

LICENSED SPECIALIST IN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY (LSSP) INVOLVEMENT IN THE  
ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING OF POSTSECONDARY TRANSITION IN TEXAS

A Dissertation

by

Melina Renee Cavazos

Submitted to the Graduate and Professional School of  
Texas A&M University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Dalun Zhang
Co-Chair of Committee,	Krystal Simmons
Committee Members,	Myeongsun Yoon
	James Laub
Head of Department,	Fuhui Tong

December 2021

Major Subject: School Psychology

Copyright 2021 Melina Cavazos

## ABSTRACT

Postsecondary transition planning is a legally-mandated service provided to special education students within the United States. Previous research has identified this process as one of many factors that can contribute to a successful postsecondary transition in various life areas for these individuals. An interdisciplinary transition team, formed of the student, parent(s), school personnel, and other professionals, must work collaboratively to identify, evaluate, and change these services as necessary to meet the student's postsecondary goals. Licensed Specialists in School Psychology, or LSSPs, are one such team member that is on the transition team. LSSPs are uniquely trained to provide services to students, families, and other personnel in various areas, including consultation, psychological and psycho-educational assessment, direct services, and program planning and evaluation within the school setting. Although LSSP involvement has been considered to be important by other transitional team members, previous research has identified several barriers that prevent increased LSSP involvement in this process. This kind of research has not been studied much within the southern United States. The purpose of this study was to add to the current literature of LSSP involvement within the postsecondary transition planning process. An online survey modified by this current researcher, with authors' permissions, was disseminated to LSSPs and other transition team members within Texas school districts. Findings from this current study are largely aligned with previous research regarding the gap between the frequency and importance of LSSP involvement, as well as shared identified barriers to LSSP involvement. Recommendations for addressing barriers to LSSP involvement are included.

*Keywords:* transition, planning, postsecondary, school psychologist, LSSP, team

## DEDICATION

It is with the deepest sincerity that I dedicate this work to my family:

To my younger brother. It has been a blessing to have grown up with you on your journey as a person with special needs. I continue to be astounded by your great strides, and pray that this world can one day effectively accommodate all individuals who also navigate it differently.

To my parents. It is truly an honor to be your daughter, and to have stood witness to your fight in an uphill battle during a time when services for special needs children and adults were even more unattainable than they are today. Your blood, sweat, and tears in supporting your son (and daughters) throughout the years continue to serve as my inspiration, and I look forward to dedicating my life in serving other families in their own uphill battles.

To my younger sister. You are such a bright light in my life, and continue to push me to be the best version of myself as your older sister. I am so proud of the young woman you have become, and am also looking forward to stand witness in your journey to adulthood!

I additionally dedicate this work to special education students and their families, who also hold a special place in my heart. You are seen, and are an inspiration to not only myself, but to others. To school psychologists and other professionals in related fields who work hard to support this very special population, continue the good fight!

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could write a thousand words, and that still wouldn't be enough to express my deepest gratitude towards those who have supported me throughout this journey.

Again, many thanks to my family. To my husband, I am incredibly blessed to have you in my life. Your encouragement, humor, and patience have been a lifesaver in this tumultuous sea called graduate school... and this pandemic! After getting through this, I am so confident that we can accomplish anything together!

To my friends, both those I've known for years and those I've made along the way, I can't imagine having been able to do this without your support. I will always treasure the laughs, the food, and the drinks. I can't wait to see where life takes us!

I would also like to extend a special thank you to my advisor and co-committee chair, Dr. Krystal Simmons. Your mentorship over the years have been so valuable, and has helped keep me sane. Thank you so much for your kindness and support! To my committee chair, Dr. Dalun Zhang, thank you for welcoming me to the CDD, and sharing your expertise in this area of transition that is so dear to me. I would additionally like to thank my other committee members, Drs. Myeongsun Yoon and James Laub. This would not have been possible without you.

## CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

### **Contributors**

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of main committee chair, Dr. Dalun Zhang of the Department of Educational Psychology, co-committee chair and advisor, Dr. Krystal Simmons of the Department of Educational Psychology, and committee members Dr. Myeongsun Yoon of the Department of Educational Psychology and Dr. James Laub of the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture at Texas A&M University.

Data collection was contributed in part by two doctoral graduate students within the Department of Educational Psychology. All other work contributed for the dissertation was completed by the researcher independently.

### **Funding Sources**

No funding support was provided for this research.

## NOMENCLATURE

IDEIA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act
LSSP	Licensed Specialist in School Psychology
IEP	Individualized Education Program

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT .....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES .....	v
NONMENCLATURE .....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions and Hypotheses .....	5
Definition of Terms .....	7
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW .....	11
Legislation on Postsecondary Transition for Students with Disabilities.....	11
History of Federal Legislation.....	11
Current Federal Legislation.....	18
Current Texas Legislation .....	18
Predictors of Postsecondary Transition Success .....	20
Kohler’s Taxonomy for Transition Programming 2.0.....	24
Interagency Collaboration .....	25
Research on Interagency Collaboration Effectiveness .....	26
Postsecondary Transition Team Members .....	26
Guidelines and Standards for School Psychologists and Licensed Specialistss in School Psychology (LSSPs) .....	27
American Psychological Association (APA) .....	28
National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) .....	30
Previous Research on LSSP/School Psychologist Involvement in the Postsecondary Transition Process .....	31
Perceptions of LSSP Level of Involvement and Importance .....	31
Noted Barriers to LSSP Involvement .....	32
Potential Benefits of Increased LSSP Involvement in Postsecondary Transition Planning .....	34
Assessment and Development of Student Skills .....	34
Increased Effectiveness of Postsecondary Transition Plan .....	35

Increased Efficiency in Postsecondary Transition Planning .....	36
CHAPTER III METHODS.....	38
Research Design .....	38
Sampling Procedures .....	38
Participants .....	41
Instrument.....	41
Variables.....	42
CHAPTER IV RESULTS .....	44
A Priori Analysis for Sample Size Determination .....	44
Participant Demographics .....	45
Group and District Type.....	45
Highest Degree Obtained.....	46
Certifications and Licensures Obtained.....	47
Training .....	48
Preparedness .....	49
Routine Participation .....	50
Experience and IEP Participation.....	51
Utilization .....	52
Research Questions .....	52
Research Question 1 .....	52
Research Question 2 .....	53
Research Question 3 .....	55
Research Question 4 .....	57
Research Question 5 .....	57
Research Question 6 .....	59
CHAPTER V DISCUSSION.....	60
Implications for Practice.....	66
Limitations.....	68
Recommendations for Future Research.....	69
Conclusion .....	70
REFERENCES .....	71
APPENDIX A.....	82
APPENDIX B.....	84
APPENDIX C.....	86
APPENDIX D.....	87

APPENDIX E .....	88
APPENDIX F .....	115
APPENDIX G .....	116
APPENDIX H .....	117
APPENDIX I .....	119
APPENDIX J .....	120
APPENDIX K .....	122
APPENDIX L .....	124

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 District Type Membership.....	46
Table 2 Highest Degree Obtained .....	47
Table 3 Certifications and Licensures Obtained.....	47
Table 4 Trainings Obtained .....	49
Table 5 Preparedness .....	50
Table 6 Routine Participation .....	50
Table 7 Experience .....	51
Table 8 LSSP Utilization.....	52
Table 9 Primary Role of LSSPs.....	53
Table 10 Perceived Frequency of LSSP Involvement.....	54
Table 11 T-Test Results for Perceived Frequency of LSSP Involvement.....	55
Table 12 One-Way ANOVA Results for LSSP Involvement by District Type .....	55
Table 13 Perceived Importance of LSSP Involvement .....	56
Table 14 T-Test Results for Perceived Importance of LSSP Involvement .....	57
Table 15 Correlation Results for Alignment of Frequency and Importance .....	57
Table 16 Identified Barriers to LSSP Involvement .....	58
Table 17 Level of Awareness of District Guidelines.....	59

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Since the passing of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 and comparable legislation, federal law has evolved over time to provide appropriate and free education for students with a range of disabilities. Data gathered from federal agencies since the 1970's have suggested that rates of college enrollment, graduation, and employment of individuals with disabilities have increased in response to these improved federal laws (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2019). However, there still remains an under-representation of individuals with disabilities in these settings. Approximately 11% (or 30,067) of individuals are identified as having a disability out of the overall civilian non-institutional population living in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). These individuals continue to be overwhelmingly underemployed when compared to their peers without disabilities (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). In fact, the percentage of unemployment among individuals with disabilities in the workforce is 7.6%, which is approximately three percentage points higher than the percentage of unemployed individuals without disabilities in the workforce (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). Individuals with disabilities also have a lower percentage of enrollment in undergraduate and post baccalaureate programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). The percentage of individuals with disabilities enrolled in the undergraduate and post baccalaureate levels were 19.4% and 11.9%, respectively (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). This is again an overwhelmingly lower percentage when compared to the enrollment of individuals without disabilities, which was 80.6% and 88.1%, respectively (U.S. Department of Education, 2019).

And so a question arises, what can be done to better the odds of postsecondary success for individuals with disabilities? Effective postsecondary transition planning is one solution. According to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, or IDEIA (2004),

transition services are defined as a coordinated set of services or activities that are results-oriented and aimed towards improving upon the student's academic and functional skills to better prepare the student to achieve their life goals post-graduation (e.g., postsecondary education, employment, independent living, etc.) (IDEIA, 2004). These services are tailored to the student's needs, strengths, preferences, experiences, and skill level, and are written on the student's transition plan. Transition planning, simply put, is the process in which the student's transition team members, which include the student, parent, and multidisciplinary professionals, work collaboratively together using a person-centered planning process in order to provide, evaluate, and change relevant transition services as deemed necessary in supporting the student in reaching their goals (IDEIA, 2004). Effective transition services have been researched to improve student outcomes post-graduation (e.g., Test et al., 2009; Mazzotti et al., 2016) in various life areas.

Formal transition plans are developed and documented for all special education students in their individualized education program, or IEP, as required by federal law, specifically under IDEIA (2004). An IEP is a comprehensive and individualized document that outlines the student's current performance, annual goals, special education and related services, participation in the least restrictive environment (LRE) with non-disabled children, participation in state- and district-wide tests, current transition services, needed transition services, an age of majority statement, and a statement of how each of the IEP goals will be measured (Price-Ellingstad, Reynolds, Ringer, Ryder, & Sheridan, 2000). The IEP is created, evaluated, and updated at least once per year, and is considered a "roadmap" to that individual students' success. The multidisciplinary IEP team is tasked to collaboratively create and include a transition plan within the student's IEP by the time the student reaches 16 years of age in accordance with federal law

(IDEIA, 2004). Some states, such as Texas, have adjusted this requirement for an earlier completion (e.g., by 14-years-old).

It is noted that during the transition planning phase, the IEP team may be referred to as the “transition team.” Other external agencies that can provide services post-graduation transition-related services may be invited to these transition planning meetings. The transition plan is required by IDEIA (2004) to include the (a) student’s identified postsecondary goals (b) services needed for the student to reach their postsecondary goals, and (c) details of how student progress will be measured per goal. It is the intention that by having a results-oriented focus and in working collaboratively with other transition team members, the student’s transition plan will be effective towards equipping the student with the necessary skills needed to be successful post-graduation in various life areas.

As a best practice to meet legal requirements, the transition team is typically formed of a transition coordinator/specialist, general education/special education teacher(s), assessment personnel, outside agency personnel, the student, and their parent(s). Licensed Specialists in School Psychology (LSSPs) are school personnel that routinely participate in IEP teams, and are largely considered to be “assessment personnel” members as providers of psychological and psychoeducational assessment services (e.g., Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002). However, the unique training of LSSPs equip them to also offer a variety services in the areas of consultation, direct services (e.g., prevention services, behavioral and/or academic intervention, trainings/workshops, coordinating services with outside agencies, etc.) and program planning and evaluation using data methods and evidence-based practice (Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002). They are also in a position to work with students, parents, teachers, school personnel, and external agencies. With this extensive training, it is unfortunate that LSSPs are often limited to

providing psychological and psychoeducational assessment services and have limited frequency of involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process, despite the perceived importance of their involvement (Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002).

In addition to missed opportunity, lack of LSSP involvement highlights a gap between national organizational guidelines and actual practice in postsecondary transition planning as outlined by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2012) and the National Association of School Psychologists (National Association of School Psychologists, 2010a; NASP, 2010b). Guidelines urge LSSPs to understand IDEIA (2004) and its requirements (APA, 2012), and to engage in all transition levels (NASP, 2010a; NASP, 2010b). These organizations stress that LSSPs should be prepared to conceptualize and implement effective, fair, and ethical assessment and interventions with their clients (APA, 2012). They also encourage LSSPs to be wholly involved within an individual's system, and additionally be aware of cultural considerations (APA, 2012) to best engage in collaborative work (APA, 2012; NASP, 2010a; NASP 2010b).

Unfortunately, multiple barriers have been identified that hinders LSSP involvement in this process, largely involving lack of training, limited resources, and logistical difficulties (e.g., Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002; Talapatra et al., 2019).

To date, not enough research regarding the involvement of LSSPs within the postsecondary transition process has been completed, especially within the southernmost United States. Further research within this geographic area has the potential to add to the knowledge-base in providing a more complete picture of the state of LSSP involvement, and aid in the development of solutions. Texas is the largest state in the contiguous United States, and as of 2018, it is estimated that it has the second largest population of residents in the United States (United States Census Bureau, 2018). Additionally, it is the third state with the largest population

size of students with disabilities being served under Part B of IDEIA (2004) in the country, with 498,588 students being served in the 2017-2018 school year (U.S. Department of Education, 2018). In 2017, out of the 1,622,962 individuals with disabilities who are within working age (ages 18-64), about 39.9% were employed, leaving about 974,985, or about 60.07% of individuals unemployed in Texas (LEAD Center, n.d.). This is again a stark difference when compared to the 75.94% employment rate and approximately 24.06% unemployment rate of working-age individuals in the state of Texas who do not have a disability (LEAD Center, n.d.). This trend is concerning, considering the large amount of special education students that Texas serves under IDEIA (2004). Therefore, local education agencies (LEAs) should be prepared to engage in this level of intervention service by identifying knowledgeable school personnel members to assist in transition planning, which includes LSSP involvement.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current frequency and importance of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process in various Texas school districts as perceived by LSSPs and other transition team members. Findings from this study will help inform current practice of LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition services, with the aim to bring attention to current Texas and national policy of LSSP involvement in this process to impact change. Additionally, this study aims to identify perceived barriers regarding LSSP involvement, and offer potential ideas for alleviating these barriers.

### **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

1. What is the primary role that LSSPs typically engage in the postsecondary transition planning process in school districts? Is there a difference between district types?

- a. Based on previous research and the traditional role of LSSPs, it is hypothesized that LSSPs will likely be most involved in assessment-related activities, and less involved in other transition-related activities.
2. How frequently are LSSPs involved in postsecondary transition planning-related activities as perceived by LSSPs and other transition team members? Is there a significant difference in the frequency of LSSP involvement across different district types?
  - a. Based on previous research, it is hypothesized that LSSPs will likely report low frequency of involvement (e.g., Never, Occasionally) in postsecondary transition planning activities. It is also hypothesized that other transition team members will report the same. It is hypothesized that there will be no significant difference between the perceptions of the frequency of LSSP involvement between both groups. It is also hypothesized that there will be a difference in LSSP involvement across district type groups.
3. How important is LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning-related activities as perceived by LSSPs and other transition team members? Is there a significant difference reported between these two groups?
  - a. Based on previous research, it is hypothesized that LSSPs will likely report a moderate to high importance of their involvement (e.g., Probably Should, Definitely Should) in transition planning activities. It is also hypothesized that other transition team members will report the same. It is hypothesized that there will be no significant difference between the perceptions of the importance of LSSP involvement between both groups.

4. Is the reported perceived importance of LSSP involvement aligned with the reported perceived frequency of LSSP involvement?
  - a. Based on previous research, it is hypothesized that there will be a small alignment between these concepts.
5. What are the identified barriers that prevent LSSPs from participating more frequently in the postsecondary transition planning process?
  - a. Based on previous research, it is hypothesized that LSSPs will report that keeping up with current caseloads/“referral backlog” and large caseloads as the most significant barriers to further involvement in transition planning activities.
6. What is the level of awareness of all transition team members regarding written and specific guidelines for postsecondary transition planning-related activities within their school district?
  - a. This research question is exploratory by nature, and will provide descriptive information.

### **Definition of Terms**

For clarity, below are definitions to key concepts and transition team roles of this research study.

1. *Postsecondary transition planning/team*: All students with disabilities who receive special education under IDEIA (2004) are mandated to have a transition plan in their IEP by the time the student turns 16 years of age (IDEIA, 2004). Transition planning is a collaborative effort by the transition team, which includes (a) the parent (s) of the student with a disability, (b) at least one regular education teacher that the child has been in contact with, (c) at least one special education teacher who has been in contact with the child, (d) a representative of the local education agency (e.g., child’s school) who has

knowledge about resource availability and the general education program, and can provide or supervise the provision of the instruction to be specifically designed and provided to the student, (e) an individual who can interpret the results of evaluation assessments and resulting instruction implications, (f) other individuals who have knowledge or “special expertise” regarding the student, including related services personnel, as deemed appropriate and at the discretion of the parent or the agency (e.g., school), and lastly but most importantly (g) the student with the disability, when appropriate (IDEIA, 2004). The team uses person-centered planning to provide, evaluate, and change services provided to aid in the student reaching their postsecondary transitional goal(s) (IDEIA, 2004).

2. *Postsecondary transition services*: The federal, state, and/or local services provided to students who meet eligibility criteria under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004) for the purpose of preparing these students for a successful and goal-oriented transition into postsecondary education or employment. All schools in the United States who opt-in to receive funding from IDEIA (2004) must adhere to its federal requirements regarding these postsecondary transition services, though delivery of these services can vary by state and school district.
3. *Licensed Specialist in School Psychology (LSSP)*: In Texas, a Licensed Specialist in School Psychology (LSSP) is a credential provided by the Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists (TSBEP) that allows for trained school psychologists to practice within the school setting (Texas Association of School Psychologists, n.d.). Requirements in obtaining an LSSP credential are as follows: (a) a graduate degree in the field of school psychology or closely related field (e.g., Master’s level, Doctorate level),

(b) a passing score on the school psychology national exam, and (c) National Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) certification eligibility, or educational equivalent (TASP, n.d.). It is important to note that the term “school psychologist” in Texas is reserved for licensed psychologists (LPs) with a doctorate degree in school psychology (TASP, n.d.), and although LPs may have an LSSP certification, an LSSP may or may not be an LP. The term “school psychologist” seems to be interchangeable with school personnel performing similar duties as Texas LSSPs in the research literature.

4. *Transition specialist/coordinator*: In Texas, the transition specialist(s) (also known as transition coordinator or transition director) of a school district are responsible for coordinating special education transition-related services for their students as outlined in the student’s IEP (IDEIA, 2004). They are considered to be a member of the transition team, and are especially present during transition planning for the student (IDEIA, 2004).
5. *Special education coordinator/director/supervisor/administrator*: An administrative position in the special education department within an independent school district that oversees special education services distributed district-wide.
6. *Educational diagnostician*: In Texas, an educational diagnostician can be a member of the transition team that can administer, score, and interpret test results from academic, cognitive, and/or vocational-related assessment. Educational diagnosticians are certified under the Texas Student Services certification category, and must have (a) completed an educator preparation program, (b) hold a master’s degree from an institution that is accredited by an accrediting agency recognized by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, (c) completed the required tests, (d) have a valid classroom teaching

certificate, and (e) have three years' experience of teaching in a classroom in a public or accredited private school (Texas Education Agency, n.d.b).

7. *Special education teacher*: A certified teacher in special education and teaching special education students within the school setting.
8. *General education teacher*: A certified teacher in general education and teaching general education students, and/or teachers who teach special education students within the general education classroom with other general education students within the school setting.
9. *Secondary administrator*: A certified administrator, primarily a principal or assistant/associate principal, who oversees general education and special education services, among other services, within a secondary school setting.
10. *Secondary guidance counselor*: A certified counselor within the secondary school setting who provides support to students in various areas. This includes, but is not limited to, counseling, scheduling, and/or providing services that are related to post-graduation.
11. *Secondary school setting*: Referring to intermediate, middle, and/or high school(s) within school districts.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### **Legislation on Postsecondary Transition for Students with Disabilities**

To best grasp the legal implications of postsecondary transition planning within the school setting, it is important to understand the historical and current legislation at the federal and state levels aimed towards supporting individuals with disabilities within the school setting and post-graduation.

*History of Federal Legislation.* Early federal legislation laid down the legal framework that would lead to later specific and improved federal services for individuals with disabilities and postsecondary transition services.

One of the first pieces of legislation regarding postsecondary transition was the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Library of Congress, n.d.f). This Act formally established the Rehabilitation Service Administration, to be housed within the Office for the Handicapped in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This Act authorized specified vocational rehabilitation programs, as well as the established working partnership between the “handicapped individual” and the vocational rehabilitation counselor or coordinator in providing these programs. Such programs included (a) rehabilitation potential evaluations, (b) services for counseling, guidance, referral, and placement, (c) services for vocation and training, (d) physical and mental restoration services, (e) maintenance during rehabilitation, (f) interpreter services for individuals who are deaf and reading services for individuals who are blind, (g) services for recruitment and training, (h) mobile, orientation, and rehabilitation teaching services for individuals who are blind, (i) occupational licenses, tools, equipment, and initial stocks and supplies, (j) transportation related to provision of vocational rehabilitation services, and (k)

sensory, technological, and telecommunication aids. This Act protected qualified individuals with disabilities from discrimination, or being denied, these services unless otherwise unqualified. Among other provisions, this Act also provided state funding for research related to vocational rehabilitation services and personnel training (Library of Congress, n.d.f).

The passing of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142) was the first piece of federal legislation to be passed in the United States that addressed public education concerns for students with disabilities. This was a progressive law, in that it was the first law to guarantee a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) for these students. It also improved how children were identified for special education, protected the rights of these students and their parents regarding due process procedures, and required assessment and evaluation of the “effectiveness of efforts” in educating these students (PL 94-142, 1975). This law provided access to more than one million students with disabilities who had either been excluded from the public education system, or who had only some access to the public education system and were not provided an appropriate education (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, 2010).

The Vocational Amendments of 1976 was an extension of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, as well as a revision of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Library of Congress, n.d.j). Under Title II, this law authorized appropriations through the 1982 fiscal year for the advancement of vocational programs for individuals with disabilities within the States, among other populations (Library of Congress, n.d.j). These grants provided funding to the States and their various educational institutions for the development of state-wide plans and initiatives to aid these populations, requiring the (a) development of long-term, annual plans, (b) establishment of advisory counseling to aid in the development of statewide programs,

policy matters, and their evaluation, and (c) determination of a minimum percentage for programs aiding persons with disabilities (Library of Congress, n.d.j). Funds were also allocated to improve the qualifications of personnel serving in vocational education program positions, and to develop and disseminate “exemplary and innovative” programs (Library of Congress, n.d.j). Lastly, these amendments included details regarding the avoidance of traditional placements based on student gender (Library of Congress, n.d.j).

The Education of the Handicapped Act was amended in 1983 (Library of Congress, n.d.g). Amendments of this Act aimed to expand the definition of “handicapped youth” to include children ages 12 and older, as well as those enrolled in school in the seventh grade or a higher grade. Among other provisions, this act expanded services to deaf-blind youth, established an assistance program for secondary education and transitional services for youth with disabilities, and authorized the Secretary to make grants and contracts with state education agencies (SEA’s), local education agencies (LEA’s), institutions of higher education, and other appropriate public and private non-profit agencies or institutions for the purpose of aiding handicapped youth in transitioning to postsecondary education, vocational training, competitive employment, continuing education, and adult services (Library of Congress, n.d.g). These amendments also outlined the types of projects that can be assisted, as well as required that these projects encourage participation of the individual with a disability and their parent(s) in the stages of project planning, development, and implementation (Library of Congress, n.d.g).

Shortly after, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (H.R.4164) was passed in 1984 (Library of Congress, n.d.c), for the purpose of improving the programs allotted and funded by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 through revision and expansion of high-quality vocational-technical education programs. For postsecondary transition students, this Act detailed

(a) the requirement of a specified allotment of state funding for individuals with disabilities in postsecondary transition, (b) the requirement for a representative state council on vocational education if state participates in these programs, (c) outlined requirements for compliance and criteria of programs, including program evaluation and assessment of needs for these individuals, (d) specified guidelines for how states can spend this allotment of funds to provide services for individuals with disabilities, and other necessary expenses (e.g., administrative and training costs), and (e) the requirement for vocational education data collection (Library of Congress, n.d.c).

Madeleine Will, the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services at the time, published an annual report in 1986 that detailed weaknesses in the educating of students with learning disabilities (Will & Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, E. W. D., 1986). This report highlighted data regarding high illiteracy and dropout rates, and how the administration and characteristics of “pull out” programs at the time were ineffective and stigmatized/segregated these students from their general education classmates. Conclusions from this report outlined recommended strategies that could assist students within the general education classroom (Will & Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, E. W. D., 1986).

The Education of the Handicapped Act was again amended in 1990 (Library of Congress, n.d.h). Revisions of the Act provided many improvements to special education. A few of such improvements (a) encouraged use of person-first language, (b) extended special education instruction to be provided to students outside of the school setting as needed (e.g., home, hospitals, institutions, etc.) as well as physical education instruction, and (c) extended coverage to children with autism or traumatic brain injury, among other provisions (Library of Congress,

n.d.h). This revision also greatly improved postsecondary transition services within special education. The term “related services” was extended to also include rehabilitation counseling.

“Transition services” were more specifically defined. It was mandated that the IEP include a statement that details students’ enrollment in transition services no later than by the time the student turns age 16, or when the student turns age 14 or younger, when appropriate (Library of Congress, n.d.h). Additionally, when appropriate, the IEP was to include a statement that details the responsibilities and/or linkages of interagency collaborations. It also provided a heightened level of accountability, in that if services agreed upon by other participating agencies fall through, the IEP team must reconvene to identify alternative and alleviative services to help the student otherwise meet their transition goal(s). It also revised postsecondary educational and transitional services to include assistance for students to transition to independence and community living. Lastly, revisions directed the Secretary to provide funding for demonstration model(s) that aim to establish appropriate methods of providing assistive technology devices and services to students making postsecondary transitions (e.g., to vocational rehabilitation, employment, postsecondary education, adult services), and coordinate such programs with projects under the Job Training Partnership Act and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (Library of Congress, n.d.h). There was also increased grant funding provides to state agencies for transition service joint programs (Library of Congress, n.d.h).

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Library of Congress, n.d.i) was a monumental act that continues to be recognized today. This Act specified the term “individuals with a disability,” and set guidelines for non-discrimination of individuals with disabilities employed by a covered entity (e.g., employer, employment agency, labor organization, joint labor-management committee) and accessibility of a public entity. This law ensured that covered

entities could not turn away any qualified individuals with disabilities “in job application procedures, hiring or discharge, compensation, advancement, training, and other terms, conditions, and privileges of employment,” as well as specifically listed actions that were considered to be discriminatory in these situations (Library of Congress, n.d.i). In regard to accessibility, public transportation entities were required to have minimal accessibility accommodations, and public entities were required to have accessibility access with appropriate constructions (e.g., railings, ramps, etc.) (Library of Congress, n.d.i).

The School to Work Opportunities Act of 1994 laid out requirements for work opportunities for students with disabilities (Library of Congress, n.d.b). Requirements included (a) establishing integration between work-based learning and school-based learning opportunities, occupational and academic learning, and between secondary and postsecondary education, (b) providing students the opportunity to engage and complete career majors, (c) incorporating components of related activities (e.g., work-based learning, school-based learning, connecting activities) into school-to-work programs, (d) providing students who participate in these programs the experience and understanding of the industry they are interested in pursuing, and (e) providing all students equal access to components of such programs as well as equal opportunity to recruitment, enrollment, placement, and related activities. This Act outlined specific mandatory activities for program components and established additional competitive grant funding, among other revisions (Library of Congress, n.d.b).

The Workforce Investment Partnership Act of 1998 extended the provisions under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Library of Congress, n.d.a). This Act (a) provided additional specific requirements for state workforce initiatives and programs, (b) called for local state boards to be inclusive of individuals with disabilities, (c) put forth the “one-stop shop”

method of providing services through local partnerships, and (d) allowed states to identify eligible providers of services within their local areas. This Act was the first to specifically outline services provided to eligible youth that is similar to today's provided services by state workforce agencies. Services outlined included (a) academic-related activities (e.g., tutoring, instruction, dropout prevention strategies, etc.), (b) services related to alternative secondary schooling, (c) summer employment opportunities, (d) appropriate work experiences to include internships and job shadowing (e.g., paid, unpaid), (e) occupational skill training, (f) development of leadership skills, (g) supportive services, (h) adult mentoring, (i) follow-up services, and (j) comprehensive counseling and guidance, which also included those related to alcohol abuse (Library of Congress, n.d.a).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act underwent amendments in 1997 (Library of Congress, n.d.d), though amendments did not provide significant changes for students with disabilities in postsecondary transition until undergoing additional amendments in 2004, and was renamed as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (Education Service Center 11, n.d.). It is noted that the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 is the most recent piece of federal legislation that has put forth amendments that are significant for students with disabilities and postsecondary transition. Additional information regarding this law related to postsecondary transition is later discussed in more detail.

The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2014 is the most recent piece of federal legislation regarding state workforce initiatives and services (Library of Congress, n.d.e). This Act established the Rehabilitation Services Administration in the Department of Education as the principal agency in providing vocational rehabilitation services under designated title programs. This Act emphasized a push for individuals with disabilities to have gainful and

competitive integrated employment. Revisions also required that states designate funding for pre-employment transition services (Pre-ETS) for students with disabilities in school-to-work education or training. Interagency collaboration was additionally encouraged through requiring state units to coordinate with local workforce development boards, one-stop centers, schools, and employers to provide these services. (Library of Congress, n.d.e).

***Current Federal Legislation.*** The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004) is the most recent piece of federal legislation that has provided significant requirements regarding transition services. This Act outlined additional requirements for development of postsecondary transition goals, ensuring that they are appropriate, measurable, and based upon age-appropriate assessments related to the areas of education, training, employment and, when appropriate, independent living skills, and updated on an annual basis. Additionally, revisions were made regarding student participation in assessments (and alternative assessments), and stricter data examination of student's progress on academic and functional performance to ensure that adequate yearly progress (AYP) is being met. Inclusion of statements that indicate a student's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance as well as measurable academic and functional annual goals were also an added requirement (Education Service Center 11, n.d.).

***Current Texas Legislation.*** Texas legislation follows federal laws pertaining to the IEP, though adopts changed language. In Texas, the IEP meeting is referred to as the Admission, Review, and Dismissal meeting (e.g., "ARD" meeting), and the IEP team is referred to the Admission, Review, and Dismissal team (e.g., "ARD" team) (ESC 11, n.d.). For the purpose of this literature review the term "IEP" will be used.

Information related to postsecondary transition planning is largely located within § 29.011 of the Texas Education Code (ESC 11, n.d.). The following summarizes this section of the Texas Education Code (ESC 11, n.d.):

1. Appropriate student involvement in the student's transition to life outside the public school system;
2. If the student is younger than 18 years of age, appropriate parental involvement in the student's transition
3. If the student is at least 18 years of age, appropriate parental involvement in the student's transition, if the parent is invited to participate by the student or the school district in which the student is enrolled
4. Any postsecondary education options
5. A functional vocational evaluation
6. Employment goals and objectives
7. If the student is at least 18 years of age, the availability of age-appropriate instructional environments
8. Independent living goals and objectives (ESC 11, n.d.)
9. Appropriate circumstances for referring a student or the student's parents to a governmental agency for services (Texas Education Agency, 2013), and
10. The use and availability of appropriate supports and services (ESC 11, n.d.).

Additional Texas legislation has been passed to amend the Texas Education Code (ESC 11, n.d.). Texas Education Code § 29.0111 indicates that transition planning for students in special education will begin no later than when the student reaches 14-years-old (ESC 11, n.d.), which provides a clear start point for transition planning. Additionally, section § 29.0112

outlines the required development of a “transition and employment guide” that lists all state-specific “transition services,” “employment and supported employment services,” “social security programs,” “community and long-term services and support,” “postsecondary educational programs and services,” “information sharing with health and human services agencies and providers,” “guardianship and alternatives to guardianship,” “self-advocacy, person-directed planning, and self-determination,” and “contact information for all relevant state agencies” (ESC 11, n.d.). This section also outlines requirements for agencies in updating their websites, and for school districts to provide public access of this guide (ESC 11, n.d.).

The § 29.011 of the Texas Education Code also outlined the need for interagency collaboration, and listed federal and state-level agencies to enhance collaboration (ESC 11, n.d.). This led to the establishment of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 2017 between the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) for the purpose of solidifying collaborative efforts in preparing students with disabilities with the necessary vocational rehabilitation services to enter competitive employment (Texas Education Agency, n.d.a).

### **Predictors of Postsecondary Transition Success**

To best enhance postsecondary transition services, researchers have explored the various predictors that make these services most effective for students post-graduation. A systematic review conducted by Test et al. (2009) reviewed 22 articles pertaining to evidence-based postsecondary transition predictors that could lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Evidence-based predictors identified included (a) career awareness, (b) community experiences, (c) exit exam requirements/high school diploma status, (d) inclusion in general education, (e) interagency collaboration, (f) occupational courses, (g) paid employment/work

experience, (h) parental involvement, (i) program of study, (j) self-advocacy/self-determination skills, (k) self-care/independent living skills, (l) social skills, (m) student support, (n) transition program, (o) vocational education, and (p) work study (Test et al., 2009), all of which can be considered postsecondary transition services that can be provided within the school, agency, and/or community settings (Test et al., 2009). Effect sizes ranged from small to large, with potential to moderate levels of evidence. This study found that all but two studies had found positive correlations with student engagement in these predictors and post-school outcomes in the areas of education, employment, and/or living independently ranging from small to large effect sizes (Test et al., 2009). It was noted by the researchers that these two studies had indicated instances of negatively correlated data due to specific student situations that may have prevented these students from substantially improving in these areas (e.g., severe disabilities) (as stated in Test et al., 2009).

A later systematic review of the research literature was conducted by Mazzotti et al. (2016) to update and build upon the systematic review conducted by Test et al. (2009). This study examined the same previously identified predictors and also added new predictors as necessary after examining the NLTS2 national survey data (Mazzotti et al., 2016). The following predictors were newly identified: (a) parental expectations, (b) youth autonomy/decision making, and (c) travel skills (Mazzotti et al., 2016). A total of 11 studies were included in this systematic review, and 55 positive effects were identified across all studies ranging from small to large effects with none to moderate levels of evidence (Mazzotti et al., 2016). Findings were similar to Test et al. (2009) in that mostly positive correlations were found between student engagement and predictors, ranging in effect sizes, with only four studies reporting significant negative correlations (Mazzotti et al., 2016). Negative correlations between schools contacting vocational

training programs or possible employers and student post-school employment were found in a study completed by Chiang et al. (2012) (as stated in Mazzotti et al, 2016). Papay and Bambara (2014) found negative correlations between family involvement and post-school employment, between interagency involvement and participation in postsecondary education, and between interagency involvement and involvement in postsecondary education, and between work experiences in high school and participation in postsecondary education, having a high quality of life, and experiencing social inclusion (as stated in Mazzotti et al, 2016). McDonnall (2011) also reported finding negative correlations between transportation difficulties and postsecondary employment (as stated in Mazzotti et al, 2016). These negative correlations are important to note, as they can provide direction for continued research for additional supports in these areas regarding transition planning to aid in student success.

Out of those articles that were reviewed in Test et al. (2009) and Mazzotti et al. (2016), a few predictors that could be included as part of transition services were particularly noteworthy regarding the level of evidence on various life outcomes. Paid employment/work experiences were found to have a moderate level of evidence for positive effects in the areas of postsecondary education and/or employment attainment for individuals with disabilities. Studies have found that students who had participated in one or more paid employment opportunities during high school were more likely to engage in postsecondary education (Benz et al., 2000; Bullis et al., 1995) or employment (Benz et al., 2000; Benz et al., 1997; Bullis et al., 1995; Doren & Benz, 1998; Rabren et al., 2002) post-graduation. Some of these studies identified that this kind of participation led to an approximate five times increase in likelihood of employment attainment post-graduation (Bullis et al., 1995; Rabren et al., 2002). Similar to paid employment/work experiences, work study was another predictor identified as having a moderate

level of evidence for positive effects in the area of employment. Students who participated in a work study opportunity during high school were two times more likely to engage in full-time employment post-graduation (Baer et al., 2003). Studies that researched the outcomes of the Bridges School to Work Program, and had found that completion of the internship led to a higher likelihood of becoming employed post-graduation (Fabian et al., 1998; Luecking & Fabian et al., 2000); with a five times increased likelihood for employment after being offered a job through the internship program (Luecking & Fabian et al., 2000).

Vocational education is another identified predictor that has a moderate level of evidence for positive effects in the area of postsecondary education attainment (Test et al., 2009; Mazzotti et al., 2016). Results have shown that student who participated in vocational education in high school were more likely to be engaged in postsecondary education (e.g., Baer et al., 2003; Halpern et al., 1995; Harvey 2002).

Learning self-care/independent living skills is a predictor with a moderate level of evidence for positive effects in the area of independent living (Test et al., 2009; Mazzotti et al., 2016). Students who had scored higher in knowledge of self-care/independent living skills on related assessments were more likely to live independently post-graduation (e.g., Heal & Rusch, 1994) and have a higher quality of life (e.g., Roessler et al., 1990). This predictor was also found to increase the likelihood of graduates pursuing postsecondary education (e.g., Blackorby et al., 1993) and/or employment (e.g., Blackorby et al., 1993; Roessler et al., 1990).

As noted, researchers have identified various predictors for effective postsecondary transition which include a multitude of services that are considered to be highly beneficial for special education students. In pursuit of providing effective transition planning, it is important that transition team members become knowledgeable of such predictors, and tailor their practice

to be based in research. It is also important that all transition team members strive for interagency collaboration, and seek effective supports that address the various areas of need for special education students in meeting their postsecondary goals.

### **Kohler's Taxonomy for Transition Programming 2.0**

To gain a better understanding of how increased LSSP involvement in a transition team can be beneficial in effective postsecondary transition planning, it is important to first provide information regarding the meaning of interagency collaboration specifically geared towards postsecondary transition planning. The Taxonomy for Transition Programming, introduced by Kohler in 1996, was the first cohesive model that linked research and practice regarding postsecondary transition planning (Kohler, 1996). This original model comprised of 133 promising and evidence-based practices and is the only transition model that is research-based and has been evaluated in research literature (as stated in Xu, Dempsey, & Foreman, 2016). It has since been updated in 2016 to a 2.0 version with added research literature (Kohler, Gothberg, Fowler, & Coyle, 2016). This model is organized into five major categories (Kohler et al., 2016). The first category is Student-Focused Planning, which is further broken down into several relevant practices that aim towards the creation of goals that capture the development of the students' IEP, planning strategies, and student participation in the IEP process (Kohler et al., 2016). The second category is Student Development, which provides information regarding types and use of assessment, academic skills and their development, life/social/emotional skills and their development, employment and occupational skills, supports provided to the student, and context of instruction (Kohler et al., 2016). The third category is Interagency Collaboration, and focuses on a framework for collaboration and service delivery (Kohler et al., 2016). The fourth category is Family Engagement, which specifies the involvement, empowerment, and

preparation of family members within the transition planning process (Kohler et al., 2016). The fifth and final category of this model is Program Structure, which establishes and provides guidelines for reviewing the transition program's characteristics, methods for evaluation, strategic planning, procedures and policies, the development and allocation of resources, and school climate (Kohler et al., 2016).

Not only informed, but collaborative transition team members are an important piece in identifying and providing appropriate and effective transition-related services for students with disabilities.

***Interagency Collaboration.*** Kohler et al.'s (2016) model outlined specific guidelines in the area of Interagency Collaboration. In total, there are 19 detailed guidelines for this particular category (Kohler et al., 2016). The collaborative framework piece of this category stresses the importance of establishing who should be a part of the interagency collaboration, namely students, parents, educators, service providers, community agencies, postsecondary institutions, employers, and other stakeholders as deemed necessary (Kohler et al., 2016). It also encourages participants to take action in addressing the roles and responsibilities of each entity, establishing agreements, gaining a mutual understanding of policies and procedures, establishing methods of communication, and minimizing barriers to collaboration, to name a few (Kohler et al., 2016). The authors also highlight how personnel should (a) use coordination in planning meetings with the students and their families, (b) request and use relevant information in the planning process, and (c) assist the student and their family with other assistance as appropriate to meet goals (Kohler et al., 2016).

## **Research on Interagency Collaboration Effectiveness**

Two high-quality research articles (Bullis et al., 1995; Repetto, Webb, Garvan, & Washington, 2002) focused on the impact of interagency collaboration in the postsecondary transition process within the systematic reviews of Mazzotti et al. (2016) and Test et al. (2009). Bullis et al. (1995) found that interagency collaboration partnerships between schools and community agencies in their study had medium effect sizes on student outcome in the area of postsecondary education. Repetto et al. (2002) found that interagency collaboration between various transition team members and agencies had small to medium effect sizes in the area of employment. Overall results from these articles have identified interagency collaboration as having potential levels of evidence (Mazzotti et al., 2016; Test et al., 2009). Although interagency collaboration is applicable and important in the transition planning process, additional research in this area is still needed for interagency collaboration to reach evidence-based practice status.

## **Postsecondary Transition Team Members**

The transition team is made up of traditional IEP team members, though may have additional members. Specifically, transition team members are (a) the parent(s) of the student with a disability, (b) at least one regular education teacher that the child has been in contact with, (c) at least one special education teacher who has been in contact with the child, (d) a representative of the local education agency (e.g., child's school) who has knowledge about resource availability and the general education program, and can provide or supervise the provision of the instruction to be specifically designed and provided to the student, (e) an individual who can interpret the results of evaluation assessments and resulting instruction implications, (f) other individuals who have knowledge or "special expertise" regarding the

student, including related services personnel, as deemed appropriate and at the discretion of the parent or the agency (e.g., school), and lastly but most importantly, (g) the student with the disability, when appropriate (IDEIA, 2004).

Texas law has outlined additional team members, with the consent of the parent or adult student and if necessary (The Legal Framework, 2018a). Additional members may include a representative from a participating agency that is likely to pay for transition services, as well as other representatives from agencies that have previously provided services (e.g., Early Childhood Intervention program, etc.) or will provide services to the student (e.g., Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program, career and technical education program) (The Legal Framework, 2018a).

All members of the transition team play their own roles in the development of a student's transition plan. LSSPs can be members of the transition team that interpret the results of student assessments and provide instruction-related implications. It is important to note that although LSSPs can provide psychoeducational assessment services, including academic and cognitive assessment and interpretation, educational diagnosticians are typically tasked with completing these specific assessments due to the shortage of LSSPs employed in Texas schools.

Traditionally, LSSPs will solely provide and interpret psychological/behavioral assessment and other psychologically-based services (e.g., counseling, consultation) within the school setting in larger school districts.

### **Guidelines and Standards for School Psychologists and Licensed Specialists in School Psychology (LSSPs)**

In the pursuit of making an argument for increased involvement of LSSPs within the transition team, it is important to understand the guidelines and standards for which LSSPs

practice to then expand upon how their specific training can further contribute towards postsecondary transition planning.

*American Psychological Association (APA)*. The American Psychological Association (APA) is the national association of membership for professionals and scientists in psychology; this includes, but is not limited to licensed psychologists and school psychologists/LSSPs. There are several publications by APA that provide guidelines of best practice for licensed psychologists, including publications that pertain to school psychologists' involvement in the postsecondary transition process for students. One such publication, "Guidelines for Assessment of and Intervention With Persons With Disabilities," outlined how school psychologists may "conceptualize and implement more effective, fair, and ethical psychological assessments and interventions with persons with disabilities" (APA, 2012). These guidelines highlight the importance of "disability awareness, training, accessibility, and diversity" (APA, 2012). Furthermore, the guidelines note that school psychologists should be aware of IDEIA (2004), related testing, and IEP planning requirements in relation to this law. School psychologists should also be aware of the social and cultural diversity in persons with disabilities, including race, culture, religion, gender, and sexual identity (APA, 2012).

School psychologists often take a systems approach when working with individuals, which includes family members, peers, schools, and others (APA, 2012). By knowing how these systems work and becoming familiarized with the unique systems of each student with a disability, school psychologists are able to better produce content that can be directly related to postsecondary transition goals (e.g., independent living vs. living with the family, etc.) (APA, 2012). Additionally, school psychologists' training in assessment, paired with their understanding of the impact of demographic characteristics of the individual (e.g., geographic

location, SES, etc.), have equipped them with the knowledge to select appropriate transition assessments based on the diverse characteristics of the individual that can greatly contribute to transition work. School psychologists' understanding of how environmental factors (e.g., attitudes, misconceptions, social environment) and the presentation of a disability influences the developmental growth also greatly contribute to transition work. Additionally, school psychologists can play an active involvement in preparing a student for transition, including building students' self-awareness, self-determination, and self-advocacy skills, and identifying possible accommodations needed for the student to be better prepared for success in the workplace. School psychologists become aware of family strengths and challenges via working closely with the student, their family, and their teachers. With this knowledge, school psychologists can help contribute to the discussion of student needs as well as family supports post-graduation to aid in successful transition (APA, 2012).

APA also has guidelines regarding testing and assessment (APA, 2012). They indicate that school psychologists' training in assessment can add an extra dimension to transition assessment, as school psychologists typically take a thorough approach. Additionally, in being familiar with the results, school psychologists can establish effective plans to help students learn the skills to achieve their post-graduation. School psychologists' training on assessment selection and administration is rigorous, and so school psychologists have the skills to select transition assessments that are as "psychometrically sound, fair, comprehensive, and appropriate" as possible for the particular student, and they can interpret results of these assessments with an in-depth understanding of the student's disability. Additionally, school psychologists use an integrative approach to articulate conclusions about students. By using different sources of data (e.g., clinical interviews, behavioral assessments, etc.), school psychologists are well-equipped to

assist in making recommendations about workplace supports that will best help. This integrative approach is useful, especially when few qualitative measures have been properly and statistically validated, such as vocational assessments (APA, 2012).

Guidelines also outline school psychologists' standards in interventions (APA, 2012). School psychologists are able to work with students and their families in providing psychological interventions. Within transition work, school psychologists could possibly assist with on-site training and coordinate resources that could help the student later thrive in a post-graduation setting (e.g., workplace, college campus, etc.). School psychologists' work focuses on increasing the well-being of the student in the school setting, however, the skills learned in the schools could also be applied outside of school settings. Additionally, school psychologists can work with the student in self-determination and self-advocacy skills, as well as self-awareness – all of which can be greatly beneficial for students. School psychologists can also work on an organizational level, including as consultant or service provider trainer, that can additionally support the student at their work placements. School psychologists can additionally aid in providing health psychoeducation to students and their families to prevent secondary conditions, and assess for skills to be learned to address health issues (e.g., functional daily skills, talking to a doctor, making appointments, etc.) (APA, 2012).

***National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).*** The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) is a nationally-recognized organization exclusively for school psychologist membership. NASP has outlined guidelines that are related to postsecondary transition. NASP stated that school psychologists should collaborate with others, including school personnel, family members at home, and other agencies, to use evidence-based practice to design, implement, and evaluate practices in student transition at all levels, and from one

environment to another, such as school-to-work transitions (NASP, 2010a; NASP 2010b). Additionally, NASP encourages that school psychologists be knowledgeable in this practice during credentialing training (NASP, 2010c).

### **Previous Research on LSSP/School Psychologist Involvement in the Postsecondary Transition Process**

There have been few research studies surveying the involvement of LSSP/school psychologist involvement in the postsecondary transition process and barriers, however, studies that have been completed and published have found noteworthy results.

*Perceptions of LSSP Level of Involvement and Importance.* Staab's (1997) dissertation research included designing and randomly distributing a survey on a national scale to school psychologists who work at a secondary-level in schools. Results indicated that perceived importance of LSSP involvement in transition planning was highly rated by most respondents, though levels of involvement did not match perceived importance, and instead was low. Functions rated as "definitely should" be performed were those that were already "frequently" performed. It is noted that no functions listed were identified as "definitely should not" be performed.

Lillenstein (2002) completed dissertation research using a similar survey originally developed by Staab (1997) to determine the level of school psychologist involvement in Pennsylvania. Additionally, Lillenstein also sent this survey to transition coordinators in the state to gather their perception of school psychologist involvement. Results indicated that both school psychologists and transition coordinators believed that it is important for school psychologists to be involved in transition assessment (Lillenstein, 2002). However, school psychologists were more involved in assessment-related activities more than other transition-related activities such

as consultation (6.4%), direct service (2.4%), and (program planning/evaluation (1.6%) (Lillenstein, 2002). Results indicated that school psychologist respondents spent about an average of 4.45% of their time involved in transition-related activities. Lillenstein, Levinson, Sylvester, & Brady (2006) further evaluated this research and concluded that school psychologists and transition coordinators similarly indicated a higher rating of importance for school psychologists to become more involved in transition assessment planning than current involvement ratings.

Watson (2017) completed similar research on this topic in Arkansas. This research evaluated school psychologists involvement in the transition planning process for students with emotional disturbance. Findings indicated that licensed psychology professionals occasionally participated in all four areas of transition (consultation, assessment, direct services, program planning/evaluation) and indicated they “probably should” to “definitely should” be performing these activities.

***Noted Barriers to LSSP Involvement.*** Several barriers have been noted in past research that contribute to the lack of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process. Specific barriers related to capacity, including limited time allotted in providing services to secondary schools (Staab, 1997; Talapatra, Wilcox, Roof, & Hutchinson, 2019), large caseloads (Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002; Talapatra et al., 2019), large referral backlog (Lillenstein, 2002), and maintaining evaluation schedules (Staab, 1997), have been identified as difficult barriers for LSSP involvement. It is hypothesized that these barriers may be a direct result of the current national shortage of LSSPs/school psychologists. According to NASP (n.d.), it is estimated that nationally, the ratio of school psychologists to students range from 1:1211 to 1:5000 in various school districts, which significantly exceeds the recommended 1:500 ratio. This is concerning, as

this low capacity can lead to lowered quality and frequency of services, and limited options in providing services beyond what is legally mandated (NASP, n.d.).

Other noted specific barriers relate to the assigned role of LSSPs and their involvement in postsecondary transition planning. This includes the lack of requirement in job description (Lillenstein, 2002; Talapatra et al., 2019) and assignment of tasks to other personnel (Watson, 2017). Special education teachers/administrators (Morningstar, Bassett, Kochhar-Bryant, Cashman, & Wehmeyer, 2012; Gelber, Volk, & Bruder, 2021) and transition coordinators (Gelber et al., 2021) have historically taken on the sole responsibility of postsecondary transition planning, though secondary education reform has encouraged increased interdisciplinary collaboration (Morningstar et al., 2012). Lack of LSSP involvement has been noted as a concern because LSSPs, as opposed to other related professionals, are especially trained in assessment, and have the expertise to assess areas that are particularly vital in successful and effective postsecondary transition planning, such as adaptive or executive functioning skills (Gelber et al., 2021). Lack of clarity in these areas of expertise within the postsecondary transition planning process may lead to uninformed and ineffective decisions regarding transition plan services (Gelber et al., 2021).

Lack of specific knowledge and training geared towards postsecondary transition planning (Ducharme, Roach, Wellons, 2020; Gelber et al., 2021; Talapatra et al., 2019) have also been identified as large barriers to LSSP involvement. Past research has noted that small percentages of LSSPs have been provided specific training in graduate school, professional developmental opportunities, and on-the job training (Ducharme et al., 2020; Gelber et al., 2021). The amount of this training seems to be minimal at best, as evidenced by one study averaging a total of 18 hours-worth of training in their sample (Gelber et al., 2021).

## **Potential Benefits of Increased LSSP Involvement in Postsecondary Transition Planning**

When considering the breadth of training that LSSPs receive to support students in various areas, the involvement of LSSPs could potentially be very beneficial in the transition planning process, should the barriers to their participation be addressed.

*Assessment and Development of Student Skills.* A primary component of LSSP training is the assessment of academic, cognitive, and psychological functioning of students, while actively considering the student's development and overall functioning in a variety of settings, such as school, home, and community. LSSP's are also trained to play an active role in providing direct services to build students' skill deficits in these areas.

Self-advocacy and self-determination skills have been identified as being beneficial towards post-graduation success, with potential levels of evidence (Test et al., 2009). These particular skills directly relate towards special education students advocating for themselves in reaching their personal goals, and include goal-setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation skills (as stated in Kleinert, Harrison, Fisher, & Kleinert, 2010). LSSPs can use their training in providing evidence-based direct service to assist students in building these particular skills in practice via students leading their own IEP meetings (Hengen & Weaver, 2018, Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018) which can effectively address a historical topic of concern. Students can additionally use these skills to advocate for their own supports on a college campus, for example (Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018).

Life skills can also be addressed by LSSP intervention, and can improve the outcome of student success post-graduation. Targeting students' executive skills, which includes organization, planning, time-management, and other related skills, can be extremely helpful in building students' skillsets and confidence in being able build their study skills and plan for their

college classwork requirements, for example (Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018). Social skills could also be a target of interest, and could help students in their social experiences on a college campus in communicating and resolving conflicts with their professors and peers, for example (Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018).

LSSPs can also aim to target building students' knowledge of self. Specifically, they may collaboratively discuss with the student about their disability, and identify the student's strengths, learning style, current accommodations, and interests (Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018) that could aid in their own use of self-advocacy and self-determinism. LSSPs can additionally explain the difference between IDEIA and ADA, and how the student's rights and support options may look like in each setting (Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018, Tyre, Johnson, & Moy, 2018).

***Increased Effectiveness of Postsecondary Transition Plan.*** Data serves as a credible source of evidence for making well-informed decisions, and something important to consider when choosing effective interventions. The services offered by LSSPs are largely rooted in and driven by data.

LSSPs seek data using various methods, including interviews, observations, questionnaires, protocols, and other forms of data collection. Sources of these data are gathered from not only school personnel, but also the student and their caregivers. With this cumulation of data, paired with training in cultural sensitivity, LSSPs are able to provide plan recommendations that are individualistically tailored to the student, and can encourage buy-in from the student's caregivers (Tyre et al., 2018).

Additionally, LSSPs can collect and provide Response to Intervention (RTI) data to the team in these intervention endeavors (Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018). This can provide vital

information regarding the effectiveness of interventions towards the student meeting their goal, and can better inform decisions made regarding the postsecondary transition plan. LSSPs may also provide data-driven consultation to school and non-school personnel in the development of student's targeted skills (Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018).

***Increased Efficiency in Postsecondary Transition Planning.*** Efficiency of services within the school setting is often a point of concern, due to limited time and personnel resources. There are several identified ways that an LSSP may decrease the amount of time needed for the postsecondary transition team to effectively and efficiently create a postsecondary transition plan. As noted above, the work that could be undertaken by LSSPs can lend itself to informed recommendations for the student's postsecondary transition plan (Ducharme et al., 2020). The LSSP can contribute towards the formation of the Summary of Progress (SOP) that is required within the student's IEP (Tyre et al., 2018). Additionally, the LSSP can complete a comprehensive and recent evaluation to provide specific postsecondary recommendations, which can additionally serve as the documentation required for students to apply for supports within the college setting (Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018). Lastly, LSSPs could provide early intervention for students who have significant disabilities or who are considered to be at-risk, which could increase success towards students' postsecondary transition goals (Tyre et al., 2018).

It is clear that LSSPs could provide a variety of services that could be beneficial towards postsecondary transition planning. The specific training and practice guidelines for LSSPs have made them especially qualified to provide additional insight into transition planning in various areas (e.g., APA, 2012; NASP 2010a; NASP 2010b; NASP 2010c), which could lend itself to more effective transition planning and services for students. It is unfortunate, however, that

previous studies have indicated that LSSPs are less involved in the process, although their participation is considered important by postsecondary transition team members (Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002; Watson, 2017). Additionally, previous studies have found that LSSPs are engaged in the transition process primarily through assessment, and less so through other activities that are relevant to the transition planning process such as consultation, direct services, and program planning/evaluation (e.g., Lillenstein, 2002; Watson, 2017), which is limited in scope.

Although LSSP involvement and importance of involvement in the postsecondary transition process has been assessed in other states, it has not been assessed in Texas thus far, to this researcher's knowledge. As a state that not only serves a noticeably large amount of special education students in the United States with a vast variety of district demographics, but also has the unique set-up of employing both LSSPs and educational diagnosticians to perform assessment-related tasks, gathering additional research in Texas could greatly add to the research literature. It is the aim that this current research study will add to the current literature in this concerning and under-researched area of postsecondary transition planning, and will address such gaps and inform a best practice for LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning process.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS

#### **Research Design**

The research design is a cross-sectional study. A questionnaire originally developed by Staab (1996) and later amended by Lillenstein (2002) was used by this researcher to collect data from participants using the Qualtrics online system.

***Sampling Procedures.*** To best sample and capture the differences in Texas school districts and their respective public schools, district samples were identified using the National Center for Education (NCES) 2017-2018 categorical dataset, accessed by this researcher in June 2019. In collaboration with the Texas Education Agency (TEA), the NCES categorizes Texas school district types based on district population size as well as its proximity to urban areas. The NCES uses four basic category types, including City, Suburb, Town, and Rural, and then further categorizes them into twelve district subtypes, including City-Large, City-Midsized, City-Small, Suburb-Large, Suburb-Midsized, Suburb-Small, Town-Fringe, Town-Distant, Town-Remote, Rural-Fringe, Rural-Distant, and Rural-Remote.

In the process of identifying a sample, this researcher removed school districts that contained charter schools as indicated by the NCES dataset from the sampling pool. Stratified sampling and simple random sampling was used to identify 10 districts per subtype. It is noted that the Suburb-Small subtype had only seven districts listed, and so all districts in this sub-type were used. All other subtypes had more than ten districts listed, and ten were randomly identified per subtype to be sampled. In conclusion, a total of 117 school districts were identified as the initial sample.

This researcher and two other doctoral school psychology students gathered eligible participant email information via school district/school websites. It is noted that email addresses from secondary-level schools that were non-public schools or specialty schools (e.g., STEM, college prep, charter, visually impaired, deaf and blind, juvenile justice, alternative placement) were not collected. A first batch of questionnaires were emailed to identified eligible participants within the City-Large, Suburb-Midsized, and Suburb-Large sub-type districts via the Qualtrics system in May 2021, and closed after remaining open for three weeks. After removal of duplicate, bounced, and failed emails, a total of 12,161 emails (Appendix A) were sent successfully. Due to missing email addresses for potentially eligible participants, an additional 29 follow-up emails (after removal of bounced emails) were sent to relevant administrators requesting that they send along the questionnaire to specific eligible participants who were not listed on websites within their district/school (Appendix B).

It is noted that after this first batch of questionnaires were sent, several school districts identified within the sample requested that this researcher seek additional permission from the district to conduct this study. This researcher identified 16 total school districts within the entire sample that would require additional permission. Applications were sent to several school districts to seek this additional permission, though requests were not responded to within examiner's timeline, and any data collected from participants identifying as working within these specific school districts were discarded from the final data set. The remaining batch of questionnaires were emailed to identified eligible participants within the City-Midsized, City-Small, Suburb-Large, Suburb-Small, Town-Fringe, Town-Distant, Town-Remote, Rural-Fringe, Rural-Distant, Rural-Remote, and partially Suburb-Midsized sub-type districts via the Qualtrics system in August 2021, and closed after remaining open for three weeks. After removal of

duplicate, bounced, and failed emails, a total of 10,514 emails were sent successfully. Due to missing email addresses for potentially eligible participants, an additional 94 follow-up emails were sent to relevant administrators requesting that they send along the questionnaire to specific eligible participants who were not listed on websites within their district/school.

In response to the low number of responses from LSSPs within the data set, 53 additional email reminders (after removal of bounced emails) were sent to relevant administrators again requesting that the survey be sent to LSSPs in late August 2021 (Appendix C). This researcher also posted the survey via Facebook to two LSSP-related groups (Appendix D) in attempts of gaining additional responses from LSSPs in Texas.

In summary, a total of 101 identified Texas school districts and were used in the final sample, and a total of 22,675 emails were successfully sent to potentially eligible participants across Texas, after removing duplicate, bounced, and failed emails. Due to lack of LSSP responses, additional requests for distribution of survey were sent to various identified school district personnel. The survey was also posted by the researcher via social media (i.e., Facebook) in topic groups related to LSSPs, and closed after two weeks.

In either format, participants were provided a Qualtrics link directing them to the Qualtrics consent form and questionnaire. At the conclusion of the survey, participants were given the opportunity to click a separate link that took them to a separate Qualtrics survey to input their email information to be entered in a random drawing for eight \$25 gift cards.

A total of 340 participants had submitted the questionnaire, with 235 participants accessing the questionnaire through their email, and six participants accessing the questionnaire via Facebook. After review, 99 questionnaire responses were removed from the data due to either of the following: (a) did not give consent to participate in research, (b) did not meet

eligibility requirements, (c) skipped questions, or (4) had required additional school district permission to be able to use participant data.

## **Participants**

Eligibility criteria for participants to participate in this research study were as follows: (a) participant was currently hired by a Texas school district, (b) provided services on a secondary education level (e.g., middle school, intermediate school, high school), and (c) currently hired as one of the following within their school district: Licensed Specialist in School Psychology (LSSP), transition specialist/coordinator, special education director/coordinator/supervisor/administrator, educational diagnostician, special education teacher, general education teacher, secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal), secondary guidance counselor. Initial survey questions were used as screening questions to assess for participant eligibility. Participants who indicated that they did not meet full eligibility criteria were directed to the end of the survey, and their data were not used in analyses. A final total of 241 useable questionnaires for data analyses.

## **Instrument**

The researcher gained permission from both Staab (1996) and Lillenstein (2002) to use their questionnaires with slight modifications as needed for this current study. Modifications made by the current researcher were largely based on adjusting the application of questions to participants in Texas, as well as additional questions to answer research questions. This survey contained 19 questions in various formats (e.g., yes/no, multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank) pertaining to eligibility, demographics, training/experience background, and perception questions regarding the role and involvement of LSSPs within the transition team. An additional 82 questions were posed via Likert scales pertaining to the participant's perception of the current

involvement and importance of involvement of LSSPs within the transition team. The questionnaire was developed and distributed via the online Qualtrics system (Appendix E).

It is noted that this researcher had distributed questionnaires during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, and so this researcher anticipated that responses to questions regarding perception of LSSP involvement within the transition planning process to be especially skewed due to potentially recent major differences in involvement as a result of COVID-19 restrictions (e.g., stay-at-home mandates, school shutdowns, social distancing, sick leave, etc.). To best capture typical LSSP involvement within this process in Texas, the researcher included multiple reminders for participants to respond to these specific questions about LSSP involvement during a typical school year outside of the COVID-19 pandemic.

### **Variables**

There are several dependent variables identified related to involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process, including (a) the primary role of LSSP involvement (e.g., Consultation, Psychological and Psycho-educational Assessment, Direct Service, Program Planning and Evaluation), (b) the frequency of LSSP involvement, (c) the importance of LSSP involvement, (d) the level of awareness of district policy in this process of all members, and (d) identified barriers to LSSP involvement. These variables are rated based on multiple choice options or Likert scales.

Two independent variables were identified for this study, including (a) group membership and (b) district type (e.g., city, suburb, town, rural).

It is noted that participants were sorted into two participant groups for some analyses. For ease of reference, shorthand names were created to describe each group. One group is referred to as the “LSSPs” group, and is comprised solely of data answered by LSSPs in the sample. The

second group is referred to as the “Others” group, and is comprised of data answered by other transition team members in the sample who did not identify as LSSPs.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current perceived frequency and importance of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process in various Texas school districts as perceived by LSSPs (“LSSPs” group) and other transition team members (“Others” group). This study also investigated the potential barriers for LSSPs in pursuing additional involvement in this process. This chapter provides results divided into eight sections, which include (a) a priori power analysis for sample size determination, (b) participant demographics, (c) identified primary roles of LSSPs by district type, (d) awareness of district-level guidelines for various areas of postsecondary transition planning, (e) the perceived frequency of LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning and observed differences by district type, (f) the perceived importance of LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning, (g) the alignment of perceptions regarding the frequency and importance of LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning, and (h) the identified barriers to LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning. Results will also provide brief reflection that compares the results from this current study with the previous results of Staab (1996) and Lillenstein (2002).

#### **A Priori Analysis for Sample Size Determination**

An a priori t-test, two tailed test of significance test was used to calculate the required sample size needed to reach power given desired alpha ( $\alpha$ ) and effect size (Cohen’s  $d$ ). The G\*Power online program was used for calculation. As the instrument used was largely reflective of the instrument modified by Lillenstein (2002), the researcher referred to Lillenstein’s (2002) power analyses parameters for determining alpha ( $\alpha$ ) and effect size. When determining the

allocation ratio for this analysis, the researcher anticipated having a larger Others group than LSSPs group due to the volume of emails sent per role, and due to the typical makeup of a school district (e.g., a school district would have more general education and special education teachers than LSSPs, for example). The researcher allocated N2/N1 as 2/1 for this analysis. A priori results for a t-test two-tailed test of significance indicated that to achieve a power of 0.80 with the effect size ( $d$ ) set at 0.5 and the alpha ( $\alpha$ ) set at 0.05, it is suggested that a total sample size of 144 participants is needed, with 48 participants belonging to the LSSPs group and 96 participants belonging to the Others group.

These sample size criteria were not met at the conclusion of data collection. The LSSPs group comprised a total of 20 LSSPs, and the Others group comprised of 221 other transition team members. Additional post-hoc analyses were completed as noted to accommodate for this difference in group size.

### **Participant Demographics**

Participant demographic data gathered included participant's current role, district type, highest degree obtained, certification and/or licenses (if any), previous experience in working within the special education field in any capacity, training in postsecondary transition, their comfort level in participating and/or completing activities related to postsecondary transition planning, and participation in a postsecondary transition IEP planning meeting.

**Group and District Type.** A total of 241 of the useable participant surveys were analyzed. The LSSPs group included 20 LSSPs. The Others group included one transition specialist/coordinator, six special education director/coordinator/supervisor/administrators, 19 educational diagnosticians, 120 secondary general education teachers, 34 special education teachers, 13 secondary administrators (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.), nine secondary

guidance counselors, 11 other general/secondary education personnel, and eight participants listing multiple roles that are non-LSSP.

Table 1 displays group membership organized by district type. Additional specific membership information by role can be found in Appendix F. The largest participant group present within this sample were secondary general education teachers ( $n = 120$ , 49.79%), followed by special education teachers ( $n = 34$ , 14.11%), and LSSPs ( $n = 20$ , 8.30%). Additionally, most participants were employed within City districts ( $n = 112$ ), followed by Suburb districts ( $n = 63$ ), Town districts ( $n = 42$ ), and Rural districts ( $n = 24$ ). These unbalanced groups across memberships were taken into consideration when performing subsequent analyses.

Table 1  
*District Type Membership*

District Type	Group			
	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
City	6	30	104	47.06
Suburb	7	35	56	25.34
Town	2	10	40	18.10
Rural	5	25	19	8.60

*Note.* This table provides the frequency ( $n$ ) and percentage (%) values of district type within group membership.

**Highest Degree Obtained.** Table 2 displays the highest degrees obtained by participants in the sample within groups. Additional specific degree information by role can be found in Appendix G. The majority of all participants across groups reported having obtained a Master’s degree as their highest level of education.

Table 2  
*Highest Degree Obtained*

Degree	Group			
	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Bachelor's	0	0	85	38.46
Specialist	2	10	0	0
Master's	12	60	121	54.75
Doctoral	5	25	12	5.43
Other	1	5	3	1.36

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of highest degree obtained within group membership.

***Certifications and Licensures Obtained.*** Table 3 displays certifications and licensures obtained by group membership. (i.e., principal certification, licensed professional counselor license). All participants indicated that they had obtained at least one certification or licensure except for three participants. “Other” certifications or licensures included registered nurse license, administrator certification, mid-management certification, principal certification, English/Spanish Language certification, bilingual education certification, Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor certification, school librarian certification, vocational certifications, superintendent certification, school counselor certification, instructional leadership certification, and/or paraprofessional certification.

Table 3  
*Certifications and Licensures Obtained*

License/Certification	Group			
	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Licensed Specialist in School Psychology certification	20	100	0	0
Licensed Psychologist licensure	1	5	0	0
National Certification School Psychologist certification	6	30	0	0
Transition specialist certification	0	0	3	1.36
Educational diagnostician certification	1	5	24	10.86

Table 3 Continued  
*Certifications and Licensures Obtained*

License/Certification	Group			
	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Special education teacher certification	3	15	70	31.67
General education teacher certification	2	10	196	88.69
Other	8	40	41	18.55
None	0	0	3	1.36

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of licensure/certification obtained within group membership.

**Training.** Table 4 displays information regarding participants’ training in postsecondary transition planning. Additional specific training information by role can be found in Appendix H. LSSP participants seemed to receive training mostly from on-the-job training ( $n = 16$ , 6.64%), collaborative work experience with transition coordinator and/or special education teachers ( $n = 15$ , 6.22%), and in-services provided by own school or school district ( $n = 12$ , 4.98%). No LSSPs reported having learned this topic in undergraduate coursework, and only a few ( $n = 3$ , 1.24%) indicated having received any kind of graduate course experience on this topic. “Other” trainings listed included personal experience (i.e., family member of a special education student), professional experience in different roles, education service centers within TEA regions, alternative certification program, Texas OnCourse (online training program), and/or trainings provided outside of the school district. It is noted that one LSSP and 26 within the Others group reported that they have not received training in postsecondary transition planning ( $n = 27$ , 11.20%).

Table 4  
*Trainings Obtained*

Training Types	Group			
	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Undergraduate courses specific to transition	0	0	20	9.05
Undergraduate courses that included information on transition	0	0	35	15.84
Graduate courses specific to transition	1	5	21	9.50
Graduate courses that included information on transition	2	10	43	19.46
Graduate program in transition	0	0	1	0.45
In- services provided by personnel within your own school and/or district	12	60	130	58.82
Workshops/seminars outside of your school district, initiated on your own	8	40	72	32.58
Outside coursework or researching, initiated on your own	1	5	35	15.84
On-the-job training	16	80	145	65.61
Collaborative work experience with transition coordinator/secondary special education teachers	15	75	89	40.27
Other	0	0	9	4.07
None	1	5	26	11.76

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of training obtained within group membership.

**Preparedness.** Participants' perceived preparedness of involvement and/or completing activities that are related to postsecondary transition planning are located in Table 5. Additional specific preparedness by role can be found in Appendix I. In summary, half of the LSSPs group ( $n = 10$ ) reported that they believe they are adequately prepared to engage in this process, while other LSSPs reported they have some information but need more ( $n = 8$ ) or are not prepared ( $n = 2$ ). Among the Others group, the majority of participants believe they are either adequately prepared ( $n = 76$ ) or have some information but need more ( $n = 76$ ). Others indicated that they are well prepared ( $n = 36$ ), or not prepared ( $n = 33$ ).

Table 5  
*Preparedness*

Preparedness	Group			
	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Well prepared	0	0	36	16.29
Adequately prepared	10	50	76	34.39
Have some information, but need more	8	40	76	34.39
Not prepared	2	10	33	14.93

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of perceived preparedness within group membership.

***Routine Participation.*** Information regarding who typically participates in postsecondary transition planning activities are located in Table 6. It is noted that participants identified that LSSPs are typically involved less than a quarter of the time ( $n = 49, 20.33\%$ ). “Others” identified included the ARD facilitator, college representative, career and technology education teacher, service providers, specialists if needed, and/or were unsure.

Table 6  
*Routine Participation*

Role	<i>n</i>	%
School Psychologist (LSSP)	49	20.33
Transition Specialist/Coordinator Special Education	105	43.57
Coordinator/Director/Supervisor/Administrator	119	49.38
Educational Diagnostician	145	60.17
Secondary General Education Teacher	131	54.36
Secondary Special Education Teacher	176	73.03
Secondary Administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.)	117	48.55
Secondary Guidance Counselor	92	38.17
School Nurse	12	4.98
School Social Worker	18	7.47
Parent	178	73.86
Student	181	75.10
Speech and Language Clinician/Pathologist	32	13.28
Occupational Therapist	22	9.13

Table 6 Continued  
*Routine Participation*

Role	<i>n</i>	%
Physical Therapist	16	6.64
Vision Specialist	19	7.88
Hearing Specialist	15	6.22
Mobility Specialist	14	5.81
Assistive Technology Representative	13	5.39
School-Based Probation Officer	4	1.66
Work Site Supervisor	15	6.22
Agency Representative (e.g., MHMR, Texas Workforce Commission/VR Counselor, etc.)	29	12.03
Requested Visitor/Advocate	14	5.81
Other(s)	20	8.30

*Note.* This table provides frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of personnel who routinely participates in postsecondary transition planning activities.

***Experience and IEP Participation.*** Participants provided information regarding their experience working within the special education field in any capacity. The years and months of experience had a range of 0 years, 0 months to 46 years, 2 months. The mean (*M*) was 12.8 years, with a standard deviation (*SD*) of 9.44. Table 7 displays the amount of experience per group and role. Additional specific experience information by role can be found in Appendix J.

Participants experience in participating at least once within the postsecondary transition planning process was measured with a “yes” and “no” question. The majority of LSSPs (*n* = 17) and Others (*n* = 173) indicated that they have participated in this process, while fewer amounts of LSSPs (*n* = 3) and Others (*n* = 48) indicated that they have not participated in this process.

Table 7  
*Experience*

Experience (Years-Months)	Group			
	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
None	0	0	15	6.79
0-1 to 0-11	0	0	2	0.90

Table 7 Continued  
*Experience*

Experience (Years-Months)	Group			
	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
1-0 to 4-11	1	5	35	15.84
5-0 to 9-11	6	30	40	18.10
10-0 to 14-11	5	25	36	16.29
15-0 to 19-11	3	15	41	18.55
20-0 to 29-11	3	15	41	18.55
30+	2	10	11	4.98

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of experience within the special education field by group membership.

**Utilization.** Information regarding the perceived utilization of LSSPs in postsecondary transition planning activities are located in Table 8. LSSPs group participants indicated a split between their perception of being under-utilized or utilized appropriately, and the Others group mostly indicated that LSSPs are under-utilized in this process, though was also largely split in opinion.

Table 8  
*LSSP Utilization*

Utilization	Group			
	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Under-utilized	10	50	125	56.56
Utilized appropriately	10	50	91	41.18
Over-utilized	0	0	5	2.26

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of perception of LSSP utilization by group membership.

## Research Questions

**Research Question 1.** *What is the primary role that LSSPs typically engage in the*

*postsecondary transition planning process in school districts? Is there a difference between district types?* Table 9 displays the amount of experience per group and role.

The majority of this sample identified the primary role of LSSPs within their school district was to complete psychological and psychoeducation assessment services ( $n = 138, 57.26\%$ ). A chi-square test of independence was performed to determine if there was a relationship between primary role of LSSPs and district type among responses. The relation between these variables were not significant,  $X^2(9, N = 241), p = 0.614$ , indicating that this role for LSSPs may be common among district types within this sample.

Table 9  
*Primary Role of LSSPs*

Part	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Consultation	0	0	49	22.17
Assessment	19	95	119	53.85
Direct	1	5	34	15.38
Planning/Eval	0	0	19	8.60

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of the primary role of LSSPs as perceived by group membership.

***Research Question 2. How frequently are LSSPs involved in postsecondary transition planning-related activities as perceived by LSSPs and other transition team members? Is there a significant difference in the frequency of LSSP involvement across different district types?***

Per Part, participants were asked to rate their perception of LSSP frequency of involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process on several item statements using a Likert scale of 1 (Never), 2 (Occasionally or 1-3 times per month or every other month), 3 (Frequently, or about 1-2 times per week), and 4 (Regularly, or about 3+ per week). There was also an “I don’t know” option. This “I don’t know” response was treated as a missing variable in data analyses, and

analyses used listwise deletion procedures for calculations (i.e., they were not included in the analyses). Responses per Part were added together to create a total sum (*n*) per Part for analyses.

Descriptive statistics per Part can be found in Table 10. The majority of participants indicated a perception that LSSPs “never” engaged in the postsecondary transition planning process across all Parts. It is noted that an additional majority of participants indicated that they were unsure of the frequency of LSSP involvement in this process.

Table 10  
*Perceived Frequency of LSSP Involvement*

Part	Never		Occasionally		Frequently		Regularly		Unsure	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Consultation	951	32.88	605	20.92	262	9.06	145	5.01	929	32.10
Assessment	541	36.05	551	23.50	219	9.33	181	7.71	855	36.40
Direct	690	31.81	443	20.42	166	7.65	135	6.22	735	33.89
Planning/Eval	869	36.06	422	17.51	125	5.19	87	3.61	907	37.63

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of perceived frequency of LSSP involvement within the postsecondary transition planning process, by group membership.

Independent samples two-tailed t-tests were used to analyze the difference between LSSP and Others responses. The Welch’s t-test was used as a post-hoc test for significant t-tests to determine if the assumption of equal variances were met for significant results, as needed. Results are displayed in Table 11. Responses indicated that there were overall significant differences in responses between the LSSPs and Others groups within the Consultation, Direct Services, and Program Planning and Evaluation Parts. Overall, responses from the Others group would rate the frequency of LSSP involvement higher than responses from the LSSPs group.

Additional analyses were conducted to determine which items were significant per significant Part for informational purposes, and are located in Appendix K.

Table 11

*T-Test Results for Perceived Frequency of LSSP Involvement*

Part	LSSPs Group		Others Group		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i> <sup>a</sup>	<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>			
Consultation	19	16.89 (5.48)	107	22.53 (9.62)	-3.61	43.38	< 0.00*
Assessment	20	18.50 (4.49)	109	20.11 (8.01)	-1.27	47.43	= 0.21
Direct	20	13.10 (2.38)	118	16.47 (6.58)	-4.18	83.28	< 0.00*
Planning/Eval	20	11.70 (1.63)	108	16.42 (7.45)	-5.87	126.27	< 0.00*

*Note.* This table provides the t-test results of participants' perception of LSSP involvement frequency in the postsecondary transition planning process. *a* = Welch's test degrees of freedom reported. The asterisk symbol (\*) notes a significant *p* value at the  $\alpha = 0.05$  level per question.

One-way ANOVAs were completed to determine if there were significant differences in responses between personnel from different district types. The Levene's test was used to determine if the assumption of equal variances were met for significant one-way ANOVAs as needed. Results are located in Table 12. Results indicated that there were no significant differences between district types.

Table 12

*One-Way ANOVA Results for LSSP Involvement by District Type*

Part	District Types						<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	Between Groups			Within Groups				
	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>		
Consultation	546.86	3	182.29	10306.44	122	84.48	2.16	0.10
Assessment	63.68	3	21.23	72.83.81	125	58.27	0.36	0.78
Direct	47.20	3	15.73	5320.77	134	39.71	0.40	0.76
Planning/Eval	31.75	3	10.58	6338.12	124	51.11	0.21	0.89

*Note.* This table provides the one-way ANOVA results of participants' perception of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process per Part by district type. The asterisk symbol (\*) notes a significant *p* value at the  $\alpha = 0.05$  level per question.

***Research Question 3. How important is LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning-related activities as perceived by LSSPs and other transition team members? Is there a significant difference reported between these two groups?*** Per Part, participants were asked to

rate their perception of the importance of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process on several item statements using a Likert scale of 1 (Definitely Not), 2 (Probably Should Not), 3 (Probably Should) and 4 (Definitely Should). Responses per Part were added together to create a total sum (*n*) per Part for analyses.

Descriptive statistics per Part can be found in Table 13. The majority of participants indicated a perception that LSSPs “probably should” engage in the postsecondary transition planning process across all Parts.

Table 13  
*Perceived Importance of LSSP Involvement*

Part	Definitely Not		Probably Should Not		Probably Should		Definitely Should	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Consultation	68	2.35	189	6.53	1514	52.35	1121	38.76
Assessment	45	1.87	143	5.93	1185	49.17	1037	43.03
Direct	56	2.58	155	7.15	1089	50.21	869	40.06
Planning/Eval	151	6.27	244	10.12	1205	50	810	33.61

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage of perceived importance of LSSP involvement within the postsecondary transition planning process, by group membership.

Independent samples two-tailed t-tests were used to analyze the difference between LSSP and Others responses. The Welch’s t-test was used as a post-hoc test for significant t-tests to determine if the assumption of equal variances were met for significant results, as needed. Results are displayed in Table 14. Responses indicated that there were overall significant differences in responses between the LSSPs and Others groups within the Consultation, Direct Services, and Program Planning and Evaluation Parts. Overall, responses from the Others group would rate the importance of LSSP involvement higher than responses from the LSSPs group.

Additional analyses were conducted to determine which items were significant per significant Part for informational purposes, and are located in Appendix L.

Table 14

*T-Test Results for Perceived Importance of LSSP Involvement*

Part	LSSPs Group		Others Group		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i> <sup>a</sup>	<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>			
Consultation	20	34.65 (8.85)	221	39.72 (5.74)	-3.60	239	< 0.00*
Assessment	20	31.95 (6.40)	221	33.46 (5.22)	-1.22	239	= 0.23
Direct	20	26.15 (5.45)	221	29.80 (4.92)	-3.15	239	< 0.00*
Planning/Eval	20	24.90 (8.91)	221	31.66 (6.69)	-4.20	239	< 0.00*

*Note.* This table provides the t-test results of participants' perception of the importance of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process. *a* = Welch's test degrees of freedom reported. The asterisk symbol (\*) notes a significant *p* value at the  $\alpha = 0.05$  level per question.

***Research Question 4. Is the reported perceived importance of LSSP involvement aligned with the reported perceived frequency of LSSP involvement?*** Descriptive statistics and correlations tests were used to analyze this question. Due to missing data in the “frequency” parts of questions, listwise deletion was used in correlation analyses. Correlation results indicate that there were small to moderate positive correlations between frequency and importance of LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning across all Parts. All correlation data are located in Table 15.

Table 15

*Correlation Results for Alignment of Frequency and Importance*

Question	<i>n</i>	<i>r</i>	Effect Size Value
Consultation	126	0.32	Moderate
Assessment	129	0.22	Small
Direct	138	0.15	Small
Planning/Eval	128	0.33	Moderate

*Note.* This table provides correlation results of participants' perception of the frequency and importance of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process per Part. Effect size values are identified as the following: small = 0.10-0.29, moderate = 0.30-0.49, large = 0.50+.

***Research Question 5. What are the identified barriers that prevent LSSPs from participating more frequently in the postsecondary transition planning process?*** Descriptive statistics were used to analyze this question. Results are located in Table 16. “LSSPs’ current

caseload is large and there is not enough time for them to participate in transition planning” was the barrier that was most often identified by all participants ( $n = 95, 16.67\%$ ), as well as by group. The next largest overall identified barriers were “LSSPs are spread too thin due to the time used to go to various buildings they serve within the school district” ( $n = 82, 14.39\%$ ), followed by “There is a lack of awareness that LSSPs could contribute to transition planning” ( $n = 74, 12.98\%$ ). “Other” barriers listed included contracting LSSPs and so they do not attend, LSSPs are having to fill so many roles due to shortages, school districts not having LSSPs, procedures lacking LSSP invite, unfamiliar with LSSP, or being unsure of barriers.

Table 16  
*Identified Barriers to LSSP Involvement*

Question	LSSPs Group		Others Group		Total (overall)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
No barriers	0	0	56	100	56	23.24
LSSPs job description does not include postsecondary transition planning	5	13.89	31	86.11	36	14.94
LSSPs are not interested in postsecondary transition planning	1	9.09	10	90.91	11	4.56
LSSPs are not trained in postsecondary transition planning	6	26.07	17	73.91	23	9.54
LSSPs’ current caseload is large and there is not enough time for them to participate in transition planning	16	16.84	79	83.16	95	39.42
LSSPs are trying to keep up with current referrals for special education (i.e., “referral backlog”)	14	23.73	45	76.27	59	24.48
There is little or no required involvement of LSSPs at the secondary level in the school district	3	7.5	37	92.5	40	16.60
LSSPs are spread too thin due to the time used to go to various buildings they serve within the school district	12	14.63	70	85.37	82	34.02
The district role of LSSPs do not include transition planning	11	25	33	75	44	18.26

Table 16 Continued  
*Identified Barriers to LSSP Involvement*

Question	LSSPs Group		Others Group		Total (overall)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
The LSSP is not invited to participate in transition planning	8	24.24	25	75.76	33	13.69
There is a lack of awareness that LSSPs could contribute to transition planning	12	16.22	62	83.78	74	30.71
Other	0	0	17	100	17	7.05

*Note.* This table provides the frequencies (*n*) and percentage (%) values of participants' perception of the barriers to LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process.

***Research Question 6. What is the level of awareness of all transition team members regarding written and specific guidelines for postsecondary transition planning-related activities within their school district?*** Results of this exploratory question indicated that out of the total number of participants (*n* = 241), more than half of participants are aware that their district has specific and written guidelines for selecting transition assessments (*n* = 148, 61.41%), who administers transition assessments (*n* = 164, 68.05%), and who is involved in transition planning (*n* = 172, 71.37%) in the postsecondary transition planning process. Table 17 displays responses by group membership.

Table 17  
*Level of Awareness of District Guidelines*

Guidelines	LSSPs		Others	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Selects Transition Assessments	12	60	136	61.54
Who Administers	4	20	16	7.24
Who Is Involved	4	20	69	31.22

*Note.* This table provides the frequency (*n*) and percentage (%) values of awareness of district guidelines across items within group membership.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

Previous studies (e.g., Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002, Watson, 2017) have investigated the state of school psychologist involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process across the United States. The purpose of this current study aimed to expand this research geographically via questionnaire distribution within the southern United States, specifically within Texas school districts, as well as to identify and address barriers. Research questions for this study were as follows:

1. What is the primary role that LSSPs typically engage in the postsecondary transition planning process in school districts? Is there a difference between district types?
2. How frequently are LSSPs involved in postsecondary transition planning-related activities as perceived by LSSPs and other transition team members? Is there a significant difference in the frequency of LSSP involvement across different district types?
3. How important is LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning-related activities as perceived by LSSPs and other transition team members? Is there a significant difference reported between these two groups?
4. Is the reported perceived importance of LSSP involvement aligned with the reported perceived frequency of LSSP involvement?
5. What are the identified barriers that prevent LSSPs from participating more frequently in the postsecondary transition planning process?
6. What is the level of awareness of all transition team members regarding written and specific guidelines for postsecondary transition planning-related activities within their school district?

Various descriptive statistics were gathered regarding participant demographics. Important to note from demographic information is the reported training and preparedness of participants. Results indicated that the LSSPs group and the Others group identified on-the-job training as the major source of training regarding postsecondary transition planning. On-the-job training as a major source of training has also been identified in previous research (Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002; Watson, 2017). The majority of LSSPs within this sample indicated that they lacked graduate coursework in the area of postsecondary transition planning, with only a few LSSPs reported having received any kind of graduate coursework experience on this topic. This is similar to previous research findings (Lillenstein, 2002). Half of the LSSPs group in this sample indicated they felt adequately prepared to complete and participate in postsecondary transition planning activities, while the other half indicated that they have some information about this process but needed more information, or were not prepared. It is noted that none of the LSSPs in this sample reported feeling well prepared to engage in this process. Previous research has found that school psychologists have reported feeling less prepared than this current sample, overall (e.g., some preparation, needing more) (Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002; Watson, 2017).

The majority of participants from this study indicated that the primary role of LSSPs within their school districts was providing psychological and psycho-educational assessments. This supports this researcher's hypothesis regarding the primary role of LSSPs, and also aligns with previous research findings (Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002). This result aligns with the traditional role of LSSPs within Texas school districts, and completes the requirement outlined in IDEIA (2004) requiring that an individual who can interpret the results of evaluation assessments and resulting instruction implications participate on the IEP team. Although identified as a primary

role, it is important to remember that LSSPs are trained in various other areas, such as consultation, providing direct services, and program planning and evaluation.

The frequency of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process were explored, and results partially supported this researcher's hypotheses. The majority of participants perceived that LSSP involvement in this process were low in frequency, ranging from "never" to "occasionally." These low frequency ratings remained the same regardless of service type, and supports this researcher's hypothesis regarding this specific assumption. It is speculated that these low LSSP participation rates may be a result of the limited time allotted for participation due to identified barriers (i.e., large caseloads, travel time) and the national shortage of LSSPs employed in school districts. It is noted that responses from the Others group were statistically significantly higher than responses from the LSSPs group, and there responses between district types were found to not be statistically significantly different, which does not support this researcher's hypotheses of having reported equal frequency among the two groups. It is unclear why there were differences in report between these groups, though it is speculated that perhaps having a larger sample size of LSSPs may result in more uniform responses across groups.

These overall low frequency ratings were similar to Lillenstein's (2002) findings (e.g., "never" to "occasionally"), and was lower than Staab's (1997) and Watson's (2017) ratings of participation (e.g., "occasionally" to "frequently"). It is additionally noted that, similar to previous research (Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002; Watson, 2017), LSSPs were not listed to have performed a service "regularly." When asked, approximately 20% of participants in this study identified that LSSPs routinely participated in postsecondary transition-related IEP meetings, which is significantly lower than the identified routine participation rate of other school-based

transition team members. This low frequency of involvement within this process does not support the engagement needed for effective postsecondary transition as outlined within Kohler's et al. (2016) empirically-supported framework, which calls for effective interagency collaboration with all team members. Lack of presence of team members within this process directly hinders interagency collaboration.

The importance of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process was also explored, and results partially supported this researcher's hypotheses. The majority of participant responses rated the importance of LSSP involvement as higher in importance, ranging from "probably should" to "definitely should," regardless of service type. This result supported this researcher's hypothesis of participants highly rating importance of LSSP participation. However, there were statistically significant differences found in responses between the LSSPs group and Others group, with participants within the Others group indicating a higher importance of LSSP involvement. This result did not support the researcher's hypothesis in this regard. It is speculated that the identified barriers (i.e., lack of time, lack of awareness of how LSSPs can be involved) may explain this difference in importance. This overall higher rating of the importance of LSSP involvement in this process is similar to previous research findings (e.g., Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002; Watson, 2017). This view of the importance of LSSP involvement in this process supports Kohler's et al. (2016) framework for interagency collaboration, as team members who believe that their involvement is important may be more likely to engage within the process.

Given the perceived frequency and importance of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition process, the alignment of these concepts were explored. Results partially supported this researcher's hypotheses. Results indicated that there was a statistically small correlation between

reported frequency and importance within the Psychological and Psycho-educational assessment and Direct Services service types, which indicated a loose alignment, and supported this researcher's hypothesis of low LSSP participation despite high importance ratings. However, results indicated that there was a statistically moderate correlation between frequency and important within the Consultation and Program Planning and Evaluation service types, which indicated a stronger alignment in these areas and did not support this researcher's hypothesis, and showed that lower importance ratings of LSSP participation in these specific service types were more closely aligned with low participation rates. Previous research results have found mixed results regarding this alignment (e.g., Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002; Watson, 2017), though overall tended to have more instances of moderate to large effect sizes in these areas. Results from this current study are lower than previous studies specifically regarding the effect sizes of Psychological and Psycho-educational Assessment, and Direct Services. These small to moderate positive relationships between frequency and importance of LSSP involvement indicates that there is a gap between the desire of working within Kohler's et al. (2016) framework in interagency collaboration, but that actual practice is not matched.

Barriers to LSSP involvement were examined. The largest barrier identified by this sample was related to large caseload followed by time limited due to travel between buildings and lack of awareness of how LSSPs could contribute to transition planning. This researcher's hypothesis regarding largest barriers were partially met (i.e., large caseload). LSSP lack of interest was the least identified barrier among participants. It is again speculated that this largest barrier is due to the national LSSP shortage. These results are reflective of previous findings regarding large caseload identified as the largest barrier (Staab 1997; Lillenstein, 2002) and lack of interest as the smallest identified barrier (Staab, 1997; Lillenstein, 2002; Watson, 2017). The

presence of barriers does not support Kohler's et al. (2016) framework within interagency collaboration, which requires that barriers be addressed. It is noted that the logistical barriers referenced within this study may be difficult to address due to limited resources within school districts.

In understanding district policy, questions were asked regarding participant knowledge of guidelines that are related to transition planning. Data collection was exploratory in nature. Most participants indicated that they were aware of their district's guidelines for selecting transition assessment, who administers transition assessments, and who is involved in postsecondary transition planning. It is unclear whether district guidelines included content regarding LSSP involvement, though this may be an area worth further exploration.

Overall, results of this research study are largely reflective of previous research. These trends of lack of graduate training, low perceived frequency of involvement, high perceptions of importance of involvement, and barriers to LSSP involvement continue to reflect the pattern as they were first recognized approximately 20 years ago. There are several speculated reasons as to why this may be the case. A first and important reason expressed throughout this paper, is the national shortage of LSSPs employed within school districts. This may result in limited time allotted for LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition process, and thus does not provide the opportunity for increased awareness of what services LSSPs may additionally provide. Second, the current availability and use of non-normed and non-standardized transition-related assessment measures, which does not require administration by an LSSP, may result in lack of required participation by the LSSP. And lastly, updated emerging legal implications of LSSP participation within the postsecondary transition process (e.g., Zirkel, 2021) have only been recently disseminated within the school psychology community. The persistence of these archaic

trends highlight the continued push for an additional research focus on the benefits of LSSP involvement in postsecondary transition planning.

### **Implications for Practice**

The reported lack of formal graduate training of LSSP participants is concerning, as previous research has found that LSSPs may be put in the position of working with special education students in providing postsecondary transition services without having received any form of previous training in this area (Gelber et al., 2021). This can potentially lead to harmful consequences. Although participants from this study indicated that lack of postsecondary training was a minor barrier to their involvement, likely due to experience gained from on-the-job training, school psychology graduate programs may have an ethical responsibility as gatekeepers to provide at least minimum exposure of the postsecondary transition planning process within their curriculum to ensure some kind of training and preparedness of their students in this area. Preparedness becomes increasingly important as emerging court decisions continue to shape the legal implications of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition process. Currently, school psychology graduate programs do not seem to offer much training in the realm of postsecondary transition (Jackson, 2013). By adding additional content on postsecondary transition planning within required graduate school coursework, this can at least minimally ensure that LSSPs are prepared to understand the process and seek appropriate resources. At best, additional coursework in this area would only benefit the LSSP in providing effective and efficient services for their students. School psychology programs, especially those who are APA- and/or NASP-approved, can additionally continue to strive towards instilling a “gold standard” of practice in their students regarding this legally-mandated process that adheres to APA and NASP recommendations. Proposed by Talapatra, Roach, Varjas, Houchins, and Crimmins

(2018), the Transition Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (TPIE) model is grounded in Kohler et al.'s (2016) model, and provides a pathway for school psychologists to engage in postsecondary planning, implementation, and evaluation within an interdisciplinary team. This model could serve as a thorough framework for school psychology graduate programs in incorporating postsecondary transition planning content.

It is difficult to address the barriers of large caseloads, referral backlog, and logistical concerns that are present on not only a state level, but a national level. Addressing this national LSSP shortage is no easy task, and there is no quick fix. However, it is important to acknowledge these very real concerns, and to address them as best we can. Effectively allocating resources in school districts can be a potential avenue of addressing this problem. Multitiered systems of support (MTSS) has been a national initiative brought about by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2015) to best address student academic and behavioral concerns with appropriate services to match severity of concern. School districts have adopted MTSS as part of their school improvement planning and school-wide interventions, with positive and significant outcomes (e.g., Bohanon et al., 2021). Morningstar, Lombardi, and Test (2018) have proposed a framework embedded within MTSS that adds a focus on college and career readiness (CRC) that incorporates response to intervention (RTI) and positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS). LSSPs' training equips them to engage in the RTI and PBIS processes within a MTSS system, and it is hypothesized that LSSPs may be able to easily transition to provide services within this familiar framework geared towards CRC, which incorporates components of postsecondary transition planning. Implementation of such a broad framework would not only pre-emptively address needs of both general and special education students, but effectively

allocate the limited time of LSSPs to provide effective supports in all MTSS tiers, and/or providing intensive supports as needed.

The gap between the frequency and importance of LSSP involvement within the postsecondary planning process has been recognized, but cannot be readily addressed without the support of administrative bodies within the school district. A call-to-action may be needed from LSSPs and other transition team members in making the argument for increased LSSP involvement that is supported by empirical evidence, and tailored to specific school district needs. In the spirit of life-long learning, LSSPs who believe they are less prepared in this area may need to pursue additional educational resources to improve their own understanding of the postsecondary transition process, provide effective services that meet evolving legal requirements, and spread awareness of how LSSPs could benefit this process.

### **Limitations**

There were several limitations for this research. As identified by Lillenstein (2002), internal validity may have been introduced. Specifically, the survey topic and length of this survey may have discouraged participation from LSSPs who otherwise work within the secondary level in school districts, and would have consequently affected sample size and generalizability (Lillenstein, 2002). Additionally, this researcher chose to continue the use of a 4-point Likert rating scales to best compare results with Staab's (1997) and Lillenstein's (2002) studies, despite previous criticism of being unable to produce more meaningful results due to the smaller increments of difference (as stated in Lillenstein, 2002).

Small sample size of the LSSP group, as well as disproportionate sample sizes across the Others group and District Types groups, were also a concern. Additional efforts to increase sample sizes were made by the researcher (i.e., sending follow-up emails to administrators,

posting survey in social media, completion incentive), though completion remained difficult. It is also noted that data collection bias may have been introduced to this study, as this survey was solely available to those with internet access, which may have excluded potential participants. Additionally, access to this survey was more challenging for potential participants whose email addresses were not readily available in their school/school district's website, and/or were not members of specific social media site/groups where the survey was additionally distributed.

Lastly, there is a large chance that recall bias may have been introduced into this study. The COVID-19 pandemic had brought about state mandates that affected day-to-day operations within the nation, including school districts. This researcher requested that participants respond to survey questions of LSSP involvement as they can best remember during a typical school year (i.e., before the COVID-19 pandemic). Participants would have been required to remember day-to-day operations that occurred approximately a year ago before the survey was distributed, and can thus lead to opportunities for misremembering events.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

It is important that emerging frameworks and models that are geared towards increased LSSP involvement within the postsecondary transition planning process continue to be thoroughly researched. It will be especially important that these frameworks and models be formed with practicality in mind, and implemented in applied settings (e.g., graduate programs, school districts). Gathering longitudinal data regarding this implementation will be especially crucial in bridging the gap between research and practice, and contribute to their refinement. Additional research may explore the specific components of these frameworks and models that are most beneficial, and develop trainings and/or curriculums that are centered on those factors to provide the most benefit within shorter amounts of time.

Due to the shortage of LSSPs within school districts, it may be beneficial to explore the implications of providing tele-participation in postsecondary transition team planning activities. State-mandated social distancing and stay-at-home orders brought about a halt to many school-related services in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. To adjust, many school districts were forced to quickly switch the school learning platform from in-person to online (e.g., video conferencing), and other school-related services shortly followed suit. Findings regarding the impact of online platform use in postsecondary transition planning services may be beneficial in decreasing logistical barriers (e.g., time, travel) for LSSP involvement.

## **Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the state of LSSP involvement within the postsecondary transition planning process in Texas school districts, as perceived by LSSPs and other transition team members. Although previously researched in other states, conducting this research in Texas not only expanded the geographical scope, but also added information from a state with personnel that serves one of the largest groups of students with disabilities in schools under Part B of IDEIA (2004) in the United States. Findings from this current study are largely aligned with previous research regarding the gap between the frequency and importance of LSSP involvement, and shares common barriers identified that hinders LSSP involvement. Findings were largely similar to findings dating back 20 years ago, which may reveal that little progress has been done in this particular area. It is through increased research and implementation of frameworks and models that tackle LSSP involvement, as well as addressing logistical barriers, that increase LSSP involvement and interagency collaboration.

## REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association (2012). Guidelines for assessment of and intervention with persons with disabilities. *American Psychologist*, *67*(1), 43-62. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025892>
- Baer, R. M., Flexer, R. W., Beck, S., Amstutz, N., Hoffman, L., Brothers, J., et al. (2003). A collaborative followup study on transition service utilization and post-school outcomes. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, *26*, 7–25. doi: <http://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/088572880302600102>
- Benz, M. R., Lindstrom, L., & Yovanoff, P. (2000). Improving graduation and employment outcomes of students with disabilities: Predictive factors and student perspectives. *Exceptional Children*, *66*, 509–541. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psych&AN=2001-00013-005&site=ehost-live>
- Benz, M. R., Yovanoff, P., & Doren, B. (1997). School-to-work components that predict postschool success for students with and without disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, *63*, 151–165. doi: <https://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/001440299706300201>
- Blackorby, J., Hancock, G. R., & Siegel, S. (1993). Human capital and structural explanations of post-school success for youth with disabilities: A latent variable exploration of the National Longitudinal Transition Study. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED380914&site=ehost-live>

- Bohanon, H. S., Wu, M.-J., Kushki, A., LeVesseur, C., Harms, A., Vera, E., Carlson-Sanei, J., & Shriberg, D. (2021). The role of school improvement planning in the implementation of MTSS in secondary schools. *Preventing School Failure, 65*(3), 230–242. <https://doi-org.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/10.1080/1045988X.2021.1908215>
- Bullis, M., Davis, C., Bull, B., & Johnson, B. (1995). Transition achievement among young adults with deafness: What variables relate to success? *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 39*, 130–150. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=9706105953&site=ehost-live>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2019). *Economic News Release; Table A-6. Employment status of the civilian population by sex, age, and disability status, not seasonally adjusted*. Retrieved from Bureau of Labor Statistics website: <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.t06.htm>
- Doren, B., & Benz, M. R. (1998). Employment inequality revisited: Predictors of better employment outcomes for young women with disabilities in transition. *The Journal of Special Education, 31*, 425–442. doi: <http://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/002246699803100402>
- Education Service Center 11 (n.d.). Education Code, Title 2. Public Education, Subtitle F. Curriculum, Programs, and Services, Chapter 29. Educational Programs, Subchapter A. Special Education Program. Retrieved from <https://www.esc11.net/cms/lib3/TX21000259/Centricity/Domain/521/TEXAS%20EDUCATION%20CODE.pdf>

Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95, § 1177 (2015).

<https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/1177>

Fabian, E., Lent, R., & Willis, S. (1998). Predicting work transition outcomes for students with disabilities: Implications for counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 76*, 311–316. doi: <http://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1998.tb02547.x>

Gelbar, N. W., Volk, D. T., & Bruder, M. B. (2021). School Psychologists Involvement in and Knowledge of Secondary Transition: Results from a Statewide Survey. *Contemporary School Psychology, 25*(2), 260–268. <https://doi-org.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/10.1007/s40688-019-00261-0>

Halpern, A.S., Yovanoff, P., Doren, B. & Benz, M.R. (1995). Predicting participation in postsecondary education for school leavers with disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 62*, 151–164. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psych&AN=1996-18315-001&site=ehost-live>

Harvey, M. W. (2002). Comparison and postsecondary transitional outcomes between students with and without disabilities by secondary vocational education participation: Findings from the National Education Longitudinal Study. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 25*, 99–122. doi: <https://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/088572880202500202>

Heal, L. W., & Rusch, F. R. (1994). Prediction of residential independence of special education high school students. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 15*, 223–243. doi: [https://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1016/0891-4222\(94\)90013-2](https://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1016/0891-4222(94)90013-2)

- Heal, L. W., & Rusch, F. R. (1995). Predicting employment for students who leave special education high school programs. *Exceptional Children*, 61, 472–487. Retrieved from <http://search.ebschost.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psych&AN=1995-31130-001&site=ehost-live>
- Hengen, S. & Weaver, A. D. (2018). Post-secondary students with disabilities: Increasing self-advocacy through educational plan participation. *The School Psychologist*, 72(2), 7–18.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1411-1419 (2004).
- Jackson, C. R. (2013). *Examination of the training of school psychologists in post-secondary transition practices* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://web-a-ebsohost.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/ehost/detail/detail?vid=8&sid=259ad90a-92ea-4b55-83a4-1b844610ca1e%40sessionmgr4007&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#>
- Kleinert, J. O., Harrison, E. M., Fisher, T. L., & Kleinert, H. L. (2010). “I Can” and “I Did” -- Self-Advocacy for Young Students With Developmental Disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 43(2), 16–26. <https://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/004005991004300202>
- Kohler, P. D. & Illinois Univ. C. T. R. I. (1996). Taxonomy for transition programming: Linking research and practice. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED399722&site=ehost-live>

Kohler, P. D., Gothberg, J. E., Fowler, C., & Coyle, J. (2016). *Taxonomy for transition programming 2.0: A model for planning, organizing, and evaluating transition education, services, and programs*. Western Michigan University. Retrieved from the NTACTION website:

[https://www.transitionta.org/system/files/resourcetrees/Taxonomy\\_for\\_Transition\\_Programming\\_v2.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=1727&force=](https://www.transitionta.org/system/files/resourcetrees/Taxonomy_for_Transition_Programming_v2.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=1727&force=)

LEAD Center (n.d.). Data and Resources to Inspire a Vision of Employment, Texas. Retrieved from <http://drivedisabilityemployment.org/texas>

Library of Congress (n.d.a) Summary of H.R.1385 – Workforce Investment Partnership Act of 1998. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/105th-congress/house-bill/1385>

Library of Congress (n.d.b) Summary of H.R.2884 – School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/2884>

Library of Congress (n.d.c) Summary of H.R.4164 – Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/98th-congress/house-bill/4164>

Library of Congress (n.d.d) Summary of H.R.5 – Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/105th-congress/house-bill/5>

Library of Congress (n.d.e) Summary of H.R.803 – Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/803>

Library of Congress (n.d.f) Summary of H.R.8070 – An Act to replace the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, with special emphasis on services to those with the most severe handicaps, to expand special Federal responsibilities and research and

training programs with respect to handicapped individuals, to establish special responsibilities in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for coordination of all programs with respect to handicapped individuals within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/93rd-congress/house-bill/8070>

Library of Congress (n.d.g) Summary of S.1341 - Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1983. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/98th-congress/senate-bill/1341>

Library of Congress (n.d.h) Summary of S.1824 – Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1990. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/senate-bill/1824>

Library of Congress (n.d.i) Summary of S.933 – Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/senate-bill/933>

Library of Congress (n.d.j). Summary of S.2657 - An Act to extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to extend and revise the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and for other purposes. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/bill/94th-congress/senate-bill/2657>

Lillenstein, D. J., Levinson, E. M., Sylvester, C. A., and Brady, E. E. (2006). School psychologist involvement in transition planning: A comparison of attitudes and perceptions of school psychologists and transition coordinators. *The Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, 29(1), 4-16. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ854375&site=ehost-live>

- Lillenstein, D.J. (2002). The role of the school psychologist in transition planning: A survey of transition coordinators and school psychologists in Pennsylvania. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 62(11-A).
- Luecking, R. G., & Fabian, E. S. (2000). Paid internships and employment success for youth in transition. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 23, 205–221. doi:  
<http://dx.doi.org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/088572880002300207>
- Mazzotti, V. L., Rowe, D. A., Sinclair, J., Poppen, M., Woods, W. E., & Shearer, M. L. (2016). Predictors of post-school success: A systematic review of NLTS2 secondary analyses. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 39(4), 196–215. doi:  
<https://doi-org.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/2165143415588047>
- Morales, L. R. & Hagermoser Sanetti, L. M. (2018). Students with disabilities and postsecondary education: A service brief for school psychologists. *The School Psychologist*, 72(2), 19–30.
- Morningstar, M. E., Bassett, D. S., Kochhar-Bryant, C., Cashman, J., & Wehmeyer, M. L. (2012). Aligning transition services with secondary education reform: A position statement of the division on career development and transition. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 35(3), 132–142. <https://doi-org.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/2165143412454915>
- Morningstar, M. E., Lombardi, A., & Test, D. (2018). Including college and career readiness within a multitiered systems of support framework. *AERA Open*, 4(1).  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2332858418761880>
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2010a). *Model for comprehensive and integrated school psychological services*. Retrieved from

[https://www.nasponline.org/assets/Documents/Standards%20and%20Certification/Standards/2\\_PracticeModel.pdf](https://www.nasponline.org/assets/Documents/Standards%20and%20Certification/Standards/2_PracticeModel.pdf)

National Association of School Psychologists. (2010b). *Standards for graduate preparation of school psychologists*. Retrieved from

[https://www.nasponline.org/assets/Documents/Standards%20and%20Certification/Standards/1\\_Graduate\\_Preparation.pdf](https://www.nasponline.org/assets/Documents/Standards%20and%20Certification/Standards/1_Graduate_Preparation.pdf)

National Association of School Psychologists. (2010c). *Standards for the credentialing of school psychologists*. Retrieved from

[https://www.nasponline.org/assets/Documents/Standards%20and%20Certification/Standards/2\\_Credentialing\\_Standards.pdf](https://www.nasponline.org/assets/Documents/Standards%20and%20Certification/Standards/2_Credentialing_Standards.pdf)

National Association of School Psychologists. (n.d.). *Policies addressing the shortage of school psychologists*. Retrieved from <https://www.nasponline.org/research-and-policy/policy-priorities/critical-policy-issues/shortage-of-school-psychologists>

National Disability Institute, The LEAD Center (2018). *Texas*. Retrieved from

<http://drivedisabilityemployment.org/texas>

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (2016). *Evidence-based practices and predictors in secondary transition: What we know and what we still need to know*.

NTACT, Charlotte, NC. Retrieved from

[https://www.transitionta.org/system/files/effectivepractices/EBPP\\_Exec\\_Summary\\_2016\\_12\\_13\\_16.pdf](https://www.transitionta.org/system/files/effectivepractices/EBPP_Exec_Summary_2016_12_13_16.pdf)

Price-Ellingstad, D., Reynolds, J., Ringer, L., Ryder, R., & Sheridan, S. (2000). *A guide to the individualized education program*. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education website: <https://www2.ed.gov/parents/needs/speced/iepguide/index.html>

- Rabren, K., Dunn, C., & Chambers, D. (2002). Predictors of posthigh school employment among young adults with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 25*, 25–40.
- Repetto, J.B., Webb, K.W., Garvan, C.W., & Washington, T. (2002). Connecting student outcomes with transition practices in Florida. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 25*(2), 123-139. doi: <https://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/08857288020500203>
- Roessler, R. T., Brolin, D. E., & Johnson, J. M. (1990). Factors affecting employment success and quality of life: A one year follow-up of students in special education. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 13*, 95–107.
- Snyder, T.D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S.A. (2019). Digest of Education Statistics 2017 (NCES 2018-070). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
- Staab, M. J. B. (1996). The role of the school psychologist in transition planning. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 58*(3-A).
- Talapatra, D., Roach, A. T., Varjas, K., Houchins, D. E., & Crimmins, D. B. (2018). Promoting school psychologist participation in transition services using the TPIE model. *Contemporary School Psychology, 22*(1), 18–29. <https://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1007/s40688-017-0159-5>
- Talapatra, D., Wilcox, G., Roof, H., & Hutchinson, C. (2020). Transition planning for students with disabilities: Perspectives of Canadian and American school psychologists. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology, 8*, 49–64. <https://doi-org.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/10.1080/21683603.2018.1558136>

- Test, D. W., Mazzotti, V. L., Mustian, A. L., Fowler, C.H., Kortering, L., & Kohler, P. (2009). Evidence-based secondary transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes for students with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 32(3), 160-181. <http://doi-org.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/0885728809346960>
- Texas Association of School Psychologists (n.d.). *What is a licensed specialist in school psychology (LSSP)?* Retrieved from <https://www.txasp.org/licensed-specialist-in-school-psychology-lssp->
- Texas Education Agency (2013). *State requirements for secondary transition planning in Texas*. Retrieved from <https://www.transitionintexas.org/Page/85>
- Texas Education Agency (n.d.a). *Secondary transition guidance*. Retrieved from [https://tea.texas.gov/Academics/Special\\_Student\\_Populations/Special\\_Education\\_SPED/Programs\\_and\\_Services/State\\_Guidance/Secondary\\_Transition\\_Guidance](https://tea.texas.gov/Academics/Special_Student_Populations/Special_Education_SPED/Programs_and_Services/State_Guidance/Secondary_Transition_Guidance)
- Texas Education Agency (n.d.b). *Student services certificates*. Retrieved from Texas Education Agency website: [https://tea.texas.gov/Texas\\_Educators/Certification/Additional\\_Certifications/Student\\_Services\\_Certificates](https://tea.texas.gov/Texas_Educators/Certification/Additional_Certifications/Student_Services_Certificates)
- The Legal Framework (2018a). *Admission, review, and dismissal committee membership*. Retrieved from <http://framework.esc18.net/display/Webforms/ESC18-FW-Summary.aspx?FID=109&DT=G&LID=en>
- Tyre, A., Johnson, C., & Moy, G. (2018). Preparing students with disabilities for successful transition into higher education. *The School Psychologist*, 72(2), 31–38.
- U.S. Department of Education (2018). *Part B child count and educational environments; Number of children and students served under IDEA, Part B, by age group and state*.

Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/static-tables/2017-2018/part-b/child-count-and-educational-environment/1718-bchildcountandedenvironment-1.xlsx>

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2017; Table 311.10* (NCES 2018-070). Retrieved from U.D

United States Census Bureau (2018). *Quick Facts, United States*. Retrieved from United States Census Bureau website:

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/geo/chart/US/PST045218?#PST045218>

Watson, M. D. (2017). The roles and functions of secondary special education teachers and licensed psychology professionals in transition planning with students with emotional disturbance in Arkansas. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 77(11-A)(E).

Will, M., & Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, E. W. D. (1986). *Educating Students with Learning Problems--A Shared Responsibility. A Report to the Secretary*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED279149&site=ehost-live>

Xu, T., Dempsey, I., & Foreman, P. (2016). Validating Kohler's Taxonomy of Transition Programming for adolescents with intellectual disability in the Chinese context. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 48, 242-252. doi: <https://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1016/j.ridd.2015.11.013>

Zirkel, P. (2021). Transition services under the IDEA: A legal overview and update. *Communiqué*, 50(1), 12–13.

## APPENDIX A

### EMAIL FORMAT A

Howdy,

You have received an email regarding voluntary participation in a research study being conducted by Melina Cavazos, M.Ed., a current doctoral school psychology student at Texas A&M University, and by Dr. Dalun Zhang, the Principal Investigator of this study and current director of the Center on Disability and Development at Texas A&M University, and associated research personnel. Participation is voluntary. Participants will be asked to complete the online survey below. The survey should take about 10 minutes to complete. Participants who complete the survey will be given the option to enter their email address to be entered in a drawing for the chance to win one (1) of eight (8) available \$25 Visa gift cards. Note: Email addresses will not be linked to survey, and all information you provide will be kept confidential.

You may be eligible to participate if:

- (a) You are currently hired by a Texas school district,
- (b) You provide services on a secondary education level (e.g., middle school, intermediate school, high school), and
- (c) You are currently hired as one of the following within your school district: Licensed Specialist in School Psychology (LSSP), transition specialist/coordinator/director, special education coordinator/director/supervisor/administrator, educational diagnostician, special education teacher, general education teacher, secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal), secondary guidance counselor.

Please click the following link to read the consent form and/or complete the survey:  
\${1://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Survey will close in two weeks, or when the desired number of participants have been reached. If you would like more information about the study, please contact either of the research team members below: Protocol Director: Melina Cavazos, M.Ed., melinacavazos@tamu.edu Principal Investigator: Dalun Zhang, Ph.D., dalun@tamu.edu

IRB NUMBER: IRB2019-0351M  
IRB APPROVAL DATE: 5/10/2021

Thank you,  
Melina Cavazos  
School Psychology Doctoral Student  
Texas A&M University  
melinacavazos@tamu.edu

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:  
\${1://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

## APPENDIX B

### EMAIL FORMAT B

Howdy,

You have received an email regarding voluntary participation in a research study being conducted by Melina Cavazos, M.Ed., a current doctoral school psychology student at Texas A&M University, and by Dr. Dalun Zhang, the Principal Investigator of this study and current director of the Center on Disability and Development at Texas A&M University, and associated research personnel.

You are being sent this additional email because the email address information for school personnel who are otherwise eligible to participate were not readily available on the district/school website. If possible, please forward the previous email with survey information to school personnel who could be potentially eligible.

This survey was unable to be sent to the following school personnel within your school/district: **(ROLE(S) HERE)**

As a reminder, eligibility criteria include:

- (a) Currently hired by a Texas school district,
- (b) Provide services on a secondary education level (e.g., middle school, intermediate school, high school), and
- (c) Currently hired as one of the following within your school district: Licensed Specialist in School Psychology (LSSP), transition specialist/coordinator/director, special education coordinator/director/supervisor/administrator, educational diagnostician, special education teacher, general education teacher, secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal), secondary guidance counselor.

If you would like more information about the study, please contact either of the research team members below:

Protocol Director: Melina Cavazos, M.Ed., [melinacavazos@tamu.edu](mailto:melinacavazos@tamu.edu)

Principal Investigator: Dalun Zhang, Ph.D., [dalun@tamu.edu](mailto:dalun@tamu.edu)

IRB Number: IRB2019-0351M

IRB Approval: 04/26/2021

Thank you,

Melina Cavazos  
School Psychology Doctoral Student  
Texas A&M University  
[melinacavazos@tamu.edu](mailto:melinacavazos@tamu.edu)

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:  
\${1://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}  
Link to survey: \${1://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

## APPENDIX C

### EMAIL FORMAT C

Howdy,

You have received an email regarding voluntary participation in a research study being conducted by Melina Cavazos, M.Ed., a current doctoral school psychology student at Texas A&M University, and by Dr. Dalun Zhang, the Principal Investigator of this study and current director of the Center on Disability and Development at Texas A&M University, and associated research personnel.

We are lacking Licensed Specialists in School Psychology (LSSP) respondents for this survey, and would deeply appreciate this survey being sent along to those specific personnel, if not already done so. Here is the survey link: [\\${1://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

*This is a final email reminder, and you will no longer be contacted unless you have any questions or have been selected as a winner of the survey drawing.*

If you would like more information about the study, please contact either of the research team members below:

Protocol Director: Melina Cavazos, M.Ed., [melinacavazos@tamu.edu](mailto:melinacavazos@tamu.edu)

Principal Investigator: Dalun Zhang, Ph.D., [dalun@tamu.edu](mailto:dalun@tamu.edu)

IRB Number: IRB2019-0351M

IRB Approval: 04/26/2021

Thank you for your time,

Melina Cavazos

School Psychology Doctoral Student Texas A&M University

[melinacavazos@tamu.edu](mailto:melinacavazos@tamu.edu)

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:

[\\${1://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}](#)

## APPENDIX D

### SOCIAL MEDIA POST FORMAT

#### \*PARTICIPANTS NEEDED FOR DISSERTATION RESEARCH\*

Howdy!

My name is Melina Cavazos, and I am a current doctoral school psychology student at Texas A&M University. I am currently completing my dissertation research regarding the perceived involvement and importance of involvement of LSSPs in the postsecondary transition assessment and planning process in Texas, and am looking forward to graduating soon!

I'm severely lacking Licensed Specialists in School Psychology (LSSP) respondents for this survey, and wanted to reach out for additional interest. As always, participation is voluntary and deeply appreciated! It should take about 10 minutes to complete.

Participants who complete the survey will be given the option to enter their email address to be entered in a drawing for the chance to win one (1) of eight (8) available \$25 Visa gift cards.

Note: Email addresses will not be linked to survey responses, and all information you provide will be kept confidential.

Eligibility criteria include (a) currently employed by a Texas school district, and (b) working within the secondary level (e.g., intermediate, middle, or high school(s)).

Here is the link to the survey (located below post)

If you would like more information about the study, please contact either of the research team members below:

Protocol Director: Melina Cavazos, M.Ed., [melinacavazos@tamu.edu](mailto:melinacavazos@tamu.edu)

Principal Investigator: Dalun Zhang, Ph.D., [dalun@tamu.edu](mailto:dalun@tamu.edu)

Thank you for your time!

IRB Number: IRB2019-0351M

IRB Approval: 04/26/2021

Melina Cavazos, M.Ed.

## APPENDIX E

### CONSENT FORM AND QUESTIONNAIRE

*Title of Research Study: Perceived Postsecondary Transition Assessment and Planning Involvement of School Psychologists in Texas*

*Principal Investigator: Dalun Zhang, Ph.D.*

*Protocol Director: Melina Cavazos, M.Ed.*

*IRB Number: IRB2019-0351M*

*Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?*

You are invited to participate in this study because we are trying to learn more about the current level of involvement of school psychologists in the postsecondary transition assessment and planning process in Texas schools.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are currently employed within a Texas school district(s) as a LSSP or other school personnel whose services related to postsecondary transition. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.

*Why is this research being done?*

The survey is designed to gather current information of Texan participants in regards to perceived involvement, importance of involvement, and barriers of school psychologists' participation in the transition assessment and transition planning processes in schools for special education students, as well as potential barriers to participation.

*How long will the research last?*

It will take about 10 minutes to complete this survey.

*What happens if I say "Yes, I want to be in this research"?*

If you decide to participate, please do the following: Please click the "I agree" button, which will take you to the survey.

*What happens if I do not want to be in this research?*

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide not to participate in this research, and it will not be held against you. You can leave the study at any time.

*Is there any way being in this study could harm me?*

There are no sensitive questions in this survey that should cause discomfort. If you experience discomfort, you may exit the survey at any point.

*What happens to the information collected for the research?*

You may view the survey host's confidentiality policy at: <https://www.qualtrics.com/terms-of-service/>

Your email address and IP address will be stored separately from your survey data, and is only being collected for the drawing and non-duplicate entry purposes. All information will be kept on a password protected computer and is only accessible by the research team. The results of the research study may be published but no one will be able to identify you.

*What else do I need to know?*

If you agree to take part in this research study, you will be entered in a randomized drawing to win one (1) of eight (8) \$25 gift cards at the end of the survey period. Winners of gift cards will be contacted via the email address provided. Other participants will not be contacted.

*Who can I talk to?*

Please feel free to ask questions regarding this study. You may contact Dr. Dalun Zhang later if you have additional questions or concerns at [dalun@tamu.edu](mailto:dalun@tamu.edu) or 979-862-6514, or the protocol director, Melina Cavazos, at [melinacavazos@tamu.edu](mailto:melinacavazos@tamu.edu)

You may also contact the Human Research Protection Program at Texas A&M University (which is a group of people who review the research to protect your rights) by phone at 1-979-458-4067, toll free at 1-855-795-8636, or by email at [irb@tamu.edu](mailto:irb@tamu.edu) for:

- additional help with any questions about the research
- voicing concerns or complaints about the research
- obtaining answers to questions about your rights as a research participant
- concerns in the event the research staff could not be reached
- the desire to talk to someone other than the research staff

If you want a copy of this consent for your records, you can print it from the screen.

If you wish to participate, please click the “**I Agree**” button and you will be taken to the survey.  
If you do not wish to participate in this study, please select “**I Disagree**” or select **X** in the corner of your browser

I Agree

I Disagree

Thank you for choosing to complete the following survey. Your participation is greatly appreciated, and will contribute to understanding the current levels of involvement in the transition assessment and planning process in Texas. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact a research team member. Contact information is located in the consent form section.

This survey will ask you questions regarding your participation in postsecondary transition planning for special education students in your district. There will be additional questions regarding your perception of (a) the current level of involvement and (b) the importance of Licensed Specialists in School Psychology (LSSPs) involvement from your school district in this process.

As stated in the consent form, your answers to this survey will remain confidential, and cannot be traced back to you.

### **Definition of Postsecondary Transition Planning:**

“The individualized education program (IEP), developed under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), for each student with a disability must address transition services requirements beginning not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child turns 16, or younger if determined appropriate by the IEP Team, and must be updated annually thereafter. The IEP must include: (1) appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills; and (2) the transition services (including courses of study) needed to assist the student with a disability in reaching those goals). While the IDEA statute and regulations refer to courses of study, they are but one example of appropriate transition services. Examples of independent living skills to consider when developing postsecondary goals include self-advocacy, management of the home and personal finances, and the use of public information”

*Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (2020). A transition guide to postsecondary education and employment for students and youth with disabilities. Retrieved from <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/postsecondary-transition-guide-august-2020.pdf>*

Note: In Texas, a postsecondary transition plan must be in a student’s IEP by the time the student reaches age 14.

I understand the definition of postsecondary transition planning and am ready to answer survey questions

Do you currently work in Texas?

Yes

No

Are you currently a school district employee?

Yes

No

Do you currently provide services on a secondary level (e.g., middle, intermediate, high school)?

Yes

No

What is your highest level of education?

Bachelor's degree

Specialist degree

Master's degree

Doctoral degree

Other \_\_\_\_\_

What is your current role(s)? (select all that apply)

- School Psychologist (LSSP)
- Transition Specialist/Coordinator
- Special Education Coordinator/Director/Supervisor/Administrator
- Educational Diagnostician
- Secondary General Education Teacher
- Secondary Special Education Teacher
- Secondary Administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.)
- Secondary Guidance Counselor
- Other General Education/Secondary Education Personnel
- None of the above

Have you ever participated (at least once) in the postsecondary transition planning process for special education students' IEP?

- Yes
- No

How many years of experience do you have working in the special education field in some capacity? (type response)

Years \_\_\_\_\_

Months \_\_\_\_\_

What is the name of the school district that you currently serve? (please type full district name)

\_\_\_\_\_

Please select all of your relevant certification(s) and/or license(s). (select all that apply)

LSSP (Licensed Specialist in School Psychology)

LP (Licensed Psychologist)

NCSP (Nationally Certified School Psychologist)

Transition Specialist Certified (e.g., Secondary Transition Education Certificate, Transition Special Education Certificate, etc.)

Educational Diagnostician Certified

Special Education Teacher Certification (any subject, any grade)

Teacher Certification (any subject, any grade)

Other \_\_\_\_\_

None

What type of training have you had related to transition/transition planning? (select all that apply)

- Undergraduate courses specific to transition
- Undergraduate courses that included information on transition
- Graduate courses specific to transition
- Graduate courses that included information on transition
- Graduate program in "Transition"
- In-service(s) provided by personnel within your own school and/or school district
- Workshops/seminars outside of your school district, initiated on your own
- Outside coursework or researching, initiated on your own
- On-the-job training
- Collaborative work experience with transition coordinator/secondary special education teachers
- Other \_\_\_\_\_
- None

How well prepared do you feel in participating/completing activities related to postsecondary transition planning?

- Well prepared
- Adequately prepared
- Have some information, but need more
- Not prepared

Please answer the following questions as observed during a typical school year (e.g., before COVID-19).

Does your current school district have written and specific guidelines for any of the following? (select one per question)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Selects transition assessments to be used? (e.g., questionnaires, inventories, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Who administers transition assessments?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Who is involved in transition planning?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Which of the following personnel in your school or school district routinely participate in transition planning? (select all that apply)

- School Psychologist (LSSP)
- Transition Specialist/Coordinator
- Special Education Coordinator/Director/Supervisor/Administrator
- Educational Diagnostician
- Secondary General Education Teacher
- Secondary Special Education Teacher
- Secondary Administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.)
- Secondary Guidance Counselor
- School Nurse
- School Social Worker
- Parent
- Student
- Speech and Language Clinician/Pathologist
- Occupational Therapist
- Physical Therapist

- Vision Specialist
- Hearing Specialist
- Mobility Specialist
- Assistive Technology Representative
- School-Based Probation Officer
- Work Site Supervisor
- Agency Representative (e.g., MHMR, Texas Workforce Commission/VR Counselor, etc.)
- Requested Visitor/Advocate
- Other(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**Please answer the following questions as observed during a typical school year (e.g., before COVID-19).**

To what extent do you think the skills of school psychologists (LSSPs) are utilized in transition planning for secondary education students in your school district?

*\*Note: LSSPs are not educational diagnosticians, though they can administer cognitive and*

*achievement testing if need be. Typically in Texas, LSSPs are those who perform psychological testing and other assessments.\**

- Under-utilized
- Utilized appropriately
- Over-utilized

Please indicate your perception of the barriers to school psychologists' (LSSPs) involvement in transition planning in your school district. (select all that apply)

- No barriers
- School psychologists' (LSSPs) job description does not include postsecondary transition planning
- School psychologists' (LSSPs) are not interested in postsecondary transition planning
- School psychologists' (LSSPs) are not trained in the area of postsecondary transition
- School psychologists' (LSSPs) current caseload is large and there is not enough time for them to participate in transition planning
- School psychologists' (LSSPs) are trying to keep up with current referrals for special education (i.e., "referral backlog")
- There is little or no required involvement of school psychologists (LSSPs) at the secondary level in the school district
- School psychologists (LSSPs) are spread thin due to the time used to go to various buildings they serve within the school district
- The district role of LSSPs do not include transition planning

- The LSSP is not invited to participate in transition planning
- There is a lack of awareness that LSSPs could contribute to transition planning
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Please answer the following questions as observed during a typical school year (e.g., before COVID-19).**

Using the key below, please review and indicate:

(a.) your *perception/opinion* of school psychologists' (LSSPs) **current level of involvement** in your school district (left column), and

(b.) your *perception/opinion* about the **importance** of school psychologists' (LSSPs) involvement (right column) for each of the follow:

**A. CONSULTATION (Part 1 of 4)**

**How OFTEN are LSSPs in your school/district involved in:**

**How IMPORTANT is it for LSSPs to be involved in:**

	Never	Occasionally (or 1-3 times per month or every other month)	Frequently (or about 1-2 times per week)	Regularly (or about 3+ per week)	I cannot figure out a rough estimate (Don't know)	Definitely not	Probably should not	Probably should	Definitely should
1. Providing in-service(s) for school personnel on the use of assessment data for transition planning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Providing in-service(s) for school personnel on transition issues – legal aspects, best practices, essential components (of transition).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Helping develop behavior plans to assist students on a job site or in community settings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Consulting with other professionals on how to provide activities to promote self-advocacy/self-determination.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Providing parent workshops/training in transition planning to help parents understand their role(s) and legal rights.

       

6. Coordinating referrals between school and post-school agencies (community, residential, social services, educational services, agency transition coordinator).

       

7. Coordinating evaluations/assessments of students with other agencies to avoid duplication of services.

       

8. Providing training or parents to develop skills to serve as advocates for their sons/daughters.

       

9. Serving as resource to families on transition issues.

10. Providing workshops to school personnel regarding conditions under which optimum learning and performance might occur.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

11. Providing workshops to school personnel regarding conditions under which optimum learning and performance might occur.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

12. Serving as group facilitator to increase cooperation and coordination of services or to help to overcome resistance to intervention implementation.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

**Please answer the following questions as observed during a typical school year (e.g., before COVID-19).**

**B. PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PSYCHO-EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT (Part 2 of 4)**

	How <u>OFTEN</u> are LSSPs in your school/district involved in:					How <u>IMPORTANT</u> is it for LSSPs to be involved in:			
	Never	Occasionally (or 1-3 times per month or every other month)	Frequently (or about 1-2 times per week)	Regularly (or about 3+ per week)	I cannot figure out a rough estimate (Don't know)	Definitely not	Probably should not	Probably should	Definitely should
1. Coordinating comprehensive transition evaluation for secondary students (strengths/needs in vocational area, social/interpersonal competence, problem solving/decision making, academic, life skills/personal management, leisure/recreational areas, support needs and accommodations).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Providing recommendations for post-high school needs and goals based on evaluation/assessment results.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Reviewing student records to assist in gathering information for transition planning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Interviewing students regarding interests and preferences for future planning.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

5. Explaining test results to students so that they understand their strengths/needs and modifications necessary for successful transition planning and programming.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

6. Completing state mandated re-evaluations to help meet transition planning needs (including interest/aptitude, achievement/performance, behavior).

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

7. Conducting Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) of students whose behavior interferes with their learning or learning of others.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

8. Conducting personality assessment of students in order to assess the

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

appropriateness of  
specific occupations.

9. Conducting assessment  
of ability to assist in  
determining the degree to  
which an individual may  
attain success in a given  
vocational setting.

10. Conducting  
assessment of social  
skills/adaptive behavior to  
identify areas that need to  
be targeted for  
intervention prior to a job  
or residential placement.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Please answer the following questions as observed during a typical school year (e.g., before COVID-19).**

**C. DIRECT SERVICES (Part 3 of 4)**

	How <u>OFTEN</u> are LSSPs in your school/district involved in:					How <u>IMPORTANT</u> is it for LSSPs to be involved in:			
	Never	Occasionally (or 1-3 times per month or every other month)	Frequently (or about 1-2 times per week)	Regularly (or about 3+ per week)	I cannot figure out a rough estimate (Don't know)	Definitely not	Probably should not	Probably should	Definitely should
1. Providing information to students to help them understand transition planning, their role(s), and legal rights.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Attending IEP meetings at secondary level where transition planning is discussed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Providing student workshops/training to promote self-determination/self-advocacy skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Providing student workshops/training on interpersonal/social skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Providing student workshops/training on career decision-making.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. Identifying students who are “at-risk” and initiate transition planning.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

7. Being involved in decisions regarding appropriate placement(s) and support of students in curricular areas.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

8. Providing short-term counseling to families in order to enlist their support for and involvement in transition planning.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

9. Conducting workshops on the use of assessment data in transition planning, adolescent psychology, or learning theory.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

**Please answer the following questions as observed during a typical school year (e.g., before COVID-19).**

**D. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION (Part 4 of 4)**

How **OFTEN** are LSSPs in your school/district involved in:

How **IMPORTANT** is it for LSSPs to be involved in:

	Never	Occasionally (or 1-3 times per month or every other month)	Frequently (or about 1-2 times per week)	Regularly (or about 3+ per week)	I cannot figure out a rough estimate (Don't know)	Definitely not	Probably should not	Probably should	Definitely should
1. Evaluating curricular models that support the needs of students for transition planning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Developing transition manual and checklist to assist parents and students to identify type and quality of options.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Serving on curriculum committee to aid in development of curriculum that will address transition needs of students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Developing social skills training program for students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Developing time line for completion of transition activities –	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

vocational interests, aptitude, career exploration with job experiences, individual vocational assessment, transition coordinator.

6. Determining effectiveness of various programs designed to promote acquisition of skills required for transition planning.

7. Developing orientation program for incoming secondary students to familiarize them with curricular options.

8. Monitoring district's compliance with state and federal regulations regarding transition planning (notification procedures, participation in meetings, content of the IEP, and agency responsibility).

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Conducting formal needs assessment in transitional area.

10. Conducting longitudinal studies to determine the long-term effect of transition plans.

Please answer the following questions as observed during a typical school year (e.g., before COVID-19).

In your perception, what is the perceived primary role of the LSSP in your school district?

- Consultation
- Psychological and psycho-educational assessment
- Direct service
- Program planning and evaluation

APPENDIX F

Table 1 - Extended  
*District Type Membership by Role*

Group and Role	District Type							
	City		Suburb		Town		Rural	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
LSSPs group	6	5.36	7	11.11	2	4.76	5	20.83
Others group	104	92.86	56	88.89	40	95.24	19	45.24
TS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.17
SPDCSA	3	2.68	1	1.59	1	2.38	1	4.17
ED	7	6.25	3	4.76	7	16.67	2	8.33
GET	59	52.68	31	49.21	20	47.62	10	41.67
SET	15	13.39	11	17.46	7	16.67	1	4.17
SA	7	6.25	3	4.76	2	4.76	1	4.17
SGC	6	5.36	1	1.59	0	0	2	8.33
OTH	5	4.46	3	4.76	2	4.76	1	4.17
MUL	4	3.57	3	4.76	1	2.38	0	0
District Type Total	112	46.47	63	26.14	42	17.43	24	9.96

*Note.* This table provides the frequency and percentage values of participants' role and district type in Texas. Roles are abbreviated as the following: LSSP= Licensed Specialist in School Psychology; TS= transition specialist/coordinator; SPDCSA= special education director/coordinator/supervisor/administrator; ED= educational diagnostician; GET= secondary general education teacher; SET= secondary special education teacher; SA= secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.); SGC= secondary guidance counselor; OTH= other general education/secondary education personnel; MUL= multiple roles listed, non-LSSP.

APPENDIX G

Table 2 - Extended  
*Highest Degree Obtained by Role*

Group and Role	Highest Degree Obtained									
	Bachelor's		Specialist		Master's		Doctoral		Other	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
LSSPs group	0	0	2	100	12	9.02	5	29.41	1	25
Others group	85	100	0	0	121	90.98	12	70.59	3	75
TS	0	0	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0
SPDCSA	0	0	0	0	3	2.26	3	0	0	0
ED	0	0	0	0	19	14.29	0	0	0	0
GET	58	68.24	0	0	57	42.86	4	23.53	1	25
SET	18	21.18	0	0	15	11.28	1	5.88	0	0
SA	0	0	0	0	11	8.27	2	11.76	0	0
SGC	0	0	0	0	8	6.02	0	0	1	25
OTH	5	5.88	0	0	3	2.26	2	11.76	1	25
MUL	4	4.71	0	0	4	3.01	0	0	0	0
Highest Degree Obtained Total	85	35.27	2	0.83	133	55.19	17	7.05	4	0.41

*Note.* This table provides the frequency and percentage values of participants' highest degree obtained. Roles are abbreviated as the following: LSSP= Licensed Specialist in School Psychology; TS= transition specialist/coordinator; SPDCSA= special education director/coordinator/supervisor/administrator; ED= educational diagnostician; GET= secondary general education teacher; SET= secondary special education teacher; SA= secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.); SGC= secondary guidance counselor; OTH= other general education/secondary education personnel; MUL= multiple roles listed, non-LSSP.

APPENDIX H

Table 4 - Extended  
*Trainings Obtained By Role*

Group and Role	Trainings											
	UCST		UCIT		GCST		GCIT		GPT		IS	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
LSSPs												
group	0	0	0	0	1	4.55	2	4.44	0	0	12	8.45
Others												
group	20	100	35	100	21	95.45	43	95.56	1	100	130	91.55
TS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPD-												
CSA	0	0	0	0	1	4.55	1	2.22	0	0	5	3.52
ED	1	5	3	8.57	2	9.09	8	17.78	0	0	13	9.15
GET	12	60	18	51.43	8	36.36	15	33.33	1	100	62	43.66
SET	4	20	9	25.71	4	18.18	7	15.56	0	0	29	20.42
SA	1	5	1	2.86	5	22.73	3	6.67	0	0	8	5.63
SGC	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8.89	0	0	4	2.82
OTH	1	5	1	2.86	0	0	2	4.44	0	0	5	3.52
MUL	1	5	3	8.57	1	4.55	3	6.67	0	0	4	2.82
Trainings												
Total	20	2.93	35	5.12	22	3.22	45	6.59	2	0.29	142	20.79

*Note.* This table provides the frequency and percentage values of participants' training sources in postsecondary transition planning. Roles are abbreviated as the following: LSSP= Licensed Specialist in School Psychology; TS= transition specialist/coordinator; SPDCSA= special education director/coordinator/supervisor/administrator; ED= educational diagnostician; GET= secondary general education teacher; SET= secondary special education teacher; SA= secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.); SGC= secondary guidance counselor; OTH= other general education/secondary education personnel; MUL= multiple roles listed, non-LSSP. Trainings are denoted as follows: UCST= undergraduate courses specific to transition, UCIT= undergraduate courses that included information on transition, GCST= graduate courses specific to transition, GCIT= graduate courses that included information on transition, GPT= graduate program in transition, IS= in-services provided by personnel within your own school and/or district

Table 4 Extended Continued  
*Trainings Obtained By Role*

Group and Role	Trainings											
	WSO		OCRO		OJT		CWE		OTHER		NONE	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
LSSPs group	8	10	1	2.78	16	9.94	15	14.42	0	0	1	3.70
Others group	72	90	35	97.22	145	90.06	89	85.58	9	100	26	96.30
TS	1	1.25	1	2.78	1	0.62	1	0.96	0	0	0	0
SPD- CSA	4	5	3	8.33	5	3.11	4	3.85	1	11.11	0	0
ED	12	15	4	11.11	13	8.07	14	13.46	1	11.11	0	0
GET	26	32.50	12	33.33	66	40.99	35	33.65	4	44.44	25	92.59
SET	14	17.50	5	13.89	27	16.77	16	15.38	2	22.22	0	0
SA	5	6.25	5	13.89	12	7.45	5	4.81	1	11.11	0	0
SGC	1	1.25	0	0	9	5.59	6	5.77	0	0	0	0
OTH	3	3.75	0	0	6	3.73	2	1.92	0	0	1	3.70
MUL	6	7.50	5	13.89	6	3.73	6	5.77	0	0	0	0
Trainings Total	80	11.71	36	5.27	161	23.57	104	15.23	9	1.32	27	3.95

*Note.* This table provides the frequency and percentage values of participants' training sources in postsecondary transition planning. Roles are abbreviated as the following: LSSP= Licensed Specialist in School Psychology; TS= transition specialist/coordinator; SPDCSA= special education director/coordinator/supervisor/administrator; ED= educational diagnostician; GET= secondary general education teacher; SET= secondary special education teacher; SA= secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.); SGC= secondary guidance counselor; OTH= other general education/secondary education personnel; MUL= multiple roles listed, non-LSSP. Trainings are denoted as follows: WSO= workshops/seminars outside of your school district, initiated on your own, OCRO= outside coursework or researching, initiated on your own, OJT= on-the-job training, CWE= collaborative work experience with transition coordinator/secondary special education teachers, OTHER= other training experience not listed, NEVER=never received training

APPENDIX I

Table 5 - Extended  
*Preparedness by Role*

Group and Role	Preparedness							
	Well Prepared		Adequately Prepared		Need More Info		Not Prepared	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
LSSPs group	0	0	10	11.63	8	9.52	2	5.71
Others group	36	100	76	88.37	76	90.48	33	94.29
TS	1	2.78	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPDCSA	3	8.33	2	2.33	1	1.19	0	0
ED	4	11.11	8	9.30	6	7.14	1	2.86
GET	10	27.78	36	41.86	45	53.57	29	82.86
SET	9	25	19	22.09	5	5.95	1	2.86
SA	3	8.33	6	6.98	4	4.76	0	0
SGC	2	5.56	1	1.16	6	7.14	0	0
OTH	2	5.56	2	2.33	5	5.95	2	5.71
MUL	2	5.56	2	2.33	4	4.76	0	0
Preparedness Total	36	14.94	86	35.68	84	34.85	35	14.52

*Note.* This table provides the frequency and percentage values of participants' role and perceived level of preparedness to participate and/or complete activities in the postsecondary transition planning process. Roles are abbreviated as the following: LSSP= Licensed Specialist in School Psychology; TS= transition specialist/coordinator; SPDCSA= special education director/coordinator/supervisor/administrator; ED= educational diagnostician; GET= secondary general education teacher; SET= secondary special education teacher; SA= secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.); SGC= secondary guidance counselor; OTH= other general education/secondary education personnel; MUL= multiple roles listed, non-LSSP.

APPENDIX J

Table 7 - Extended  
*Experience by Role*

Group and Role	Experience (Years-Months)							
	0-1 to 0-11		1-0 to 4-11		5-0 to 9-11		10-0 to 14-11	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
LSSPs group	0	0	1	2.78	6	13.04	5	12.20
Others group	2	100	35	97.22	40	86.96	41	100
TS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPD- CSA	0	0	0	0	1	2.17	1	2.44
ED	0	0	2	5.56	2	4.35	3	7.32
GET	1	50	22	61.11	19	41.30	17	41.46
SET	1	50	5	13.89	9	19.57	9	21.95
SA	0	0	4	11.11	1	2.17	1	2.44
SGC	0	0	1	2.78	3	6.52	0	0
OTH	0	0	1	2.78	4	8.70	2	4.88
MUL	0	0	0	0	1	2.17	3	7.32
Experience Total	2	0.78	36	14.01	46	17.90	41	15.95

*Note.* This table provides the frequency and percentage values of participants' role and experience in years and months working within the special education field in any capacity. Roles are abbreviated as the following: LSSP= Licensed Specialist in School Psychology; TS= transition specialist/coordinator; SPDCSA= special education director/coordinator/supervisor/administrator; ED= educational diagnostician; GET= secondary general education teacher; SET= secondary special education teacher; SA= secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.); SGC= secondary guidance counselor; OTH= other general education/secondary education personnel; MUL= multiple roles listed, non-LSSP.

Table 7 Extended Continued  
*Experience by Role*

Group and Role	Experience (Years-Months)					
	15-0 to 19-11		20-0 to 29-11		30-0+	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
LSSPs group	3	6.82	3	6.82	3	6.82
Others group	41	93.18	41	93.18	41	93.18
TS	1	2.27	0	0	1	2.27
SPD-						
CSA	0	0	3	6.82	0	0
ED	7	15.91	4	9.09	7	15.91
GET	17	38.64	22	50	17	38.64
SET	7	15.91	3	6.82	7	15.91
SA	3	6.82	4	9.09	3	6.82
SGC	4	9.09	1	2.27	4	9.09
OTH	0	0	2	4.55	0	0
MUL	2	4.55	2	4.55	2	4.55
Experience Total	44	17.12	44	17.12	44	17.12

*Note.* This table provides the frequency and percentage values of participants' role and experience in years and months working within the special education field in any capacity. Roles are abbreviated as the following: LSSP= Licensed Specialist in School Psychology; TS= transition specialist/coordinator; SPDCSA= special education director/coordinator/supervisor/administrator; ED= educational diagnostician; GET= secondary general education teacher; SET= secondary special education teacher; SA= secondary administrator (e.g., principal, associate principal, etc.); SGC= secondary guidance counselor; OTH= other general education/secondary education personnel; MUL= multiple roles listed, non-LSSP.

APPENDIX K

Table 11 - Extended

*T-Test Results for Perceived Frequency of LSSP Involvement*

Question	N (total)	LSSPs Group		Others Group		t	df <sup>a</sup>	p
		n	M (SD)	n	M (SD)			
A-Q1	168	20	1.20 (.52)	148	1.63 (.87)	-3.13	36.74	< 0.01*
A-Q2	173	20	1.15 (.49)	153	1.63 (.87)	-3.68	38.74	< 0.01*
A-Q3	171	19	1.58 (.84)	152	2.11 (.98)	-2.53	25.29	0.02*
A-Q4	159	20	1.65 (.67)	139	2.01 (.90)	-2.59	31.10	0.01*
A-Q5	156	20	1.25 (.55)	136	1.68 (.90)	-2.94	37.92	< 0.01*
A-Q6	156	20	1.35 (.59)	136	2.00 (.99)	-4.16	39.08	< 0.01*
A-Q7	152	20	1.50 (.83)	132	2.07 (.97)	-2.79	28.55	< 0.01*
A-Q8	153	20	1.45 (.76)	133	1.77 (.97)	-1.67	30.23	0.10
A-Q9	163	20	1.50 (.51)	143	2.04 (.96)	-3.87	43.21	< 0.01*
A-Q10	174	20	1.35 (.49)	154	1.66 (.90)	-2.33	40.55	0.03*
A-Q11	174	20	1.45 (.60)	154	1.68 (.93)	-1.46	33.36	0.15
A-Q12	164	20	1.25 (.64)	144	1.96 (1.0)	-4.27	35.45	< 0.01*
B-Q1	160	20	1.25 (.55)	140	1.98 (.98)	-4.92	40.94	< 0.00*
B-Q2	161	20	2.05 (.76)	141	2.04 (.99)	0.08	30.04	0.94
B-Q3	161	20	1.95 (.89)	141	2.02 (.93)	-0.33	25.95	0.74
B-Q4	160	20	1.80 (1.06)	140	1.98 (.93)	-0.72	23.89	0.48
B-Q5	158	20	1.80 (.83)	138	1.97 (.94)	-0.84	27.22	0.41
B-Q6	157	20	2.35 (1.09)	137	2.22 (1.00)	0.51	24.40	0.62
B-Q7	149	20	2.75 (1.02)	129	2.37 (1.10)	1.54	26.41	0.14
B-Q8	148	20	1.65 (.88)	128	1.95 (.99)	-1.38	28.05	0.18
B-Q9	151	20	1.20 (.41)	131	1.95 (.96)	-6.07	61.64	< 0.00*
B-Q10	150	20	1.70 (.73)	130	2.05 (.98)	-1.91	31.82	0.07
C-Q1	160	20	1.40 (.75)	140	1.89 (.95)	-2.60	29.43	0.01*
C-Q2	172	20	2.55 (1.10)	152	2.39 (1.10)	0.60	24.36	0.56

Table 11 – Extended Continued

*T-Test Results for Perceived Frequency of LSSP Involvement*

Question	<i>N</i> (total)	LSSPs Group		Others Group		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i> <sup><i>a</i></sup>	<i>p</i>
		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )			
C-Q3	159	20	1.05 (.22)	139	1.65 (.81)	-7.05	111.50	< 0.00*
C-Q4	160	20	1.25 (.55)	140	1.66 (.86)	-2.85	35.67	< 0.01*
C-Q5	159	20	1.10 (.31)	139	1.57 (.85)	-4.69	76.47	< 0.00*
C-Q6	157	20	1.20 (.52)	137	2.00 (.99)	-5.55	44.48	< 0.00*
C-Q7	163	20	2.50 (1.10)	143	2.29 (1.10)	0.82	24.73	0.42
C-Q8	152	20	1.05 (.22)	132	1.85 (.98)	-8.10	135.06	< 0.00*
C-Q9	152	20	1.00 (0)	132	1.52 (.76)	-7.82	131.00	< 0.00*
D-Q1	145	20	1.00 (0)	125	1.60 (.84)	-7.96	124	< 0.00*
D-Q2	151	20	1.05 (.22)	131	1.64 (.84)	-6.65	118.48	< 0.00*
D-Q3	152	20	1.20 (.52)	132	1.55 (.81)	-2.58	36.38	0.01*
D-Q4	150	20	1.65 (.81)	130	1.75 (.86)	-0.49	26.65	0.63
D-Q5	152	20	1.05 (.22)	132	1.72 (.92)	-7.10	128.78	< 0.00*
D-Q6	148	20	1.10 (.31)	128	1.68 (.88)	-5.60	83.75	< 0.00*
D-Q7	156	20	1.00 (0)	136	1.58 (.83)	-8.16	135	< 0.00*
D-Q8	151	20	1.45 (.89)	131	1.97 (1.00)	-2.39	28.33	0.02*
D-Q9	151	20	1.20 (.41)	131	1.85 (.94)	-5.26	59.84	< 0.00*
D-Q10	147	20	1.00 (0)	127	1.56 (.86)	-7.32	126	< 0.00*

*Note.* This table provides the t-test results of participants' perception of LSSP involvement frequency in the postsecondary transition planning process across Parts. *a* = Welch's test degrees of freedom reported. The asterisk symbol (\*) notes a significant *p* value at the  $\alpha = 0.05$  level per question.

APPENDIX L

Table 14 - Extended

*T-Test Results for Perceived Importance of LSSP Involvement*

Question	N (total)	LSSPs Group		Others Group		t	df <sup>a</sup>	p
		n	M (SD)	n	M (SD)			
A-Q1	241	20	2.85 (.81)	221	3.23 (.70)	-2.03	21.72	0.05*
A-Q2	241	20	2.7 (.98)	221	3.20 (.71)	-2.25	21.06	0.04*
A-Q3	241	20	3.4 (.60)	221	3.51 (.57)	-0.77	22.56	0.45
A-Q4	241	20	3.35 (.49)	221	3.43 (.54)	-0.69	23.85	0.50
A-Q5	241	20	2.7 (1.13)	221	3.29 (.64)	-2.29	20.22	0.03*
A-Q6	241	20	2.7 (.98)	221	3.26 (.66)	-2.52	20.74	0.02*
A-Q7	241	20	2.9 (1.07)	221	3.37 (.62)	-1.92	20.27	0.07
A-Q8	241	20	2.85 (.99)	221	3.32 (.68)	-2.07	20.84	0.05
A-Q9	241	20	2.85 (.81)	221	3.34 (.68)	-2.61	21.79	0.02*
A-Q10	241	20	2.85 (.93)	221	3.26 (.66)	-1.93	20.96	0.07
A-Q11	241	20	2.9 (.91)	221	3.26 (.65)	-1.72	20.96	0.10
A-Q12	241	20	2.6 (.99)	221	3.26 (.65)	-2.92	20.65	< 0.01*
B-Q1	241	20	2.75 (1.07)	221	3.33 (.67)	-2.40	20.52	0.03*
B-Q2	241	20	3.35 (.75)	221	3.38 (.56)	-0.18	21.23	0.86
B-Q3	241	20	3.2 (.77)	221	3.32 (.67)	-0.66	21.95	0.52
B-Q4	241	20	3.25 (.85)	221	3.29 (.72)	-0.20	21.79	0.84
B-Q5	241	20	3.4 (.75)	221	3.39 (.65)	0.04	21.90	0.97
B-Q6	241	20	3.35 (.99)	221	3.36 (.64)	-0.05	20.64	0.96
B-Q7	241	20	3.75 (.44)	221	3.45 (.61)	2.81	26.58	0.01*
B-Q8	241	20	2.9 (1.17)	221	3.29 (.64)	-1.47	20.18	0.16
B-Q9	241	20	2.65 (.99)	221	3.29 (.67)	-2.84	20.79	0.01*
B-Q10	241	20	3.35 (.67)	221	3.36 (.61)	-0.05	22.28	0.96
C-Q1	241	20	2.38 (.95)	221	3.31 (.72)	-2.35	21.22	0.03*
C-Q2	241	20	3.15 (.75)	221	3.48 (.58)	-1.90	21.33	0.07
C-Q3	241	20	3.00 (.73)	221	3.27 (.64)	-1.59	22.02	0.13

Table 14 – Extended Continued  
*T-Test Results for Perceived Importance of LSSP Involvement*

Question	<i>N</i> (total)	LSSPs Group		Others Group		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i> <sup>a</sup>	<i>p</i>
		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )			
C-Q4	241	20	2.95 (.69)	221	3.27 (.65)	-1.99	22.54	0.06
C-Q5	241	20	2.60 (.88)	221	3.20 (.72)	-3.01	21.62	0.01*
C-Q6	241	20	2.75 (1.02)	221	3.37 (.69)	-2.65	20.78	0.02*
C-Q7	241	20	3.45 (.51)	221	3.38 (.67)	0.57	25.94	0.57
C-Q8	241	20	2.70 (.86)	221	3.31 (.70)	-3.05	21.59	0.01*
C-Q9	241	20	2.75 (.79)	221	3.21 (.74)	-2.53	22.50	0.02*
D-Q1	241	20	2.45 (.89)	221	3.09 (.79)	-3.12	22.09	0.01*
D-Q2	241	20	2.25 (1.02)	221	3.19 (.78)	-4.04	21.29	< 0.00*
D-Q3	241	20	2.40 (.99)	221	3.12 (.78)	-3.14	21.38	< 0.00*
D-Q4	241	20	3.25 (.55)	221	3.29 (.64)	-0.30	24.51	0.76
D-Q5	241	20	2.45 (.99)	221	3.15 (.77)	-3.28	21.33	0.01*
D-Q6	241	20	2.45 (1.00)	221	3.14 (.74)	-3.00	21.12	0.01*
D-Q7	241	20	2.40 (.99)	221	3.09 (.87)	-2.98	21.98	0.01*
D-Q8	241	20	2.50 (1.19)	221	3.19 (.83)	-2.53	20.88	0.02*
D-Q9	241	20	2.60 (.94)	221	3.26 (.78)	-3.06	21.67	0.01*
D-Q10	241	20	2.20 (1.06)	221	3.14 (.81)	-3.88	21.29	< 0.00*

Note. This table provides t-tests results of participants' perception of the importance of LSSP involvement in the postsecondary transition planning process across all Parts. *a* = Welch's test degrees of freedom reported. The asterisk symbol (\*) notes a significant *p* value at the  $\alpha = 0.05$  level per question.