collect the data and the statistical measures that were executed. This is a portion of a large database from the Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study with which to measure the performance of Ohio students regarding compliance with Indicator 14 to look at outcomes of students with disabilities (Dennis & Baer, 2009). It is a reflection of the voices of the Ohio students with intellectual disabilities and will clarify the condition of transition programs in Ohio.

The purpose of this investigation was to examine perceived education experiences of students with intellectual disabilities exiting Ohio’s high schools, to identify the critical preparation that was unavailable to them based upon their report of coursework or experiences that were not available to them, to explore the experiences that were most valuable during the transition process, to compare and identify the anticipated and actual fields of work that these individuals are currently employed in and to identify reasons for unemployment.

Research Questions

1. What critical courses of study or experiences do students with intellectual disabilities identify as unavailable?
2. What experiences did they rate as the most valuable during the transition process?

3. What fields of work did they anticipate working in, compared to what they are currently working in?

4. What are the participants’ reported reasons for unemployment?

The answers to these questions can be further explored using data from the Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study with data reflecting from the in school and post-school survey. These data are valuable because they provide information on students with intellectual disabilities. This category of disability has not been studied with the current data available. This population of students with their unique limitations and gifts, and how they feel about transition services needs to be addressed.

The state of Ohio is being evaluated on Target Indicator 14 and the outcomes of individuals with disabilities. If the federal government wants to look at these students’ outcomes, their preparation for transition needs to be studied. This study helped to identify how well they felt they were prepared and what actual outcomes they had compared to what was expected.

**Research Design**

This study was a descriptive ex-post facto research method; the data examined have been used to investigate students with other disabilities. Gall et al. (2003) identified the ex-post facto research method as a design that depends on the observations on relationships between naturally occurring variation in the presumed variables. The ex-post facto research method is used in educational research with data collected for other
purposes. Franco (2006) used an ex-post facto research design while controlling for alternative hypothesis in analyzing the relationships among school/nonschool factors and grade level/content value added scores in Ohio. The advantages of this type of research are that the data are from a pre-existing source which is one of the strengths; the weakness is that you are working with older data and cannot manipulate it. The investigation used EMIS data and the Ohio Proficiency Test and Ohio Achievement Test scores of grades 3, 5, and 8 math and reading sections. Franco implemented paired $t$ tests and descriptive statistics to determine the difference between means with each subtest between charter schools and traditional schools. The traditional schools outperformed the charter schools in reading and math. Franco demonstrated the use of pre-existing data with controlling for an alternative hypothesis; the investigation in this study used descriptive statistics which do not require a hypothesis.

These data have been generated from the state of Ohio for the Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study investigating the transition outcomes of Ohio students with disabilities. The OLTS data specifically look at outcomes to determine if there is a positive match between expected and actual outcome. Dennis and Baer state that in compliance with IDEIA (2004) the State of Ohio, Office for Exceptional Children collected post-graduation status data of students with disabilities to fulfill the State Superintendent’s Work Plan requirements of maintaining a longitudinal tracking system (2010). This system of collecting data had the ability to create a system of contact with graduates, identify and create interventions necessary for graduates while promoting program improvement, and to demonstrate the level of efficacy of programs not able to be assessed otherwise (Dennis & Baer, 2010).
Descriptive frequencies for examining course of study, gender, field of employment, and reasons for unemployment were analyzed. A chi square was used for analysis of differences between gender and reasons for unemployment.

Table 1
Research Questions-Statistical Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Demographic data questions</th>
<th>Analysis type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demographic information | In-School Transition Survey Record Review (EMIS)  
Question #2 Gender: Male, Female  
Question #3 Ethnicity: Native American, Hispanic, African-American, White, Asian American, ESL, Other:  
Question #7 What type of school? (at graduation) Bubble all that apply. Career Tech School, High School, Other  
Question #10 What transition services did the student receive? (Bubble all that apply) Work Study, VOSE, Option IV/JTC, Special Needs CTE, Student had a transition plan completed with measurable postsecondary goals by age 16, Transition Specialist, Career Assessment, Assistive Technology | Descriptive, Frequency, Percentage, Descriptive, Frequency, Percentage, Descriptive, Frequency, Percentage, |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variable/Survey items</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What critical courses of study or experiences do students with intellectual activities were you not able to take that would have better prepared you for life after graduation? (Bubble all that apply) Proficiency testing IEP/Transition meetings School supervised paid work in the community School supervised volunteer work In-school job Job shadowing Paid work on your own Classes at a community college Career/Technical Education Extracurricular activities Preparing for college entrance exams (SAT, ACT) Help applying to college Visits to college Coursework (specify) Career assessment t Vocational Rehabilitation (BVR, BSVI) services MR/DD services Other school-to-career activities (specify)</td>
<td>Question # 10 OLTS In-School Transition Survey Interview Which high school courses or activities were you not able to take that would have better prepared you for life after graduation? (Bubble all that apply) Proficiency testing IEP/Transition meetings School supervised paid work in the community School supervised volunteer work In-school job Job shadowing Paid work on your own Classes at a community college Career/Technical Education Extracurricular activities Preparing for college entrance exams (SAT, ACT) Help applying to college Visits to college Coursework (specify) Career assessment t Vocational Rehabilitation (BVR, BSVI) services MR/DD services Other school-to-career activities (specify)</td>
<td>Descriptive, Frequency Percentage Percentage disabilities identify as unavailable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What experiences did they rate as the most valuable during the transition process?</td>
<td>Question # 7 OLTS In-School Transition Survey Interview When you were in high school how helpful were the following in preparing you for life after graduation? The choices include: Not Applicable, Not Helpful at all, Somewhat Helpful, Helpful, Very Helpful.</td>
<td>Frequency Percentage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1

Research Questions-Statistical Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variable/Survey items</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Proficiency testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. IEP Transition meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. School supervised paid work in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. School supervised volunteer work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. In-School job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Job shadowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Paid work on your own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Classes at a community college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Career/Technical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Extracurricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Preparing for college entrance exams (SAT, ACT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Help applying to college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Visits to college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Coursework (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Career assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Vocational Rehabilitation (BVR, BSVI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. MR/DD services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Other school-to-career activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What fields of work did they anticipate working in, compared to what they are currently working in?

OLTS In-School Transition Survey Interview Question #2 Which of the following fields do you anticipate working or studying in after graduation? (Bubble ONE)

<p>| a. Hospitality and Tourism                                                        |                                                                                       |                               |
| b. Transportation Systems                                                         |                                                                                       |                               |
| c. Information Technology                                                         |                                                                                       |                               |
| d. Construction Technologies                                                       |                                                                                       |                               |
| e. Manufacturing Technologies                                                      |                                                                                       |                               |
| f. Marketing                                                                      |                                                                                       |                               |
| g. Finance                                                                        |                                                                                       |                               |
| h. Arts and Communication                                                          |                                                                                       |                               |
| i. Agricultural and Environmental Systems                                          |                                                                                       |                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variable/Survey items</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j. Education and Training</td>
<td>k. Engineering and Science Technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Health Science</td>
<td>m. Human Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Government and Public Administration</td>
<td>o. Law and Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Business and Administrative Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-School Data Collection Survey</td>
<td>OLTS Phone Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #2 If you are currently working, what kind of job do you have? (Bubble ONE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Information Technology</td>
<td>b. Manufacturing Technologies</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Marketing</td>
<td>d. Finance</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Arts and Communication</td>
<td>f. Agricultural and Environmental Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Human Services</td>
<td>h. Transportation Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Construction Technologies</td>
<td>j. Hospitality and Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Education and Training</td>
<td>l. Engineering and Science Technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Health Science</td>
<td>n. Government and Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Law and Public Safety</td>
<td>p. Business and Administrative Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

Research Questions-Statistical Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variable/Survey items</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. What are the participants’ reported reasons for unemployment?</td>
<td>Post-School Data Collection</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLTS Phone Interview</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question #4 If you are not currently working, what are the reasons for not working? (Bubble all that apply)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Enrolled in post-secondary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Cannot find job that fits my interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Cannot find any job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Need assistance finding a job, but none is available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Lack of required skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Transportation problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Don’t want to lose my benefits (e.g. SSI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Don’t want to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of the Variables Interested and the Measurements**

The information for research question one, What critical courses of study or experiences do students with intellectual disabilities identify as unavailable, was obtained from demographic data found in the EMIS Record Review question number 2 Gender, question number 3 Ethnicity, question number 7 What type of school, and question number 10 What transition services did the student receive. Research question one was also answered through the OLTS In-School Transition Survey Interview question number
10. Which high school courses or activities were you not able to take that would have better prepared you for life after graduation. To investigate research question two, What experiences did they rate as the most valuable during the transition process, the OLTS In-School Transition Survey Interview question number 7, When you were in high school how helpful were the following in preparing you for life after graduation, were used.

The findings of research question three, What fields of work did they anticipate working in, compared to what they are currently working in, were found through answering the OLTS In-School Transition Survey Interview question number 2, Which of the following fields do you anticipate working or studying in after graduation, along with Post-School Data Collection Survey OLTS Phone Interview question number 2, If you are currently working, what kind of job do you have. To find the information for research question four, What are the participants’ reported reasons for unemployment?, the Post-School Data Collection Survey OLTS Phone Interview question number four, If you are not currently working, what are the reasons for not working were used.

The Educational Management Information Systems (EMIS) provided data for the student record review such as the projected graduation date, gender, ethnicity, age of student at time of graduation, type of school setting (rural, suburban, or urban), disability category, type of school, and class participation data (Baer et al., 2003). Baer et al. stated the student or family member interview section included information relating to academic participation information, transition planning, information ratings of transition services, and expected post-school outcomes.

Baer et al. (2003) further stated the post-school survey was similar to the in-school survey; however, it was in a follow-up format. The information included inquiries
into specific outcomes of students after graduation. The survey was administrated as an interview through the use of guided prompts and the use of selected questions obtained from the In-School Transition Survey. The survey item selection was based on school service ratings, post-school outcomes and demographic variables.

**Data Collection Procedures (OLTS)**

The Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study (OLTS) was funded by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) and the Office for the Exceptional Children. The purpose of this study was to investigate the post-school outcomes of individuals with intellectual disabilities and to follow their outcomes. The reason that this study was implemented was to evaluate the continuous improvement of secondary education programs. The model was a joint collaborative effort among the SERRCs, LEAs, and a state university (Baer et al., 2003).

The initial phase began by establishing the research design through teaming with the OEC. The primary researchers and state legislation met to identify the reasons for the study. The main reasons were to evaluate services and programs used by secondary education students with disabilities and to establish recommendations for continuous improvement for transition services and secondary education programs. The study was a longitudinal design which required gathering information on students with disabilities in their last year of school along with follow-ups in one, three and five year intervals following graduation (Baer, Flexer, & Dennis, 2007).

The second phase of the OLTS required using the Ohio SERRCs to find a representative sample of rural, suburban, and urban LEAs in their respective regions to participate in this investigation. In the beginning SERRCs were invited to participate in
the first wave of recruitment and finally 52 LEAs were recruited over five regions. After this process KSU staff trained key LEA staff to enable them to perform as surveyors in collaboration with KSU.

According to Baer et al. (2003), for the third portion of the OLTS the LEA representatives (who were usually the transition coordinators) received training which included selecting a random sample of their students, performing an appropriate student record review, conducting a student interview, and learning how to record and interpret data. Through the initial year of the OLTS, exit surveys were performed with graduating special education students in the spring of 2004. In the summer of 2004, the completed surveys were sent to KSU for analysis and coding. After the beginning of data collection at the LEAs the state university representative sponsored follow-up meetings to discuss questions or problems during the process of implementing the survey.

For the fourth phase the LEAs prepared recommendations based upon the regional and state data. At this point in the study, the LEA surveyors from each of the five regional teams were able to give suggestions reflecting the representativeness of their data with regards to their student and followed with making suggestions for completion of the study. The LEA surveyors put together presentations of the data and their findings of the study to school personnel as well as continuous improvement teams (Baer et al., 2005). The data being used in this study were from the students that exited secondary education settings in 2004-2011. This process continued with the follow up of the waves of students completing the exit, one year, three years, and five years until the completion of 2012.
While using the OLTS, the design involved the use of two surveys, one in-school or exit survey and then a post-school survey given, one, three and five years after exit. The exit survey was a student record review and a student/family interview. The literature on effective transition practices provided direction for the implementation of this survey (Kohler, 1998; additionally, a follow-up study was implemented by Ohio’s Systems Change Project for Transition (Baer et al., 2003), along with the follow-up surveys designed for the National Longitudinal Study for Transition (Blackorby & Wagner, 1996, Wagner et al., 2005). The face validity of the survey was tested over the period of four years during two pilot SERRCs with 140 students (Baer et al., 2003).

While piloting the survey administrators evaluated the survey process and questions for reliability, clarity, and content (Baer et al., 2003). Survey questions were eliminated if too difficult for student comprehension provided unreliable information or offered inconsistent interpretations. The questions regarding history of adjudication and annual income were discarded as unreliable. Furthermore the cross checking process of student records for congruency was based upon knowledge of the student. Upon editing and refining the survey questions, the bubble format was implemented to facilitate the coding process.

The data analysis method was to identify the variables of interest and corresponding demographic information and their respective codes to bring up descriptive statistics for the survey data.
Description of Participants

The participants in this study included individuals from diverse socio-economic statuses, races, and ethnic backgrounds who exited Ohio’s high schools. The target population includes the students who have intellectual disabilities in Ohio’s schools identified as being a disability characterized by significant limitations both in intellectual functioning (reasoning, learning, problem solving) and in adaptive behavior, which covers a range of everyday social and practical skills. This disability originates before the age of 18 (retrieved from http://www.aamr.org/content_104.cfm). The students studied were under the label of mental retardation for the purposes of student disability type.

Data Analysis Method

The data analysis for this investigation involved using descriptive data obtained through Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) statistical software. The data showed the frequency of responses for selections demonstrating trends. The use of a chi square identified the difference between genders in the participants’ reported reasons for unemployment.

Summary

The description of participants and where they came from was discussed in this chapter. The research questions were stated for the participants to answer from open-ended statements. The survey provided data, which was collected, coded, and analyzed.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to identify critical issues and determine the efficacy of the transition programs as perceived by individuals with intellectual disabilities in the state of Ohio. This analysis also demonstrated a rank order of services received by the students, thus displaying services which are most essential and nonessential to their success after graduation. Descriptive frequencies for examining course of study, gender, field of employment, and reasons for unemployment were analyzed. A chi square for analysis of differences between gender and unemployment was used. The results are presented according to the order of questions stated in chapter I.

Demographic Information for the Participants

While identifying demographic characteristics of the students with intellectual disabilities the numbers representing their gender were 1,003 males and 860 females. This represented males at 53.5% and females at 45.9%. These students came from a variety of ethnic backgrounds; the largest group was 1,258 whites, 553 African-Americans, 23 Hispanic, 6 Native-Americans, 3 Asian-Americans, 5 English Second Language, and 10 other ethnicity students. These are represented as follows: 67.1%
whites, 29.5% African-Americans, 1.2% Hispanic, 0.3% Native-Americans, 0.2% Asian-Americans, 0.3% English Second Language, and 0.5% other ethnicity students.

Table 2

The Gender and Ethnicity of the Participants (n = 1,875)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Americans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Second Language</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ages the students would be at graduation were between 16 and 23 years of age. The largest group of students stated they would be 18 years of age at graduation which is 871 or 46.5% of the students; 680 or 36.3% of the students said they would be 19 years of age at graduation; 107 or 5.7% of the students said they would be 20 years of age at graduation; 90 or 4.8% of the students said they would be 17 years of age at graduation; 37 or 2.0% students said they would be 21 years of age at graduation; 19 or 1.0% of the students said they would be 22 years of age at graduation; 3 or 0.2% of the students said they would be 16 years of age at graduation; and 1 or 0.1% of the students said they would be 23 years of age at graduation.
Table 3

The Ages at Graduation for the Sample (n = 1,875)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When addressing the type of school setting the student was educated in, the largest group of 638 students were educated in a rural setting, the next largest group of students of 404 were in a large city setting (more than 50,000), then followed by 389 students in a small city setting (less than 50,000), and the smallest group 362 students in a suburban setting. The percentages for the type of school setting consisted of 34.0% rural setting, 21.5% in a large city setting, 20.7% in a small city setting, and 19.3% in a suburban setting.
Table 4

School Setting for the Sample (n = 1,875)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School setting</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large city (more than 50,000)</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city (less than 50,000)</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of school students attended was either a career technical or high school. The data showed that 524 or 27.9% attended a career technical school, while 402 or 21.4% attended high school. The students who participated in regular education classes less than 21% of the day were 612 students representing 32.6% of the sample population. The students who participated in regular education classes 21% to 60% of the day were 810 students representing 43.2% of the population. The students who participated in regular education 60% or more of the day were 453 students representing 24.2% of the population.
Table 5
The School Type and Participation for the Sample (n = 1,875)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career technical</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in regular education</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 21% of the day</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% to 60% of the day</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% or more of the day</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When identifying transition services students received, 782 or 41.7% of the students received work study, 473 or 25.2% of the students received VOSE services, 86 or 4.6% of the students received Option IV/JTC, 95 or 5.1% of the students received special needs CTE, 974 or 51.9% of the students received transition specialist, 440 or 23.5% of the students received career assessment, and 849 or 45.3% of the students received career/technical education. This information demonstrated the overlapping of services; the most widely applied service would be the use of a transition specialist. They are the most widely used because they write the transition plans for the students from high school age and beyond that time for the transition into the community (see Table 6).
Table 6

Transition Services Received by Gender (n = 1,875)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition service</th>
<th>Male n</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female n</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOSE</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option IV/JTC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs CTE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Specialist</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Assessment</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Assessment 2</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive Technology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Education/Technical Education</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When addressing the anticipated working status of the participants in the study, 931 or 49.7% of the students said that when they leave high school they expected to work full time, while 662 or 35.3% of the students said they expected to work part time when they leave high school. When looking at postsecondary training; 589 or 31.4% of the students said they expected to attend a two-year college after high school, while 254 or 13.5% of the students said they expected to attend a four-year college after leaving high school. The number of students who expected to attend a technical school after leaving high school was 197 or 10.5% of the students. The data showed that 98 or 5.2% of the students anticipated enlisting in the military after leaving high school. With regards to vocational rehabilitation, 378 or 20.2% of the students said that when they leave high school they would be involved in vocational rehabilitation. While looking at receiving...
MR/DD services 165 or 8.8% of the students said that they expected to receive services from the local MR/DD agency when they leave high school (see Table 7).

Table 7
The Expected Post-school Goals for the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-school goals</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work full-time</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work part-time</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a 2 year college</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a 4 year college</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a technical school</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist in military</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive vocational rehabilitative training</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive MR/DD training services</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other training services</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unavailable Courses of Study or Experiences

The first question in this investigation was, What critical courses of study or experiences do students with intellectual disabilities identify as unavailable? The largest number of students stated job shadowing with 562 or 62.7% of the students selecting this choice; 493 or 57.0% of the students chose school supervised work; 402 or 51.6% of the
students choosing classes at a community college; 402 or 51.0% of the students selected an in school job; 353 or 46.5% of the students chose paid work on own; 329 or 45.4% of the students selected visits to college; 314 or 43.9% of the students selected preparation for college entrance exams; 311 or 43.4% of the students selected school supervised volunteer work; 281 or 41.1% of the students selected help applying to a college; 212 or 33.4% of the students selected extracurricular activities; 165 or 27.5% of the students selected career assessment; 139 or 24.4% of the students selected vocational rehabilitation; 117 or 20.7% of the students selected coursework; 80 or 4.3% of the students selected proficiency testing; 76 or 14.5% of the students selected MR/DD services; 66 or 12.5% of the students selected IEP and transition meetings; and 46 or 9.1% of the students selected other school-to-career activities. The majority of the selections were pertaining to work-related services and activities (see Table 8).

The top tier of services and activities that were unavailable surround a theme relative to employment and employability training. The highest percentage listed was for job-shadowing with 562 or 62.7% of the students; this experience was where a student would be given an employment opportunity with a job coach supervising. The job coach helps to groom the student with the appropriate work related skills and knowledge. With the next choice, 493 or 57.0% of the students selected school-supervised work. The employment experiences within the high school level allow the student to gather an opinion based upon their experiences as to what their job choice may be. This was followed with 402 or 51.6% of the students choosing classes at a community college. This choice was related to technical or career-related coursework within a community college setting. Another important choice made by 402 or 51.0% of the students selected
an in-school job. When students are given work experiences, they can make more informed work choice decisions. The fifth group consisted of 353 or 46.5% of the students who chose paid work on own. This opportunity allows the students to appreciate the extrinsic value of employment and increases job skills and experiences.

Table 8

The Classes Not Able to Take That Would Have Better Prepared You (n = 1,875)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services and activities</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency testing</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP and transition meetings</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School supervised work</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School supervised volunteer</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school job</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job shadowing</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid work on own</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes at a community college</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and technical education</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for college entrance exams</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help applying to college</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to college</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Assessment</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR/DD Services</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other school-to-career activities</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Valuable Transition Experiences

The second question in this investigation was, What experiences did they rate as the most valuable in the transition process? The ratings of school services and transitional activities were scaled from one to four with the least valuable at a one and the most valuable being a four. The mean ratings of the school services and transitional activities were as follows: paid work on own, 3.26; career and technical education, 3.25; in-school job, 3.13; coursework in high school, 3.12; IEP and transition meetings, 3.11; school supervised volunteer, 3.06; school supervised work, 3.06; job shadowing, 3.03; visits to colleges, 3.02; vocational rehabilitation services, 2.99; help applying to college, 2.95; other school-to-career activities, 2.93; extracurricular activities, 2.88; career assessment, 2.85; MR/DD services, 2.83; classes at a community college, 2.72; preparation for college entrance exams, 2.63; and proficiency testing, 2.19 (see Table 9).

The top tier of service and activity rating also involved a theme surrounding employment and employability training. The highest rated school services and transitional activities was for paid work on own choice, with a mean rating of 3.26. The next highest rated school service and transitional activity with a mean rating of 3.25 was career and technical education. This was followed by the third highest rated school service and activity of an in-school job with a mean rating of 3.13. The fourth highest rated school service and transitional activity with a mean rating of 3.12 was coursework in high school. The fifth highest mean rated school service and transitional activity was IEP and transition meetings with a mean rating of 3.11. The lowest rated selection was proficiency testing with a 2.19 mean rating. The majority of these choices involve career and technical training along with preparation to transition/employment.
Table 9

Ratings of School Services and Transitional Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services and activities</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency testing</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP and transition meetings</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School supervised work</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School supervised volunteer</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school job</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job shadowing</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid work on own</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes at a community college</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and technical education</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for college entrance exams</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help applying to college</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to colleges</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in high school</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career assessment</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation services</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR/DD services</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other school-to-career activities</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean ratings of the school services and transitional activities by gender were as follows: paid work on own, 3.27 for male, 3.23 for female; career and technical education, 3.29 for male, 3.21 for female; in-school job, 3.07 for male, 3.20 for female; coursework in high school, 3.11 for male, 3.12 for female; IEP and transition meetings, 3.04 for male, 3.18 for female; school supervised volunteer, 2.97 for male, 3.15 for female; school supervised work, 3.07 for male, 3.06 for female; job shadowing, 3.00 for male, 3.05 for female; visits to colleges, 2.98 for male, 3.05 for female; vocational rehabilitation services, 2.96 for male, 3.03 for female; help applying to college, 2.96 for female;
male, 2.95 for female; other school-to-career activities, 2.95 for male, 2.89 for female; extracurricular activities, 2.92 for male, 2.81 for female; career assessment, 2.85 for male, 2.86 for female; MR/DD services, 2.84 for male, 2.83 for female; classes at a community college, 2.70 for male, 2.74 for female; preparation for college entrance exams, 2.55 for male, 2.69 for female; and proficiency testing, 2.19 for male, 2.20 for female. The highest mean ratings again were for the areas of work related activities or services (see Table 10).

Table 10
Ratings of School Services and Transitional Activities by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services and activities</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency testing</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP and transition meetings</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School supervised work</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School supervised volunteer</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school job</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job shadowing</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid work on own</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes at a community college</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and technical education</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for college entrance exams</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help applying to college</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to colleges</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Ratings of School Services and Transitional Activities by Gender (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services and activities</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in high school</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career assessment</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation services</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR/DD services</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other school-to-career activities</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fields of Work**

The third question in this investigation was, What fields of work did they anticipate working in compared to what they are currently working in? The Native American population had anticipated to work in five fields. They were hospitality and tourism 1 or 16.7% of the students; construction technologies 1 or 16.7% of the students; marketing, 1 or 16.7% of the students; human services 1 or 16.7% of the students; and transportation systems 1 or 16.7% of the students. The actual fields of work for the Native American population were manufacturing technologies 1 or 16.7% of the students, and government and public administration 1 or 16.7% of the students.

The anticipated fields of work for the Hispanic population consisted of the following: hospitality and tourism 3 or 13.0% of the students; transportation systems 1 or 4.3% of the students; information technology 1 or 4.3% of the students; construction technologies 2 or 8.7% of the students; manufacturing technologies 2 or 8.7% of the students.
students; agriculture and environmental systems 1 or 4.3% of the students; education and training 2 or 8.7% of the students; health science 2 or 8.7% of the students; human services 2 or 8.7% of the students; law and public safety 1 or 4.3% of the students; and other 6 or 26.1% of the students. The actual fields of work of the Hispanic population were hospitality and tourism 2 or 8.7% of the students; manufacturing technologies 1 or 4.3% of the students; and government and public administration 1 or 4.3% of the students.

The anticipated fields of work for the African American population consisted of the following: hospitality and tourism 64 or 11.6% of the students; transportation systems 25 or 4.5% of the students; information technology 27 or 4.9% of the students; construction technologies 41 or 7.4% of the students; manufacturing technologies 17 or 3.1% of the students; marketing 11 or 2.0% of the students; finance 8 or 1.4% of the students; arts and communication 12 or 2.2% of the students; agriculture and environmental systems 5 or .9% of the students; education and training 40 or 7.2% of the students; engineering and science technologies 7 or 1.3%; health science 80 or 14.5% of the students; human services 50 or 9.0% of the students; government and public administration 1 or .2% of the students; law and public safety 10 or 1.8% of the students; business and administrative services 23 or 4.2% of the students; other 74 or 13.4% of the students.

The actual fields of work for the African American population consisted of the following: hospitality and tourism 28 or 5.1% of the students; transportation systems 4 or .7% of the students; information technology 1 or .2% of the students; construction technologies 3 or .5% of the students; manufacturing technologies 8 or 1.4% of the students; marketing 11 or 2.0% of the students; finance 1 or .2% of the students; arts and
communication 9 or 1.6% of the students; agriculture and environmental systems 6 or 1.1% of the students; education and training 6 or 1.1% of the students; engineering and science technologies 2 or .4%; health science 4 or .7% of the students; human services 9 or 1.6% of the students; government and public administration 17 or 3.1% of the students; business and administrative services 6 or 1.1% of the students; and other 2 or .4% of the students.

The anticipated fields of work for the White population consisted of the following: hospitality and tourism 152 or 12.1% of the students; transportation systems 82 or 6.5% of the students; information technology 47 or 3.7% of the students; construction technologies 152 or 12.1% of the students; manufacturing technologies 75 or 6.0% of the students; marketing 28 or 2.2% of the students; finance 1 or .1% of the students; arts and communication 26 or 2.1% of the students; agriculture and environmental systems 58 or 4.6% of the students; education and training 92 or 7.3% of the students; engineering and science technologies 13 or 1.0%; health science 134 or 10.7% of the students; human services 74 or 5.9% of the students; government and public administration 2 or .2% of the students; law and public safety 23 or 1.8% of the students; business and administrative services 27 or 2.1% of the students; and other 147 or 11.7% of the students.

The top five anticipated fields of work for the African American population consisted of the following: health science 80 or 14.5% of the students; other 74 or 13.4% of the students; hospitality and tourism 64 or 11.6% of the students; construction technologies 41 or 7.4% of the students; human services 50 or 9.0% of the students. The top five anticipated fields of work for the White population consisted of the following:
hospitality and tourism 152 or 12.1% of the students; construction technologies 152 or 12.1% of the students; other 147 or 11.7% of the students; health science 134 or 10.7% of the students; education and training 92 or 7.3% of the students.

The actual fields of work for the white population consisted of the following: hospitality and tourism 66 or 5.2% of the students; transportation systems 8 or .6% of the students; information technology 3 or .2% of the students; construction technologies 22 or 1.7% of the students; manufacturing technologies 32 or 2.5% of the students; marketing 22 or 1.7% of the students; finance 4 or .3% of the students; arts and communication 8 or .6% of the students; agriculture and environmental systems 25 or 2.0% of the students; education and training 7 or .6% of the students; engineering and science technologies 0 or 0%; health science 15 or 1.2% of the students; human services 24 or 1.9% of the students; government and public administration 27 or 2.1% of the students; law and public safety 0 or 0% of the students; business and administrative services 8 or .6% of the students; and other 19 or .8% of the students.

The top five selections for the anticipated fields of work for the white population consisted of the following: hospitality and tourism 152 or 12.1% of the students; construction technologies 152 or 12.1% of the students; other 147 or 11.7% of the students; health science 134 or 10.7% of the students; education and training 92 or 7.3% of the students.

The anticipated fields of work for the Asian American population consisted of the following fields: construction technologies 1 or 33.3% of the population; health science 1 or 33.3% of the population; human services 1 or 33.3% of the population. The actual field of work for the Asian American population was hospitality and tourism 1 or 33.3%.
The anticipated fields of work for the ESL population were: hospitality and tourism 1 or 20% of the population; transportation systems 1 or 20% of the population; information technology 1 or 20% of the population; manufacturing technologies 1 or 20% of the population; other 1 or 20% of the population. The actual field of work for the ESL population was construction technologies 1 or 20% of the population. The other population actual fields of work consisted of construction technologies 1 or 10% of the population and other with 1 or 10% of the population.

The top selections for the African-American versus white population in actual fields of work were hospitality and tourism 28 or 5.1% of the African American students; hospitality and tourism 66 or 5.2% of the white students; government and public administration 17 or 3.1% of the African American students; manufacturing technologies 32 or 2.5% of the white students; marketing 11 or 2.0% of the African American students; government and public administration 27 or 2.1% of the white students; human services 9 or 1.6% of the African American students; agriculture and environmental systems 25 or 2.0% of the white students; arts and communication 9 or 1.6% of the African American students; human services 24 or 1.9% of the white students.

The top selections for the African-American versus white population for anticipated fields of work were health science 80 or 14.5% of the African-American students, hospitality and tourism 152 or 12.1% of the white students; other 74 or 13.4% of the African-American students; construction technologies 152 or 12.1% of the white students; hospitality and tourism 64 or 11.6% of the African-American students; other 147 or 11.7% of the white students; construction technologies 41 or 7.4% of the African-American students; health science 134 or 10.7% of the white students; human services 50
or 9.0% of the African-American students; education and training 92 or 7.3% of the white 
students. The ANOVA was not conducted on the two populations due to the small cell 
numbers.

Table 11

Anticipated and Actual Fields of Work or Study by Ethnicity (n = 1,875)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Anticipated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and public administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and tourism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction technologies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing technologies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and environmental systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and public administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and public safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and tourism</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation systems</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction technologies</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing technologies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Anticipated and Actual Fields of Work or Study by Ethnicity (n = 1,875) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Work</th>
<th>Anticipated n</th>
<th>Anticipated Percent</th>
<th>Actual n</th>
<th>Actual Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and communication</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and environmental systems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and science technologies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health science</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and public administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and public safety</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and administrative services</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**White**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Work</th>
<th>Anticipated n</th>
<th>Anticipated Percent</th>
<th>Actual n</th>
<th>Actual Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and tourism</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation systems</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction technologies</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing technologies</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and communication</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and environmental systems</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and science technologies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health science</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and public administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and public safety</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and administrative services</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asian American**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Work</th>
<th>Anticipated n</th>
<th>Anticipated Percent</th>
<th>Actual n</th>
<th>Actual Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11

Anticipated and Actual Fields of Work or Study by Ethnicity (n = 1,875) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticipated</th>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for Unemployment

The fourth question in this investigation was, What are the participants’ reported reasons for unemployment? The primary issue with this question was that the current economic conditions are bleak for the typically able individual. With this said, the students who stated that they had any employment numbered 768 with total missing responses of 1,107. Given these conditions the responses are as follows: Enrolled in post-secondary education 63 or 3.4% of the sample; cannot find a job that suits my interest 52 or 2.8% of the sample; cannot find any job 117 or 6.2% of the sample; need assistance finding a job but none is available 30 or 1.6% of the sample; lack of required skills 25 or 1.3% of the sample; transportation problems 48 or 2.6% of the sample; don’t want to lose
my benefits 34 or 1.8% of the sample; don’t want to work 43 or 2.3% of the sample; other 77 or 4.1% of the sample. In this area of the study the predominant response to reasons for unemployment was relative to the job market and the unavailability of jobs.

Table 12

Reasons for Not Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in post-secondary education</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot find a job that suits my interest</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot find any job</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need assistance finding a job but none is available</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of required skills</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation problems</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to lose my benefits</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to work</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons for not working by gender demonstrate some differences among the two populations. The selections are as follows: Enrolled in post-secondary education 30 or 47.6% of the sample for male, 33 or 52.4% of the sample for female; cannot find a job that suits my interest 30 or 57.7% of the sample for male, 22 or 42.3% of the sample for female; cannot find any job 53 or 45.3% of the sample for male, 64 or 54.7% of the sample for female. 
sample for female; need assistance finding a job but none is available 11 or 36.7\% of the sample for male, 19 or 63.3\% of the sample for female; lack of required skills 12 or 48.0\% of the sample for male, 13 or 52.0\% of the sample for female; transportation problems 25 or 52.1\% of the sample for male, 23 or 47.9\% of the sample for female; don’t want to lose my benefits 17 or 50.0\% of the sample for male, 17 or 50.0\% for female; don’t want to work 19 or 44.2\% of the sample for male, 24 or 55.8\% of the sample for female; other 33 or 43.4\% of the sample for male, 43 or 56.6 of the sample for female. The use of the chi square demonstrates the \( p \) value of these differences.

The following data are representing the chi square analysis for question four looking at the reasons for unemployment and gender. The number of missing N and selection of “no” per response decrease the number in each reason. The probability is given to show if there is a significant difference among the genders. They are as follows: Enrolled in post-secondary education 30 or 47.6\% of the sample for male, 33 or 52.4\% of the sample for female, the missing system number is , the total no responses and the \( p \) value is .230 which demonstrates a statistical difference among genders for this response; cannot find a job that suits my interest 30 or 57.7\% of the sample for male, 22 or 42.3\% of the sample for female the missing system number is 1,287, the total “no” responses 524, and the \( p \) value is .770 which is not statistically significant among genders for this response; cannot find any job 53 or 45.3\% of the sample for male, 64 or 54.7\% of the sample for female, the missing system number is 1,274, the total “no” responses is 472 and the \( p \) value is .038 which demonstrates a statistical difference among genders for this response; need assistance finding a job but none is available 11 or 36.7\% of the sample for male, 19 or 63.3\% of the sample for female, the missing system number is 1,296, the
total no responses 537 and the p value is 0.059 which is not statistically significant among genders for this response; lack of required skills 12 or 48.0% of the sample for male, 13 or 52.0% of the sample for female, the missing system number is 1,296, the total no responses 542 and the p value is 0.540 which is not statistically significant among genders for this response; transportation problems 24 or 52.1% of the sample for male, 23 or 47.9% of the sample for female, the missing system number is 1,290, the total no responses 525 and the p value is 0.763 which is not statistically significant among genders for this response; don’t want to lose my benefits 17 or 50.0% of the sample for male, 17 or 50.0% for female, the missing system number is 1,291, the total no responses 538 and the p value is 0.598 which is not statistically significant among genders for this response; don’t want to work 19 or 44.2% of the sample for male, 24 or 55.8% of the sample for female, the missing system number is 1,292, the total no responses 528 and the p value is 0.202 which is not statistically significant among genders for this response; other 33 or 43.4% of the sample for male, 43 or 56.6 of the sample for female, the missing system number is 1,288, the total no responses 499 and the p value is 0.047 which demonstrates a statistical difference among genders for this response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Male n</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female n</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in post-secondary education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot find a job that suits my interest</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot find a job</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need assistance finding a job but none is available</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of required skills</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation problems</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to lose my benefits (e.g. SSI)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.* indicates statistical significant difference.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This discussion was organized by the research questions investigated in this study. These questions were studied with information from the Ohio Longitudinal Transition Study (OLTS). One thousand eight hundred seventy-five students completed the in-school exit survey. Seven hundred seventy graduates participated in the follow-up interviews with data being gathered at the local education agencies.

Research Questions

1. What critical courses of study or experiences do students with intellectual disabilities identify as unavailable?

2. What experiences did they rate as the most valuable during the transition process?

3. What fields of work did they anticipate working in, compared to what they are currently working in?

4. What are the participants’ reported reasons for unemployment?

Research Question 1: What critical courses of study or experiences do students with intellectual disabilities identify as unavailable? The largest percentage of responses for this question state that the opportunity to work in some employment or volunteer position was unavailable as well as career or technical coursework. These responses
indicate students did not have sufficient job training or work experience to be able to place into a position of employment. There is research to indicate that successful transition outcomes occur when there are ample opportunities for work-related experience to make an informed employment choice. Neubert and Alvarez Redd (2008) shared the following 10 recommended transition practices: community based instruction, employment experiences, campus inclusion, self-determination, functional academics, social skills, independent living skills, career education and assessment, parental involvement, and collaboration. Phillips et al. (2009) discussed a study involving the use of customization to aid in transition. The authors observed six students of a rural school setting over a 10-year period, who received services combining special education and vocational rehabilitation. Through compiling a discovery profile for the students they implemented individualized job placements.

The authors suggested that work experiences, job development, and customized employment are a good start to prevent difficulties. Phillips et al. (2009) demonstrated customized transition programs through involvement of special education staff, occupational therapists, and vocational rehabilitation therapists’ collaboration to provide services to students who graduate with meaningful jobs.

Research question 2: What experiences did they rate as the most valuable during the transition process? The top tier of service and activity rating also involve a theme surrounding employment and employability training. The highest rated school services and transitional activities was for paid work on own choice, with a mean rating of 3.26. The next highest rated school service and transitional activity with a mean rating of 3.25 was career and technical education. This was followed by the third highest rated school
service and activity of an in-school job with a mean rating of 3.13. The fourth highest rated school service and transitional activity with a mean rating of 3.12 was coursework in high school. The fifth highest mean rated school service and transitional activity was IEP and transition meetings with a mean rating of 3.11. These ratings indicate a need for transition planning, coursework, and experience relative to employment. The optimum program for our students of transition age should have a balance of the guidance for making informed choices, training to allow the individual to perform the various duties of employment, and experience to become competent and skilled in an area that the individual should choose to work in. Phillips et al. (2009) recognized that this collaboration of services and experiences is necessary for the optimum outcome for an individual. These ratings substantiate what the students with intellectual disabilities in Ohio feel were the most valued services and experiences.

Research question 3: What fields of work did they anticipate working in, compared to what they are currently working in? The information obtained from the exit survey and the post-school survey indicated the top five anticipated fields of work for the African American population consisted of the following: health science 80 or 14.5% of the students, other 74 or 13.4% of the students, hospitality and tourism 64 or 11.6% of the students, construction technologies 41 or 7.4% of the students, and human services 50 or 9.0% of the students. The top five anticipated fields of work for the White population consisted of the following: hospitality and tourism 152 or 12.1% of the students, construction technologies 152 or 12.1% of the students, other 147 or 11.7% of the students, health science 134 or 10.7% of the students, and education and training 92 or 7.3% of the students.
The actual fields of work for the African American population consisted of the following: hospitality and tourism 28 or 5.1% of the students, transportation systems 4 or .7% of the students, information technology 1 or .2% of the students, construction technologies 3 or .5% of the students, manufacturing technologies 8 or 1.4% of the students, marketing 11 or 2.0% of the students, finance 1 or .2% of the students; arts and communication 9 or 1.6% of the students; agriculture and environmental systems 6 or 1.1% of the students; education and training 6 or 1.1% of the students; engineering and science technologies 2 or .4%; health science 4 or .7% of the students; human services 9 or 1.6% of the students; government and public administration 17 or 3.1% of the students; business and administrative services 6 or 1.1% of the students; and other 2 or .4% of the students.

The anticipated fields of work for the White population consisted of the following: hospitality and tourism 152 or 12.1% of the students, transportation systems 82 or 6.5% of the students, information technology 47 or 3.7% of the students, construction technologies 152 or 12.1% of the students, manufacturing technologies 75 or 6.0% of the students, marketing 28 or 2.2% of the students, finance 1 or .1% of the students, arts and communication 26 or 2.1% of the students, agriculture and environmental systems 58 or 4.6% of the students, education and training 92 or 7.3% of the students, engineering and science technologies 13 or 1.0%, health science 134 or 10.7% of the students, human services 74 or 5.9% of the students, government and public administration 2 or .2% of the students, law and public safety 23 or 1.8% of the students, business and administrative services 27 or 2.1% of the students, and other 147 or 11.7% of the students. The actual fields of work for the white population consisted of the
following: hospitality and tourism 66 or 5.2% of the students, transportation systems 8 or
.6% of the students, information technology 3 or .2% of the students, construction
technologies 22 or 1.7% of the students, manufacturing technologies 32 or 2.5% of the
students, marketing 22 or 1.7% of the students, finance 4 or .3% of the students, arts and
communication 8 or .6% of the students, agriculture and environmental systems 25 or
2.0% of the students, education and training 7 or .6% of the students, engineering and
science technologies 0 or 0%, health science 15 or 1.2% of the students, human services
24 or 1.9% of the students, government and public administration 27 or 2.1% of the
students, law and public safety 0 or 0% of the students, business and administrative
services 8 or .6% of the students, and other 19 or .8% of the students. According to
Wagner et al. (2005) fewer cohort 2 than cohort1 youth held maintenance or clerical jobs
and more worked in retail at their current or most recent job.

Research Question 4: What are the participants’ reported reasons for
unemployment? When looking at the findings of question four, the most important factor
to consider with these data are the bleak economic conditions. While addressing
employment opportunities, typical individuals are not becoming employed. That then
provides an overabundance of overqualified individuals who cannot gain employment.
With these factors in consideration the climate for seeking and maintaining employment
is challenging and the data demonstrate the hardship with regards to becoming employed.

The largest group of respondents (117n or 6.2% of the sample) cannot find any
job. The next largest group of respondents (77n or 4.1% of the sample) indicated the
response of other for reasons for not working. Wagner et al. (2005) stated that there was a
17 percentage point increase between 1987 and 2003 in young adults with disabilities
continuing their education at the postsecondary level \((p < .001)\). With regards to the postsecondary education and youth with disabilities, Wagner et al. (2005) stated that attendance at four-year institutions had increased significantly (8%) so that 10% of youth with disabilities had been students in these schools since leaving high school. Wagner et al. (2005) also recognized that enrollment at postsecondary vocational, technical, or business schools were unchanged; 6% of cohort 2 youth had enrolled in these.

Wagner et al. (2005) shared that in 2003 that 70% of youth with disabilities who had been out of school up to two years had worked for pay at some time since leaving school; 52% had done so in 1987. For the employed cohort 2 youth 18% were less likely than cohort1 peers to work full-time at their current or most recent job, 39% were full-time workers (Wagner et al., 2005). This may be due to a decline in the economy.

The overall evidence for the chi square performed on question 4 analyses demonstrates the statistical significance among the genders and the reasons for unemployment. The reason cannot find any job was 53 or 45.3% of the sample for male, 64 or 54.7% of the sample for female. The missing system number is 1,274, the total no responses is 472, and the \(p\) value is .038 which demonstrates a statistical significance which may be due to more effort seeking out a job or more opportunities for females. The response of other with 33 or 43.4% of the sample for male, 43 or 56.6% female, the missing number is 1,288, the total no responses and the \(p\) value is .047 which demonstrates a statistical significance for this response. With this response it is difficult to presume any implications because of the varied reasons one may select other. While considering this population it may be possible that other could be associated with the level of involvement or supports necessary of the intellectually disabled population.
Health issues, physically or mentally may be a consideration. Phillips et al. (2009) demonstrated customized transition programs through involvement of special education staff, occupational therapists, and vocational rehabilitation therapists’ collaboration to provide services to students who graduate with meaningful jobs.

**Recommendations for Future Research and Methodology**

Further research is necessary to identify the areas of individuals with intellectual disabilities of this population in the early transition stages. The questions addressed in this investigation demonstrated that courses needed further study to look into the amount of time spent in the coursework or job training necessary for a successful employment transition. Another area to address is the amount of career investigation and exposure that is needed for students to choose an appropriate field of employment. With this area of career investigation a very important factor to consider is looking at what fields of growth would provide subsequent opportunities to gain employment. This needs special consideration with the current economic conditions. Students don’t get as much to choose from with the limited opportunities in the job market; however, a more realistic approach to the selection and training of students could mean increased chances of gaining employment.

Another area of investigation would be to look at when we start training students for their potential career. Other countries may approach transition in the formative stages of education. Where is the model that our country should follow? Finally, do our students with intellectual disabilities deserve to have an education void of all the
industrial arts and home economic coursework? Grandin recognized the impact of cutting these programs on our youth with disabilities.

Implications for Educational Practices

With these findings it is clear that training students with intellectual disabilities as well as typical students in academic and not employability skills is a disservice for the progression in transition for these atypical and typical individuals. The need to offer many employment experiences and apprenticeships is necessary at an early age. The need for a more integrated approach to the training for students preparing to exit high school could be implemented, academic versus career options need to be investigated. Students immersed in academics until the 10th grade are not prepared for employment for the 21st century. There exists a need for students to go to many job sites and see what many options are out there before the 10th grade. Preliminary training in the fields available and in-site exposure should be required before the ninth grade. During the ninth grade students should learn basic employment-seeking skills, filling out applications, searching want ads, interviewing, and transportation training should be imbedded into the coursework prior to career planning. Time should be spent with job counselors, vocational rehabilitation specialists, and state employment support staff. The labyrinth of services to negotiate once out of school should be set in place in ninth grade.

In the 10th grade students should be aware of the areas of interest and training for a broader arena of skills requisite to employment training (safety, social, etc.). Then several five-six-week part-time sessions of actual job site experience should be implemented. During the 11th grade an apprenticeship in two areas could be
implemented; one for a first choice and one for a back up for the two 18-week sessions. In the 12th grade one apprenticeship in the preferred area of employment should be in place. In the last year all linkages to supports must be in place with back-up plans to give students persons to call when they aren’t able to get in contact with the normal support. All agencies should be collaborating with this person. The employer should also potentially be pre-arranged in the last nine weeks with a designated start date. BVR, MRDD should have a plan for monitoring with visits to job site for two years.

This investigation provided a voice for students with intellectual disabilities transitioning in the state of Ohio. Their perceptions of what services they wanted, participants’ reported reasons for unemployment, ratings of services and anticipated along with actual areas of employment were identified. Through their voices, a more efficacious transition process can be shaped into practice.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

STUDENT EXIT SURVEY

Student Exit Survey (SES)
Ohio Longitudinal
Transition Study
Permission Form
(To be kept by school)

Dear student or family member:
You have been selected to participate in a study “Follow-up of Special and Regular Education Graduates in Ohio.” The purpose of this study is to identify programs and activities that were effective in preparing you or your family member to live and work in the community. This research will be conducted by your school and all information will be confidential and recorded anonymously.

We hope that you will agree to participate in this survey and allow us to call you up to three times over the next five years to see how you are doing. Of course, you may choose not to participate in this study or withdraw at any time without penalty. If you would like further information on how this research will be used, you may contact:

Robert Bauer, Ph.D.
Kent State University
300 White Hall
Kent, OH 44242-0001
(330) 672-0722
rbauer@kent.edu

Yes, I will participate. The following are phone numbers where I can be reached or contacted after graduation:

Name
Phone
Cell Phone
E-mail

Name
Phone
Cell Phone
E-mail

Name
Phone
Cell Phone
E-mail

Name
Phone
Cell Phone
E-mail

Signature
Print Name

200000
APPENDIX B

OLTS EXIT SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

OLTS EXIT SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS
Rachel McMahan Queen, PhD (330) 672-0724 or rmcmanhan@kent.edu
Website – http://www.ohsu.kent.edu/site/OLTS

HOW DO I DETERMINE WHEN TO SURVEY AND WHICH STUDENTS TO SURVEY?
- Survey all students with IEPs exiting secondary education including students aging out or dropping out.
- You will fill out the exit survey with students graduating or aging out and then contact them over the phone one year later.
- You will fill out the follow-up survey with any student who has officially dropped out during the 2011/2012 school year.

HOW DO I OBTAIN SURVEYS?
- Regional trainings will be held at the State Support Teams. Ohio and regional data will be presented. Participants will be trained in the implementation of this process and the OLTS surveys will be available at that time.
- If you cannot make any regional training, you can email Dr. Rachel McMahan-Queen at rmcmanhan@kent.edu. On the email:
  - State how many surveys you would like.
  - Provide a person and mailing address to send the surveys.
  - Schedule a time to speak with Rachel and discuss these instructions.

HOW DO I CONDUCT THE EXIT “OLTS IN-SCHOOL TRANSITION SURVEY” (PAGES 1-3)
- Complete the cover page “Permission Form” of the survey packet by:
  - Obtaining the student’s permission, unless there is a guardian.
  - Getting as many ways of reaching the student as possible.
  - Storing this page for future reference. (Do not send to Kent State.)
- Complete the “Record Review (EMIS)” section (page 1) using student records and/or EMIS data. (Please provide the name of the interviewer.)
- Schedule a meeting and complete the student “Interview” (pages 2 and 3)
  - Conduct the survey orally and paraphrase questions as needed.
  - Leave questions blank for no response and code N/A if not applicable
- Make copies of the record review and exit survey (yellow sheets). Keep the packet originals at the school for your records.

WHERE DO I SEND THE COMPLETED SURVEYS?
Note: You should make copies of any survey materials you send to Kent State. Surveys due by June 30, 2012
- Mail exit survey copies to:
  Dr. Rachel McMahan-Queen, 202 White Hall, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44242

Rev. 10/4/2011
In-School Transition Survey

Interview

(You may paraphrase questions, if necessary)

1. When you leave high school do you expect to:
   (Bubble all that apply)
   a. Work full-time (36 hours or more).
   b. Work part-time (34 hours or less).
   c. Attend a 2 year college.
   d. Attend a 4 year college.
   e. Attend a technical school.
   f. Enlist in the military.
   g. Receive vocational rehabilitation (SVR/ESV) services.
   h. Receive MR/DD services.
   i. Receive other training or services.
   j. Other.
   Specify: ____________________________

2. Which of the following fields do you anticipate working or studying in after graduation?
   (Bubble ONE)
   a. Hospitality and Tourism.
   b. Transportation Systems.
   c. Information Technology.
   d. Construction Technologies.
   e. Manufacturing Technologies.
   f. Marketing.
   g. Finance.
   h. Arts and Communication.
   i. Agricultural and Environmental Systems.
   j. Education and Training.
   k. Engineering and Science Technologies.
   l. Health Science.
   m. Human services.
   n. Government and Public Administration.
   o. Law and Public Safety.
   Specify: ____________________________

3. Where do you plan to live one year after graduation? (Bubble ONE)
   a. Living with parents or relative.
   b. Living on one's own.
   c. Living with friends.
   d. Living with a husband or wife.
   e. Living with children.
   f. Living with a foster family.
   g. Living in a group home.
   h. Living on a college campus.
   i. Other.
   Specify: ____________________________

4. What are your leisure and community participation goals after graduation?
   (Bubble all that apply)
   a. Voting.
   b. Drivers license.
   c. Own a car.
   d. Use public transportation.
   e. Use a computer.
   f. Playing sports.
   g. Doing hobbies.
   h. Going to church or religious activities.
   i. Going to the mall or movies.
   j. Doing outdoor activities.
   k. Other.
   Specify: ____________________________

5. How well were the following post school goals addressed in your IEP and transition plan?
   a. My work goals.
   b. My college goals.
   c. My independent living goals.
   d. My leisure and community participation goals.
   e. Other.
   Specify: ____________________________
6. How do you plan to pay for the things you need after graduation? (Bubble all that apply)
   a. Competitive Work
   b. Shelters Work
   c. Medicaid for health expenses
   d. Family members help
   e. Disability benefits (such as SSI)
   f. Food stamps
   g. Job and Family Services
   h. Aid in paying rent
   i. Scholarships
   j. Student loans
   k. Other
   Specify

7. When you were in high school how helpful were the following in preparing you for life after graduation?
   a. Proficiency testing
   b. IEP/Transition meetings
   c. School supervised paid work in the community
   d. School supervised volunteer work
   e. In-school job
   f. Job shadowing
   g. Paid work on your own
   h. Classes at a community college
   i. Career/Technical Education
   j. Extracurricular activities
   k. Preparing for college entrance exams (SAT, ACT)
   l. Help applying to college
   m. Visits to college
   n. Coursework (specify)
   o. Career assessment
   p. Vocational Rehabilitation (BVR, BSVI) services
   q. MR/DD services
   r. Other school-to-career activities
   Specify

8. If you took career/technical classes, how many semesters did you take in your field (e.g., auto mechanics)?

9. How well did the school prepare you to get a job or go on to further study?
   - Very well
   - Well
   - Somewhat well
   - Not well at all
   Specify if possible:

10. Which high school courses or activities were you not able to take that would have better prepared you for life after graduation? (Bubble all that apply)
   - Proficiency testing
   - IEP/Transition meetings
   - School supervised paid work in the community
   - School supervised volunteer work
   - In-school job
   - Job shadowing
   - Paid work on your own
   - Classes at a community college
   - Career/Technical Education
   - Extracurricular activities
   - Preparing for college entrance exams (SAT, ACT)
   - Help applying to college
   - Visits to college
   - Coursework (specify)
   - Career assessment
   - Vocational Rehabilitation (BVR, BSVI) services
   - MR/DD services
   - Other school-to-career activities (specify)

Comments:
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OLTS FOLLOW-UP SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

OLTS FOLLOW-UP SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS
Rachel McMahan Queen, PhD (330) 672-0724 or rmcmahan@kent.edu
Website – http://www.clhs.kent.edu/cite/OLTS

HOW TO CONTACT THE STUDENTS
- Find your survey packets and coordinate with those who plan to collect the data – if there is more than one person collecting follow-up – schedule a time to discuss the on-line data collection method.
- You will first collect the data on the actual follow-up forms.
- Try to contact each student 4 times. You may begin your phone interviews as early as April or you can wait to do them over the summer. All surveys must be submitted online by the end of August 2012.
- Contact the students using the information on the “Permission Form”.
- Try to interview the same informant as used in the exit interview.
- You can obtain the information from a family member or relative as necessary.

REGISTER FOR THE OLTS ONLINE FOLLOW UP SURVEY WEBSITE
- Identify one person to enter the OLTS data online.
- Register for the OLTS online follow-up data site by going to the following link: http://oltafollowup.kent.edu/tnu/tnu.aspx
- You will be asked to enter information related to yourself, your school district, your district IRN, and the number of follow-up surveys that will be entered.
- You will be emailed your username and password for the online OLTS follow-up survey.

ENTERING THE DATA ON THE OLTS FOLLOW UP SURVEY WEBSITE
- Once you have registered for the OLTS online survey – go to the following website to enter the data: http://oltafollowup.kent.edu/tnu/tnu.aspx.
- Take one survey at a time and enter the data as reported.
- If you need to start over, you can reset the survey.
- Once you finish entering data on the first page, click on “Next Page”.
- Continue entering data on the second page.
- Once you have completed entering the data, you can click on “Submit Survey” and your data will be stored.

ONCE YOU HAVE COMPLETED ENTERING ALL SURVEY DATA ONLINE
- Keep the hard copies of your follow-up surveys in your OLTS file.
- If you have any questions, contact me at (330) 672-0724 or rmcmahan@kent.edu
7. Please rate how satisfied you are with the following:
   a. Your current job
   b. Your current residence
   c. Your current contact with friends
   d. Your current transportation arrangements
   e. Adult services (BVR, MR/DD)
   Comments:

8. How do you pay for the things you need?
   (Bubble all that apply)
   a. Competitive Work
   b. Sheltered Work
   c. Medicaid for health expenses
   d. Family members help
   e. Disability benefits (such as SSI)
   f. Food stamps
   g. Job and Family Services
   h. Aid in paying rent
   i. Scholarships
   j. Student loans
   k. Other

9. If you went on to a post secondary education, did you receive any of the following?
   a. Remedial classes
   b. Note taking services
   c. Tutoring
   d. Extra time for tests
   e. Tapes of books or lectures
   f. Accommodations for visual impairments
   g. Reduced schedule loads
   h. Sign language interpreters
   i. Register for disability services
   j. Other

10. Did you have a paying job at the time you left high school?
    □ Yes
    □ No
    Specify if possible:

11. Did you choose your current job?
    □ Yes
    □ No

12. If you did not go on to post-secondary education as planned, can you tell us why?
    a. Changed plans
    b. Not enough money
    c. Needed help applying
    d. Was not accepted
    e. Did not have required courses
    Specify:
    f. Other
    Specify:

13. In retrospect, was there any service or experience that was particularly helpful in preparing you for your goals?
    Specify:

14. How many paying jobs have you had since graduation?

15. (Optional) If working, what is your hourly wage?

16. Approximately how many hours per week?

17. Are you experiencing any problems currently that require assistance?
    □ Yes
    □ No
    Specify if yes:

COMMENTS:

Contact person:

00000000

Specified date: [Signature]