

Fall 2021

School Psychologists' Involvement in Transition Programming

Valerie Bell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>



Part of the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bell, V.(2021). *School Psychologists' Involvement in Transition Programming*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/6627>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS' INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION
PROGRAMMING

by

Valerie Bell

Bachelor of Arts
University of Pittsburgh, 2004

Master of Arts in Education
University of Pittsburgh, 2005

Master of Arts
The Citadel, 2010

Specialist in Education
The Citadel, 2011

Masters of Arts in Administration
University of South Carolina, 2020

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Special Education

College of Education

University of South Carolina

2021

Accepted by:

Kathleen Marshall, Major Professor

Anthony Plotner, Committee Member

Mark Samudre, Committee Member

Kelly Wulf, Committee Member

Tracey L. Weldon, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Valerie Bell, 2021
All Rights Reserved.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the extent school psychologists reported pre-service training programs addressed involvement in transition programming (e.g., planning, monitoring, and evaluation); their involvement in it; their desire to be involved in transition; possible factors influencing school psychologists' involvement in it; and if pre-service and professional training in transition affects school psychologists' involvement and perceptions of their role in the process. Four hundred-fifteen respondents completed an anonymous, online survey. Results indicated participants had not received pre-service training or professional development related to transition; they were rarely or never involved in transition at the elementary, middle, and/or high school levels, although they indicated it was important to be; and caseload size, current responsibilities, transition programming not being a part of their job descriptions, and current work setting had the greatest influence on their involvement in transition. The implications for both practice and research are discussed.

Keywords: National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), school psychologist, transition planning

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER ONE: DECRPTION AND SIGNFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM	1
TRASITION PLANNING	1
IEP TEAMS	2
FOUNDATION OF THE PRACTICE OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY	3
ROLES OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS.....	5
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE TRANSITION PROCESS	7
STATEMENT OF NEED	8
PURPOSE STATEMENT	11
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	12
METHOD SUMMARY	12
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS	13
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	16
EVOLUTION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION.....	16
HISTORY OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY	20
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY CERTIFICATION, LISCENSURE, AND ACCREDITATION.....	27
CURRENT PRACTICE IN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY	30
CURRENT ROLES OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS	31

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS' INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION.....	53
PROPOSALS FOR CHANGING ROLES RELATED TO SECONDARY TRANSITON	60
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS EMPLOYED AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.....	64
PERCEPTIONS RELATED TO TRANSITION SERVICES.....	66
SUMMARY	70
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH	72
METHODOLOGY	72
STUDY DESIGN.....	73
SURVEY PARTICIPANTS	74
INSTRUMENTATION	75
SURVEY PILOT	75
SURVEY DESIGN.....	75
PROCEDURES.....	77
DATA ANALYSIS.....	78
RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY	80
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	82
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	82
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	97
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	100
SUMMARY OF SUDY	100
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	101
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	108

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE	109
DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	113
REFERENCES	116
APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR HUMAN RESEARCH APPROVAL LETTER.....	126
APPENDIX B: RESEARCH QUESTION/SURVEY ITEM ALIGNMENT	131
APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FOR WEB-BASED SURVEY.....	134
APPENDIX D: CONTACT 1: INITIAL EMAIL	140
APPENDIX E: CONTACT 2: REMINDER 1 EMAIL.....	142
APPENDIX F: CONTACT 3: REMINDER 2 EMAIL.....	143
APPENDIX G: TABLES TO ACCOMPANY CHAPTER 4.....	144
APPENDIX H: HOW PRE-SERVICE TRAINING CAN IMPROVE TRANSITION EDUCATION	155

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 4.1 HOW PRE-SERVICE PROGRAMS PROVIDED TRAINING	83
TABLE 4.2 PREPAREDNESS TO ADDRESS TRANSITION BASED ON PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION	84
TABLE 4.3 SATISFACTION OF PRE-SERVICE TRANSITION EDUCATION TRAINING RECEIVED	85
TABLE 4.4 INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS	86
TABLE 4.5 MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL TRANSITION PROGRAMMING INVOLVEMENT	88
TABLE 4.6 FAMILIARITY WITH SUPPORTS PROVIDED TO TRANSITION-AGE YOUTH.....	90
TABLE 4.7 FAMILIARITY WITH EVIDENCE-BASED TRANSITION PRACTICES	91
TABLE 4.8 TRANSITION LISTED AS PART OF JOB DESCRIPTION	91
TABLE 4.9 SETTINGS' EMPLOYMENT OF A TRANSITION COORDINATOR	92
TABLE 4.10 HOW PRE-SERVICE TRAINING PROVIDED TRANSITION TRAINING	94
TABE 4.11 MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT CORRELATED TO PRE-SERVICE TRAINING.....	95
TABLE 4.12 ELEMENTARY INVOLVEMENT CORRELATED TO PRE-SERVICE TRAINING.....	95
TABLE 4.13 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RECEIVED RELATED TO TRANSITION.....	96
TABLE 4.14 INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION CORRELATED TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.....	96

TABLE 4.15 FAMILIARITY OF SUPPORTS CORRELATED TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	111
TABLE B.1 RESEARCH QUESTION/SURVEY ALIGNMENT	131
TABLE G.1 DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPATING SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS	144
TABLE G.2 EXTENT AREAS WERE ADDRESSED BY PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM	147
TABLE G.3 AREAS OF INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION FOR EMELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS	148
TABLE G.4 AREAS OF INVOLEVEMENT IN TRANSITION FOR MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.....	149
TABLE G.5 IMPORTANCE OF INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION	150
TABLE G.6 FACTORS INFLUENCING INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION.....	151
TABLE G.7 FAMILIARITY WITH TRANSITION SERVICE DELIVERY.....	152
TABLE G.8 RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE CORRELATED TO PRE-SERVICE TRAINING.....	153
TABLE H.1 HOW PRESERVICE TRINING CAN IMPROVE TRANSITION EDUCATION	154

CHAPTER 1

DESCRIPTION AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Transition Planning

Advantageous outcomes for students transitioning from high school to higher education, employment, and independent living is important for all students. Transition planning is especially important for students with disabilities, their families, individuals working with them, and the communities in which they reside. Research has found students with disabilities are more likely to be unemployed, work for lower wages, and be isolated from their communities and friends after leaving high school. (National Longitudinal Transition Study-2, 2003). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004) mandates the inclusion of transition goals and transition services in IEPs of students at the time of their sixteenth birthdays and then annual reviews of the goals. Transition goals are derived from transition assessments related to students' training, education, employment, and, when appropriate, independent living skills, in order for students to be successful after exiting high school. Well-written transition plans consider students' abilities, needs, and preferences, as well as their anticipated needs after high school (Hardman & Dawson, 2010). Thoughtful transition planning is also necessary in order for students to improve their quality of life by outlining the provision of instruction regarding to and improving upon necessary skills related to training, education, employment, and independent living skills while in school. Numerous individuals are

involved in developing successful transition plans. At the high school level, these individuals may include but are not limited to the students themselves, the students' families, special education teachers, transition coordinators, and outside agencies (IDEA, 2004).

IEP Teams

IDEA (2004) mandates the following individuals be included in IEP teams: parents of the students; a regular education teacher; a special education teacher; a representative of the school district who is qualified to provide (or supervise the provision of) specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of the students and is knowledgeable of the general education curriculum and the district's availability of resources; an individual who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results; other individuals who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the students; and, when appropriate, the students themselves. Although the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) (HR 1350) mandates transition planning services, it does not indicate who is responsible for organizing and providing services. Although not explicitly identified as necessary IEP team members, school psychologists can be invaluable members of IEP team for numerous reasons.

During IEP meetings, school psychologists can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results and participate as members of IEP teams at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels. Their participation can include initial development of IEPs when students are found eligible to receive special education, as well as development and review of Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs). Through their participation in transition programming, they can be a valuable resource when creating

successful transition plans for students; consequently, they can be beneficial members of IEP teams (Kellems, Springer, Wilkins, & Anderson, 2016; Talapatra, Roach, Varjas, Houchins, & Crimmins, 2018; Talapatra, Miller, & Schumacher-Martinez, 2019; Wilczenski, Cook, & Regal, 2017). School psychologists have received training regarding how to administer assessments, how to determine what assessments are most appropriate to meet students' needs, and how to choose assessments to best align with the concepts being measured. This specialized training can be utilized to interpret results of transition assessments to create effective transition plans.

Foundation of the Practice of School Psychology

School psychologists receive training regarding how to utilize information obtained from students, as well as from the systems they are part of, in order to ensure students' success. They consider all aspects related to students' welfare, as well as the interactions of individuals around them in order to ensure students' success. According to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP, 2020), school psychologists possess knowledge of psychology and education and can communicate important principles and concepts; promote the academic, social, behavioral, and emotional success of students; maintain safe, supportive, equitable, and effective learning environments; improve family, school, and community collaboration; demonstrate relevant knowledge and skills; reflect an understanding and respect for human diversity and promote effective services, advocacy, and social justice; and deliver a comprehensive range of services resulting in direct, measurable outcomes for students, families, schools, etc. The role of school psychologists is to improve outcomes for all students by helping them be successful academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally (NASP, 2020). The

NASP Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services is NASP's official policy related to the delivery of comprehensive school psychological services (NASP, 2020). NASP's Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists promotes effective school psychology services by identifying critical graduate education experiences and competencies necessary for individuals preparing to be school psychologists (NASP, 2020). NASP's Principles for Professional Ethics (2020) is meant to protect individuals receiving services from school psychologists by informing school psychologists of the ethical aspects of their work, educating them about appropriate conduct, assisting them in monitoring their behavior, and providing standards to be used in the resolution of complaints of unethical conduct. The Model and NASP's Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists and Principles for Professional Ethics (NASP, 2020) define contemporary school psychology; promote school psychologists' services for children, families, and schools; and provide a foundation for the future of school psychology. The Model includes organizational principles as well as professional practices which include data-based decision making, instructional consultation, academic interventions, diversity in learning and development, program evaluation, and legal practices. The domains within the Model in which school psychologists provide comprehensive and integrated services are as follows: data-based decision making and accountability; consultation and collaboration; interventions and instructional support to develop academic skills; interventions and mental health services to develop social and life skills; school-wide practices to promote learning; preventative and responsive services; family-school collaboration services; diversity in development and learning; research and program evaluation; and legal, ethical, and professional

practice (NASP, 2020). The Model and NASP's Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists and Principles for Professional Ethics help shape the functions and roles of school psychologists.

Roles of School Psychologists

Historically, the primary role of school psychologists has been assessment in order to determine special education eligibility (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). As the field of school psychology developed, the administration and interpretation of aptitude and achievement tests became school psychologists' primary role (Fagan & Wise, 2007). School psychologists' tasks in assessment include evaluating students in order to assist with determining eligibility for special education services and accommodations, as well as the continued need for special education services and accommodations. Typically, a school psychologist is the member of an IEP team who is capable of interpreting evaluation results, which is a required role as outlined by IDEA (2004). The Regular Education Initiative (1986) of the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services advocated for the integration of special and general education. Prereferral assessment and intervention gained attention due to IDEA (2004) and was considered part of the referral process. Therefore, ideally, school psychologists should be more involved in general education in order to address interventions, as well as aspects of students' social-emotional well-being. Many school psychologists' functions are similar to those of the 1920s although referrals and preferences of practitioners are different (Fagan & Wise, 2007).

Results from the NASP Self-Assessment Tool for School Psychologists (SATSP) show school psychologists continue to engage in the traditional role of test-and-place

despite federal legislative and policy changes calling for a more comprehensive and integrated service delivery model (i.e., the NASP Practice Model, Every Student Succeeds Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, and multitiered systems of support) (Walcott, McNamara, Hyson, & Charvat, 2018). If school psychologists are able to engage in the range of activities included in the broader roles outlined by the NASP Practice Model, they can contribute more comprehensively to promote positive outcomes for children and their families by supporting positive school climates (including strong family-school partnerships), improving instruction and learning, and improving assessment and accountability (NASP, 2020). Examples of activities outlined in the NASP Practice Model include evaluating treatment fidelity of interventions, their effectiveness, and the need to modify them; facilitating effective communication and collaboration between families, teachers, community providers, etc.; and providing a continuum of mental and behavioral health services (e.g., individual and group counseling, behavioral coaching, positive behavioral supports, parent education) (NASP, 2020). One of the additional activities within the broader role of school psychology is facilitating the design and delivery of curricula to help students develop effective skills, such as self-regulation, planning, organization, empathy, social skills, and decision making. Engagement in this activity is an example of how school psychologists' can be involved in the transition process. By participating in transition planning and support, school psychologists can have a positive effect on children, their families, and the communities in which they reside; as well as improve family-school partnerships, assessment, instruction, and learning which aligns with activities outlined in the NASP Practice Model.

School Psychologists' Involvement in the Transition Process

The role of transition specialists is to facilitate and coordinate transition services among stakeholders (e.g., the school and other agencies). Skills taught in transition specialist training programs are similar to skills possessed by school psychologists and can be used to collaborate with transition specialists to contribute to the transition planning process (Levinson & Murphy, 1999). When all stakeholders (e.g., schools, community agencies, human service organizations, employers, student, and families) work together, the success of postsecondary outcomes increases (Blanchett, 2001; Knott & Asselin, 1999).

Due to the training school psychologists receive, "School psychologists are well positioned both to assist in transition assessment and to provide documentation of accommodations students will need when they exit the school system" (Kellems et al., 2016). Lillenstein, Lennson, Sylvester, and Brady (2006) found that although school psychologists can significantly contribute to transition planning, their actual involvement is limited. Traditionally, school psychologist support transition by collaborating with IEP teams in order to carry out the roles as outlined by the NASP Practice Model. Although the roles of school psychologists in transition can vary, the administration of assessments, interpretation of the results, and provision of evidence-based recommendations are considered to be the responsibilities of school psychologists (Kellems et al., 2016). School psychologists are also responsible for providing assessment information used to create and implement transition plans. Additionally, school psychologists are aware of available assessments and their appropriateness for specific students, including their appropriate use and interpretation. The information from assessments administered by

school psychologists provide IEP teams with information necessary in order to “ground transition efforts and provide a basis for services and accommodations students will require in the future” (Kellems et al., 2016). The information obtained from assessments administered by school psychologists can also be used to anticipate the level of success students will have after high school in an institution of higher education or at specific jobs and can be used to strengthen areas of need identified by them (Lillenstein et al, 2006). School psychologists can also assist IEP teams in identifying and developing appropriate transition goals. Lillenstein et al., (2006) believe school psychologists can evaluate the anticipated effectiveness of transition plans in facilitating necessary skills needed for students to be successful after leaving high school. They can also be consultants by conducting professional development and parent trainings and be group facilitators to promote cooperation and coordination among team members. Additionally, school psychologists can develop and/or implement social skills or behavior management programs.

Statement of Need

Minimal research has been completed regarding school psychologists’ involvement related to transition tasks. Staab (1996) surveyed school psychologists working with secondary students about their performance of functions related to transition planning. Results indicated school psychologist were not or only occasionally performing functions related to the categories of consultation, direct services, and program planning/evaluation; however, they frequently performed functions related to the category of assessment (e.g., 50% of their time). School psychologists reported functions under the category of consultation, assessment, and direct services “probably should” or

“definitely should” be performed. They believed they “definitely should” explain test results to students so they understand their strengths/needs and modifications/adaptions needed for successful transition planning and programming; complete triannual evaluations to help meet transition planning needs; and be involved in decisions regarding appropriate placements and support of students in curricular areas. Direct services and program planning were areas school psychologists had less exposure. Beliefs regarding the importance of transitions services appeared to emerge through experience, although most school psychologists indicated they would like more training. The school psychologists surveyed believed they should be a part of completing transition activities and they were not performing them at the level they should. Barriers of involvement in transition planning included time assigned at the secondary level, caseloads, and evaluation schedules.

Lillenstein et al., (2006) attempted to determine the levels of involvement and perceived importance of school psychologists’ involvement in transition related tasks. In the study, school psychologists and transition coordinators in Pennsylvania completed a questionnaire looking at how often tasks were performed by school psychologists and the perceived importance of involvement by school psychologists in the following areas: consultation, psychological and psycho-educational assessment; direct services; and program planning and evaluation. The results of the study concluded school psychologists and transition coordinators agreed as to the importance of school psychologists’ involvement in each transition task.

Within the study, more than half of school psychologists reported knowing some information about transition but felt they needed to be more knowledgeable in order to

complete transition activities. Less than one percent of school psychologists reported receiving transition training through a graduate program. Additionally, less than 11% of school psychologists reported being well prepared; approximately 26% reported being adequately prepared; and 10% reported they were not prepared to participate in transition.

Lillenstein et al., (2006) concluded school psychologists recognize and support the importance of transition planning and desire to be more involved in the process. However, various barriers limit school psychologists' involvement in the transition process. These barriers include large caseloads, lack of time, and absence of training (Levinson et al., 2006). In interviews, both school psychologists and transition coordinators identified the following barriers of involvement: transition is not part of the job description; lack of interest in transition activities; lack of training in transition; referral backlog; little secondary work; not invited to participate; lack of awareness; role restriction; and number of buildings served.

Despite federal legislative and policy changes calling for a more comprehensive and integrated service delivery model, school psychologists continue to engage in the traditional role of test-and-place (Staab, 1996; Fagan, & Wise, 2000; Walcott et al., 2018). Additionally, school psychologists recognize and support the importance of transition planning and want to be more involved; however, barriers such as large caseloads, lack of time, and absence of training prevent it (Levinson et al., 2006). Results from a study conducted by Talapatra, Wilcox, Roof, & Hutchinson (2019) substantiate school psychologists are minimally involved in transition assessment, transition planning, and IEP transition goal development.

Additional research is needed related to the amount and type of training school psychologists receive related to transition programming; their involvement in transition programming; and barriers related to their involvement. School psychologists desire to be more involved in the process of transition in order to provide additional support to students, families, and agencies. Ideally, an increased understanding of the preparation of school psychologists, as well as their capacity to work in various roles related to IEP development and the transition process, will allow them to provide a more comprehensive range of supports to students, families, and agencies. An understanding of the amount of training received; the aspects of transition programming it addressed; and school psychologists' involvement in transition assessment, programs, and practices will help determine if school psychologists are being utilized to their fullest potential based on the skills they possess. Therefore, it is important to gather additional information concerning the training of school psychologists related to transition programming in order to determine if school psychologists need additional preparation in the area of transition, as well as their current involvement in transition programming and what factors may influence their involvement. What school psychologists would like their roles in transition programming to be and how to make this a reality in the future is also an important consideration.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to determine school psychologists' reported training and involvement in the transition planning process and the relationship between the two. An understanding of the perceived training of school psychologists and their involvement in transition assessment, programs, and practices will help determine if school

psychologists are being utilized to their fullest potential based on their roles, responsibilities, and capabilities when considering the array of the skills they possess.

Research Questions

This study is designed to answer the following research questions:

RQ 1: To what extent do school psychologist report their training programs addressed involvement in transition programming (e.g., planning, monitoring, and evaluation)?

RQ 2: How involved are school psychologists in transition programming (e.g., assessment, collaboration, IEP development, implementation, data collection) for elementary, middle, and high school students?

RQ 3: To what extent (e.g., assessment, collaboration, IEP development, implementation, data collection) do school psychologist want to be involved in transition programming?

RQ 4: What factors influence school psychologists' involvement in the transition programming (e.g., caseload, presences of a transition coordinator)?

RQ 5: Does training in transition programming affect school psychologists' involvement and perceptions of their role in the transition programming process?

Method Summary

To answer each of these research questions, individuals who hold certificates in the area of School Psychology in five south eastern states will completed a web-based survey using a link obtained from an email. Quantitative analysis will be used to analyze survey responses. Descriptive statistics for close-ended items and content analysis for open-ended items will be used to describe patterns in school psychologists' reports

concerning the extent to which their training programs addressed involvement in transition programming; their involvement in transition programming; and the degree to which they want to be involved in transition programming. Inferential statistics will be used to identify factors that may contribute to school psychologists' involvement in transition programming; determine if the amount of training received related to transition programming affects school psychologists' involvement in or preference to be involved in transition programming; and if school psychologists' level of training related to transition programming affects their perceived accountability to be involved in it.

Definitions of Terms

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The Every Student Succeeds Act is a reauthorization of the 50-year-old Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The previous version of the law was the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. ESSA's goal is to fully prepare all students for success in college and careers (U.S. Department of Education).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) (HR 1350). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) ensures children with disabilities are offered a free, appropriate, public education, as well as special education and related services (U.S. Department of Education).

Individualized Education Program (IEP). Individualized Education Program or IEP is a written statement for a child with a disability that is developed, reviewed, and revised in a meeting in accordance with Section 300.320 through 300.324, and that must include (a) a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance..., (b) a statement of measurable annual goals..., (c) a description

of how the child's progress...will be measured... and when..., and (d) a statement of special education and related services... [IDEA, 20 U.S.C. 1414(d)(1)(A) and (d)(6)].

Multitiered systems of support (MTSS). Multitiered systems of support (MTSS) are intended to expand access to comprehensive and differentiated school services by integrating multiple systems and services to simultaneously address students' academic achievement, behavior, and social-emotional well-being (NASP, 2019).

National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). The National Association of School Psychologists or NASP represents over 25,000 school psychologists, graduate students, and related professionals throughout the United States and other countries worldwide. It is the world's largest organization of school psychologists and works to advance effective practices improving students' learning, behavior, and mental health (NASP, 2019).

NASP Practice Model. The NASP Practice Model is a formal model of practice designed to improve consistent implementation of services provided by school psychologists to ensure maximize effectiveness, efficiency, and quality nationwide (NASP, 2020).

School Psychologist. A school psychologist is a member of school teams with expertise in mental health, learning, and behavior who helps students succeed academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. They strengthen connections and foster supportive learning environments by partnering with families, individuals within schools, and other professionals (NASP, 2019).

Transition Plan. Transition plans are developed as part of students' IEPs at the time of their sixteenth birthdays in accordance with IDEA (2004). They are tailored to

meet the needs of individual students and increase the likelihood of achieving post school outcomes. Transition plans include interpreting transition assessment results; developing present levels of performance, measurable postsecondary goals, and annual transition goals; and describing transition services.

Transition Planning. During transition planning, students, parents, educators, and services providers collaborate to create a match between students' abilities, needs, preferences, and the demands of their adult environment (Hardman & Dawson, 2010).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Evolution of Special Education

The development of the contemporary field of school psychology parallels the evolution of the field of special education. Understanding the progression of the field of special education provides perspective for the current roles and responsibilities of school psychologists, most of which were developed in response to the shifting regulations resulting from special education legislation. Both litigation and legislation continue to shape the nature and breadth of services provided to students with or at-risk for disabilities, and, consequently, continue to affect the scope of services expected of school psychologists.

Rights for children with disabilities evolved from state statutes, federal court cases based on the U.S. Constitution, and federal legislation such as IDEA (2004), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (1973), and the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act. In 1909, the first White House Conference on Children and Youth sought to define and establish remedial programs for children with disabilities and students with disabilities transitioning from being institutionalized to being segregated in separate classes within public schools (Yell, Rogers, & Rogers, 1998). All states had compulsory attendance laws by 1918; however, millions of children with disabilities were refused enrollment or improperly served by public schools prior to the 1970s (Fagan & Wise, 2007; Kauffman, Hallahan, Pullen, & Badar 2018; Martin, Martin, & Terman, 1996;

Osborne & Russo, 2014; Yell, et al., 1998). Parental advocacy groups such as the Cuyahoga County Ohio Council for the Retarded Children, the National Association for Retarded Citizens, the Council for Exceptional Children, and the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps banded together to address issues encountered by students with disabilities who attended school, including those who continued to be excluded. By working together and collaborating with professional organizations, positive change occurred at district, state, and national levels. By the early 1970s, most states had passed laws requiring the education of students with disabilities (Yell, et al., 1998; Osborne & Russo, 2014). By 1973, 45 states had passed legislation related to educating children with disabilities; however, many students with disabilities remained unserved or underserved due to the slow enforcement of compulsory attendance laws, as well as courts continuing to uphold schools' decisions not to educate students with disabilities (Martin et al., 1996; Yell, et al., 1998). However, the Civil Rights movement and the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 shifted the nation's view regarding the education of students with disabilities from exclusionary to inclusionary practices.

Court cases.

Legislation prompted by the Civil Rights movement led to improved equality for minority populations, as well as for individuals with disabilities. Precedents set by *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954, changed schools' policies, as well as how students with disabilities were treated. Additionally, *Brown v. Board of Education* determined segregation based on disability was unconstitutional. Citing the *Brown* case, advocates for students with disabilities argued students with disabilities had the same rights as students without disabilities (Yell, et al., 1998). In 1971, *Pennsylvania Association for*

Retarded Children (PARC) v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania resulted in Pennsylvania agreeing to provide children with intellectual disabilities full access to a free, public education up to age 21. The case also determined, “Each child be offered an education appropriate to his or her learning capacities,” and the least restrictive placement (Martin et al., 1996; Yell, et al., 1998; Osborne & Russo, 2014). The *Mills v. Board of Education* case in 1972 prohibited school districts from determining they did not have adequate resources to serve students with disabilities. It specified students with disabilities had “an equal right to public education offered in a form that was meaningful to them” and that they were entitled to full procedural protections (i.e., notice of proposed changes, access to school records, a right to be heard and to be represented by legal counsel at hearings to determine changes in individual programs, regularly scheduled status reviews, etc.). *Mills* also prohibited districts from planning special education programs in advance and offering them to students based on available space (Martin et al., 1996; Yell, Rogers, & Rogers, 1998; Osborne & Russo, 2014). In *Board of Education v. Rowley*, the court concluded students should have access to specialized instruction and services that provide educational benefit designed on an individual basis. A free, appropriate, public education (FAPE) was also defined. Although laws and court cases dictated education was necessary for students with disabilities, the form of education differed by state and states continued to make excuses for not providing appropriate education for students with disabilities (e.g., lack of resources including funding, qualified teachers, etc.). Therefore, federal involvement was required.

Legislation.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 increased funding for the education of students in public schools and provided financial support to colleges and universities in order to train leadership personnel in teaching children with intellectual disabilities. In 1963, grants were also included to train college teachers and researchers regarding a broad array of disabilities in (Martin et al., 1996; Yell, et al., 1998). In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (titled the Education for the Handicapped Act in 1970) provided funds to improve the education of students with disabilities. It was amended in 1974 in order to require states receiving federal funding for special education to provide full educational opportunities for all students with disabilities. Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA) in 1996, a Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped (BEH) provided grants to states to “initiate, expand, or improve programs for educating children with disabilities” (Martin et al., 1996). Section 504 prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities by agencies receiving federal funds. When Section 504 was amended in 1974, the amendment extended civil rights protection to students with disabilities. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) of 1975 (renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 1990) required all students with disabilities receive a free, appropriate, public education and provided funding related to the excess costs of offering programs. It also specified IEPs would be developed for every student receiving special education and they would include the following: goals and objectives of students’ programs, educational placement, length of the school year, and evaluation and measurement criteria (Yell, et al., 1998; Osborne & Russo, 2014). IDEA mandated states to provide services to students with disabilities ages

three to 21. It also stated students with disabilities should be educated in regular education classrooms when appropriate (i.e., least restrictive environment [LRE]), as well as offered a continuum of services. State statutes, federal court cases, and federal legislation have influenced and continue to attempt to improve the education of students with disabilities which has ranged from students with disabilities not being educated within public school settings to public schools being required to offer students with disabilities a free, appropriate, public education.

As students with disabilities enrolled in school and special education evolved, individuals who could help support schools in their efforts to serve students with disabilities were needed. The field of school psychology emerged in order to fulfill this requirement and has been and continues to be shaped by legislation. However, professionals within the field continue to desire and advocate for the expansion of the services they provide.

History of School Psychology

According to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP, 2020), the understanding of diversity in development and learning; research and program evaluation; and legal, ethical, and professional practice encompass the foundation of all services provided by school psychologists. The role of school psychologists is to improve outcomes for all students by helping them succeed academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Traditionally, the outcome of the practice of school psychology has been the determination of special education placement for students with disabilities (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000); however, the functions of school psychologists are capable of expansion. Aspects of contemporary school psychology did not exist prior

to the 1890s. Major developments occurring within the field can be organized into two periods: the hybrid and thoroughbred years (Fagan & Wise, 2007). Several key individuals in both periods were responsible for guiding the development of school psychology as it exists today.

Hybrid years: 1890-1969.

A blend of practices from the fields of education and psychology evolved into the field of school psychology with the initial purpose of determining special class placement for students with disabilities (Fagan & Wise, 2007; Kaplan & Kaplan, 1985). What would eventually become school psychological services was prompted by reform movements (e.g., compulsory schooling, juvenile courts, child labor laws, mental health, and vocational guidance) regarded as child-saving efforts. Child-saving efforts developed from a new perspective in which people believed many societal problems could be overcome by improving the conditions of children's lives (i.e., systematic education). This notion has been a pervasive theme within the United States' educational system (Fagan, 1992; Fagan & Wise, 2007; Kaplan & Kaplan, 1985).

The requirement of compulsory education adopted among states between 1852 and 1890 increased student enrollment, leading to concerns regarding students' physical and mental states and resulted in the emergence of special education. By 1910, special education classes were available in many urban and some rural cities. At that time, special education classes were also provided to students who were truant, delinquent, or had intellectual disabilities (Fagan, 1992). Special education and the need to identify students requiring it necessitated the use of minimal school psychological services. Services were delivered in clinics within and outside of schools. In 1915, Arnold Gesell

was assigned to travel throughout the state of Connecticut diagnosing children in need of special class placement (French, 1984). By the 1920s, psychological testing was prevalent and used to segregate individuals for specialized treatment. With the advent of widely available psychological testing, the administration and interpretation of ability and achievement tests became school psychologists' primary role and led to the development of special education categories related to intellectual ability (e.g., bright, above average, normal, slow) (Fagan & Wise, 2007; Farrell, 2010). The refer-test-report model consumed school psychologists' time through the hybrid years with little time left to complete other functions (Fagan & Wise, 2007). The variety of ability and achievement tests grew and the purpose of their administration evolved to focus on answering school districts' specific questions rather than outlining students' strengths and weaknesses (Fagan & Wise 2007). Clinics were established in the 1900s to the 1930s and provided services similar to those currently provided by school psychologists (Fagan & Wise, 2007). For example, a director of psychological measurements in 1925 believed school psychologists were responsible for selecting and interpreting tests; consulting; conducting research; establishing mental health programs; and working with various populations of students including those suspected of having intellectual and physical disabilities, those not working up to their potential, and those who had conduct disorders (French, 1984). At first, school psychology was not a separate specialization and was a combination of clinical psychology and child study; later, services were provided by practitioners with training in the "new" physiological psychology and by individuals considered forerunners in clinical psychology (Fagan, 1996; Fagan & Wise, 2007). School psychologists were not necessarily regarded as professionals within school systems but rather viewed as

support, enabling schools to educate “average” students through identification and segregation of students requiring special education. Hence, the notion of school psychologists as “gatekeepers” emerged which continues to be a prevalent perception to this day (Fagan & Wise, 2007; Merrell, Ervin, Gimpel Peacock, 2012). At the time, the profession did not hold professional status and psychologists working in school settings did not have the same status as those employed in other settings. However, the field continued to grow, as did school psychologists’ status (e.g., credentialing), the need for the field, and the amount of training programs.

The educational and clinical psychology roots of school psychology programs have been influenced by the clinical and experimental child study efforts of Witmer and Hall (Fagan, 1992; French 1984; Merrell et al., 2012) throughout the turn of the century. During this time, psychological services focused on understanding the individual child and distinguished the field of school psychology from others. Lightner Witmer (1867-1956), considered by many to be the father of school psychology, advocated for the training of a “psychological expert who is capable of treating the many difficult cases that resist the ordinary methods of the school room”. He stressed an individualized approach which used psychological methods to solve the problems of children, particularly problems related to schooling, and focused on prevention and intervention (Fagan, 1996; Fagan & Wise, 2007; Reschly, 2000).

G. Stanley Hall (1844-1924), who founded the American Psychological Association (APA) in 1892, was also influential in the scientific study of children and adolescents. He was concerned with the individual child, as well as the impact other

individuals within their environments had on them (Fagan, 1996; Fagan & Wise, 2007; French, 1984; Kaplan & Kaplan, 1985).

In 1937, Robert G. Bernreuter became head of Pennsylvania's State Education Agency. He enacted various legal changes within Pennsylvania including authorizing school psychologists, rather than physicians, to make recommendations for placing intellectually disabled children in classes; using the term Supervisors of Special Education for school psychologists; requiring every county to have a school psychologist to provide services to school districts and, when requested, to juvenile courts; and having every child who was not making typical progress in school take an examination given by a school psychologist. Due to these legal changes, Pennsylvania state educational agencies advanced the concept of school psychology by establishing regulations for certification and employment in the schools (French, 1984).

Development of measurement and psychological science built the foundation for the study of individual differences and test standardization. Mental ability testing allowed sorting of children for special education (Fagan, 1992; French, 1984; Merrell et al., 2012). In 1890, Cattell described tests assessing mental ability and stressed the importance of the administration and interpretation of batteries of tests (French, 1984). Alfred Binet's work in the early 1900s resulted in mental testing and the study of higher cognitive processes and gained widespread acceptability. Although work completed by Binet throughout his lifetime led to various contributions, his collaboration with Theodore Simon led to the development of an intelligence test. Henry H. Goodard promoted the popularity of Binet's test, although their definitions of intelligence varied (e.g., fixed versus fluctuating) (Francher, 1998). Arnold Gesell was the first person in the

United States to hold the title of school psychologist and his role was similar to many contemporary school psychologists' (Fagan & Wise, 2007; French, 1984; Merrell et al., 2000).

Thoroughbred years: 1970-present.

During the thoroughbred years, there was an increase in the number of training programs, practitioners, state and national associations, literature, and regulations leading to the establishment of the field of school psychology (Fagan & Wells, 2000; Fagan & Wise, 2007; Pryzwansky, 1993). Educational legislation helped promote the identity of school psychology and increase opportunities for child services. For example, *Larry P. v. Riles* (1984) highlighted the need for more culturally diverse assessments appropriate for all students despite their race, ethnic background, and gender, as well as students' special education placement after testing. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA, 1975) required psychological assessment for all students tested for disabilities and subsequent reauthorizations of the law influenced training and practice. Prior to the 1970s, psychological assessments and special class placements were recommended without requiring parents' permission (Fagan & Wise, 2007). Legislation led to improved guidelines for the practice of school psychology; the need to collect and maintain extensive documentation related to assessment, placement, etc.; and an increase of students requiring special education services which resulted in a need for additional school psychologists. Legislation and available certification of school psychologists resulted in Pennsylvania being one of the early leaders in the number of psychologists employed, as well as children served (French, 1984).

In the 1980s, the focus of the practice of school psychology shifted from students requiring special education to students who were considered at-risk due to changes in family structure, the rising cost of living, etc. An increase in school violence expanded the roles school psychologists were expected to perform (Fagan & Wise, 2007; Furlong, Morrison, & Pavelski, 2000). During the Regular Education Initiative enacted by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services in the 1980s, there was increased emphasis on the integration of special and general education and prereferral assessment (Fagan & Wise, 2007). Both academic and behavior intervention gained attention and became part of the referral process leading to the emergence of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), response to intervention (RtI), and multitiered system of supports (MTSS). As they emerged and evolved, PBIS established a foundation of universal, regular, proactive supports to prevent unwanted behaviors; RtI focused on providing academic interventions in order to increase student success; and MTSS focused on the provision of both academic and social-emotional interventions in order to increase success. The integration of general and special education and prereferral assessment resulted in the notion school psychologists should be more involved in general education in order to address interventions, mental health, and violence (Fagan & Wise, 2007; Sullivan & Long, 2010). The extent of school psychologists' involvement expanded to include participation in consultation; being members of intervention teams; and using data-based problem-solving skills to select and progress monitor interventions.

The field of school psychology is relatively new and has evolved in conjunction with the fields of education and psychology. The scope of assessments has evolved and

additional factors (e.g., personal characteristics, family, and environment) influencing students are considered with regard to student achievement. Although expectations of employers, technology, referrals, and preferences of practitioners have changed, many school psychologists' functions are similar to those of the 1920s (Fagan & Wise, 2007). Because the field of school psychology is relatively recent, the process of its certification, licensure, and accreditation is also new.

School Psychology Certification, Licensure, and Accreditation

Licensure.

In 1921, the American Psychological Association (APA), which is now known as the leading scientific and professional organization representing psychology in the United States, appointed the Committee on Certification of Consulting Psychologists in an effort to regulate practice and grant certificates. Twenty-four years later, the first school psychology licensure act was passed by the state of Connecticut for non-school practice. APA formally discussed and eventually recognized specialties related to psychology licensing in the mid to late 1970s. The emergence of school psychology was also due to formal recognition by APA's accreditation system and by the American Board of Professional Psychology. During that time, four states granted licensure for the title of school psychologist (Pryzwansky, 1993).

Certification.

In 1925, schools in New York instituted an examination for school psychologists and, in the 1930s, New York and Pennsylvania established state certification standards for school psychologists. Certification developments were significant for the following reasons: psychologists in schools were the first to be regulated by the government;

psychologists were authorized to handle responsibilities previously assumed by physicians; the role of school psychologist was restricted by requirements; programs of study at graduate schools were dictated by state education agencies; and certification led to an increased number of school positions (Pryzwansky, 1993). Seventeen states used the title of school psychologist by 1960 and by 1976, all states as well as the District of Columbia, were certifying school psychologists. Certification typically consisted of a paper review of an individual's credentials. In 1967, the American Board of Professional Psychology agreed to offer diplomas in the specialty of school psychology. In 1978 and 1981 NASP and then APA, respectively, developed credential standards. A national school psychology examination was developed by the Educational Testing Service as part of the National Teacher Examination for NASP and the National School Psychology Certification System was established (Pryzwansky, 1993). Since 1981, school psychologists have been able to register on the National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology.

Accreditation.

By 1953, the National Council for Accreditation in Teacher Education (NCATE) had authority to accredit school psychology programs within schools of education in institutions of higher education. The Thayer Conference was held by APA in 1954 in order to examine the roles, training, and qualifications of school psychologists. It determined the purpose of the practice of school psychology was to promote the best possible mental health of all children. Furthermore, it was determined the purpose of school psychologists was to assess and interpret the intellectual, social, and emotional development of children; diagnose educational and personal problems and recommend

intervention programs to facilitate learning and adjustment of all children; help identify exceptional children and collaborate with other professionals in order to meet their individual learning needs; and encourage and initiate research and interpret research findings applicable to the solution of school problems (French, 1984; Merrell et al., 2012). An APA accreditation program was established which recommended accreditation for school psychologists at the doctoral and two-year program level. Currently, the field of school psychology can be accredited by APA, NCATE, and NASP. In 1947, a survey of 102 psychology departments identified 20 departments providing training in school psychology and the number grew to 45 (plus nine combined programs including school psychology) in 1997 (Fagan & Wells, 2000). In 1970, the Standards and Criteria for the Accreditation of Doctoral Programs in School Psychology was approved by the APA Committee. The standards mirrored those of clinical and counseling psychology with the exception of a statement regarding the orientation and context, faculty, and field experiences of school psychology (Fagan & Wells, 2000).

In 1978, the APA/NASP Task Force was established in order to address concerns arising from both APA and NCATE being approved accreditors. Currently, the task force is only indirectly involved in accreditation activities. NCATE evaluates teacher education programs' objectives, effectiveness, student personnel policies and practices, patterns of academic and professional courses, faculty qualifications, facilities and resources, and professional laboratory experiences and accredits elementary and secondary school teachers, as well as school service personnel. School psychology was initially mentioned by NCATE in 1962. The first school psychology program was approved by APA in 1971 at the University of Texas. In 1972, NASP developed the Guidelines for Training

Programs and, by 1977, advocated for specialist and doctoral level training programs while APA appeared to be concerned with programs only at the doctoral level (Pryzwansky, 1993). NCATE sanctioned formal NASP approval of programs in 1987 which considered programs' values and philosophies, specific curricular content, field experiences, performance-based accountability, faculty and student information, resources, and facilities. As listed by NCATE in 1996, 123 institutions offered 37 doctoral, 64 specialists, and 86 master's programs for school psychology (Fagan & Wells, 2000).

Current Practice in School Psychology

The NASP Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services (2020), in conjunction with the NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists (2020) and Principles for Professional Ethics (2020), describe contemporary school psychology; promote school psychologists' services for children, families, and schools; and provide a foundation for the future of school psychology. The NASP Model includes organizational principles as well as professional practices. Today, school psychologists are trained in data-based decision making, instructional consultation, academic interventions, diversity in learning and development, program evaluation, and legal practices. The NASP Model identifies ten domains in which school psychologists provide comprehensive and integrated services. These domains are as follows: data-based decision making; consultation and collaboration; academic interventions and instructional supports; mental and behavioral health services and interventions; school-wide practices to promote learning; services to promote safe and supportive schools; family, school, and community collaboration; equitable practices for

diverse student populations; research and evidenced-based practices; and legal, ethical, and professional practice (NASP, 2020). The training of school psychologists prepares them to serve numerous functions and provide multiple services within educational settings. Specific characteristics (e.g., student-to-school psychologist ratio and opportunities for leadership development) of the educational settings in which school psychologists are employed impact the opportunities they have to fulfil these roles and provide a variety of services. Often legislation and policy dictates, at least partially, the services school psychologists provide. Although school psychologists are capable of providing a variety of services, they may be limited to testing and placement decisions depending on how localities interpret mandates (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Reschly, 2000).

Current Roles of School Psychologists

The current practice of school psychology does not align with its ideal vision (Fagan & Wise, 2007). As discussed previously, traditionally school psychologists' foremost role has been assessment (Fagan & Wise, 2007; Rossen & Charvat, 2011). One reason for this has been due to the reliance on a medical model for conceptualizing and providing services (Sheridan & Gutkin 2000). According to Ehrhardt-Padgett, Hatzichriston, Kitson, and Meyers (2004), focus within the field of school psychology has been limited to individual students, assessment, and special education placement which may result from local interpretation of policies and mandates. Additionally, eligibility determination is the foundation of financial support for school psychologists in nearly every state (Reschly, 2000) further contributing to assessment being the primary task of school psychologists. Because assessment has been emphasized and tied to

placement decisions, the activities of school psychologists are often restricted to the field of special education, although legislation supports and school psychologists believe they should be providing services to all children (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). Collaboration, which is included in NASP's Model (2020), is intended to be more than written reports and brief team meetings which routinely provide the primary guidance for individuals to implement psychological suggestions (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). An example of collaboration includes effectively communicating information and collaboration should occur with educational professionals at the individual, family, group, and systems levels, as well as with professionals within and across disciplines. Continuation of the assessment and placement mindset perpetuates school psychologists working with individual students, rather than providing preventative support and interventions at the systems-level.

School psychologists' tasks in assessment include evaluating students in order to assist with determining eligibility, as well as the continued need for special education services and accommodations. IDEA (2004) mandates IEP teams must consist of multiple individuals, one of which must be someone capable of interpreting evaluation results. School psychologists are capable of fulfilling this role due to their extensive training in administration of assessments and interpretation of results. Although NASP promotes a 1:500 school psychologist ratio, this is typically not a reality as school psychologists serve a multitude of students and often in multiple buildings. Their large caseloads, as well as the procedures of the schools in which they serve, often allow school psychologists to participate in only brief and infrequent meetings. School psychologists' typical role of communicating steps for implementing interventions which occurs in brief,

infrequent meetings with multiple participants, is insufficient for teachers and parents (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). Examples of these brief, infrequent meetings can include conversations with educators in hallways or in classrooms during instructional time and in the conclusion and discussions of written evaluation reports. School psychologists may become disheartened when treated as gatekeepers, overwhelmed with paperwork and legal guidelines (Berninger, 2006). Sheridan and Gutkin (2000) argue the primary and all-encompassing focus of assessment by school psychologists is time-consuming, yields minimal intervention information, and has occurred for far too long. The NASP Practice Model promotes advancement of the school psychologists' role of traditional test-and-place to a more comprehensive and integrated service delivery model (Walcott et al., 2018).

NASP developed an instrument, the Self-Assessment Tool for School Psychologists (SATSP), to help evaluate the roles and responsibilities of psychologists in schools. The SATSP is a self-report survey asking respondents to rate their degree of engagement in activities related to the ten domains of the NASP Practice Model; the importance of the activities to their overall effectiveness as school psychologists; and the degree to which they feel a need for professional development regarding these activities. Data from the completion of the SATSP can be used to identify skills and services expected to be available from most school psychologists; highlight the amount of time devoted to various activities in school psychologists' current roles, as well as the perceived importance of the activities; point out areas needing additional professional development; and establish goals for school psychologists in order to expand their current roles. Results of the SATSP suggest school psychologists continue to engage in the more

traditional role of test-and-place and continued training in system-level roles promoted by the NASP Practice Model is needed (Rossen & Charvat, 2011; Walcott et al., 2018).

In 2015, 1,274 NASP members returned 2,654 Membership Surveys randomly distributed in order to investigate nationwide demographic and professional trends in school psychology over a five-year cycle (Walcott et al., 2018). The survey targeted demographic and employment conditions of school psychologists during the 2014-2015 school year and trends in these conditions over time. The following information was gathered regarding primary job/role setting: school-based school psychologists-82.9%; university faculty-7.1%; school administrators-4.6%; employed by the State Department of Education-0.4%; and other-5.1%. The average student-to-school psychologist ratio reported was 1:1,381; therefore, it is less likely school psychologists are appropriately positioned to make significant contributions in order to achieve the broad range of services outlined by the NASP Practice Model (Walcott et al., 2018). However, when the NASP survey results (which are collected every five years) from 2015 and 2010 are compared, there is an improvement from previous years (e.g., in 1990 when 43% of respondents reported serving 1,500 students or fewer); However, these changes still fall short of the NASP Practice Model's recommended student-to-school psychologist ratio in order for school psychologists to carry out the broad-based roles advocated for by the Model. Additionally, the data from the Membership Survey shows some improvement when compared to a survey conducted by Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford, and Hall, (2002). The survey administered by Bramlett et al., (2002) updated estimates of the amount of time school psychologists spend in various roles and functions, as well identified the types of problems commonly referred to them. The results of the survey

indicated only 15% of the 370 respondents reported a ratio of 1:1,000. Additional results from the Membership Survey revealed school psychologists continue to engage primarily in the role of test-and-place despite federal legislative and policy changes calling for a more comprehensive and integrated service delivery model (e.g., the NASP Practice Model, Every Student Succeeds Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, and MTSS) (Walcott et al., 2018).

In order for school psychologists to be effective, they must also collaborate with other individuals influencing students' lives (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). Results obtained from 370 randomly-selected NASP members who completed the survey conducted by Bramlett et al., (2002) showed respondents' estimated amount of time engaging in the following activities: assessment-46%, consultation-16%, intervention-13%, counseling-8%, conferencing-7%, supervision-3%, providing in-services-2%, research-1%, parent training-1%, and other-3%. Although assessment is one of the roles of school psychologists, if school psychologists are able to engage in the range of activities included in the broader roles outlined by the NASP Practice Model, they can contribute more comprehensively to positive outcomes for children and their families by providing supportive, positive school climates (including strong family-school partnerships), improved instruction and learning, and improved assessment and accountability (NASP, 2020).

There are many ways the roles of school psychologists can be expanded to meet professional guidelines and address the changing instructional and service-delivery model in today's schools. As prevention and early intervention become emphasized and assessment includes a focus on progress measures, the possibility for school

psychologists to expand the breadth of their responsibilities to include working with interventions at the individual or systems level increases. However, results from SATSP (2015) show school psychologists continue to engage in the traditional role of test-and-place despite federal legislative and policy changes calling for a more comprehensive and integrated service delivery model (Walcott et al., 2018). An integrated service delivery model includes assessment, collaboration, consultation, prevention, intervention, and evaluation to ensure all students are achieving to the best of their abilities academically, socially, and emotionally. The school psychologist's role in an integrated service delivery model includes data-based decision making and accountability, consultation and collaboration, and direct and indirect services for children, families, and schools at the student and systems levels. Federal legislative and policy changes include the NASP Practice Model, Every Student Succeeds Act (2015), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004), and MTSS.

In order for the greatest number of students to benefit from services provided by school psychologists, school psychologists' responsibilities should grow from assessment to include interventions. However, training programs for school psychologists in the 1980s still continued to focus on traditional psychodiagnostics assessment. Surveys conducted in the 1960s through 1980s illustrated school psychologists continued to spend the majority of their time conducting assessments (Goldwasser, Meyers, Christenson, & Graden, 1983; Gross & Farling, 1969). However, school psychologists indicate they would like to expand their roles into consultation and intervention (Larson & Choi, 2009). Special education legislation has dictated the roles of school psychologists. However, Larson and Choi (2009) believe the reauthorization of IDEA in 2004, which

requires the use of response-to-intervention, is supporting the changing role of school psychologists. The percentage of work time devoted to roles before and after IDEA 2004 was passed was estimated by one hundred eighty-nine practicing school psychologists. Results showed the estimated amount of time devoted to traditional psychodiagnostic assessment decreased (55% to 47%) and estimated time devoted to intervention, preventative services, and team collaboration slightly increased (8% to 10%; 4% to 5%; and 10% to 11% respectively) (Larson & Choi, 2009). The study concluded assessment remains the dominant role of school psychologists but was found, for the first time, to be under 50% (47%) of school psychologists' work time. Furlong et al., (2000) suggest the responsibilities of school psychologists are changing due to policy initiatives, including those focusing on collaboration and building activities such as implementing early-screening and prevention programs, counseling and intervention for high-risk youth, creating and coordinating comprehensive support-services programs, collaboration with public and private mental health professionals, and collaboration with juvenile probation departments. Furlong, et al., (2000) believe school psychologists are well positioned to assist with these mandates due to their training in research and assessment. Two examples of areas school psychologists have received training in and are capable of providing support include MTSS and mental health.

Multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS).

Since the enactment of IDEA in 1975, funds supporting it have declined (Berninger, 2006) and the full funding amount (e.g., 40% of the national average per pupil expenditure [APPE]) has fallen short through fiscal year 2018 (Congressional Research Service, 2018). In an effort to reduce the number of students requiring special

education services and supports, schools are working towards implementation of or have implemented MTSS in order to provide early intervention. MTSS combines the execution of Response to Intervention (RtI) and PBIS, continuing the practice of early identification and intervention, progress monitoring, and data-based decision making (Eagle, Dowd-Eagle, Snyder, & Holtzman (2015). It focuses on students' academic, behavior, and social-emotional needs and how those needs affect each other in order to provide academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. School psychologists are capable of providing content knowledge and leadership to support MTSS's effectiveness. Eagle et al., (2015) assert school psychologists can provide information regarding data-based decision making, curricular and instructional methodology, evidence-based interventions, and collaborative problem-solving procedures. MTSS is intended to expand students' access to comprehensive and differentiated school services by integrating multiple systems and services to simultaneously address students' academic achievement, behavior, and social-emotional well-being. Sullivan and Long (2010) assert MTSS allows school psychologists' roles to expand beyond assessment into areas of consultation and intervention. School psychologists are knowledgeable of MTSS content and capable of affecting meaningful change by selecting appropriate professionals to serve as MTSS team members; selecting interventions; setting goals; and fulfilling roles of problem-solving team facilitator, professional development provider, coach, performance assessor, and/or developer of data tracking systems (Bahr, Leduc, Hild, Davis, Summers, & McNeal, 2017; Eagle et al., 2015; and Forman & Crystal, 2015).

Bahr, et al., (2017) maintain school psychologists currently are spending more time contributing to the development of intervention plans and engaging in MTSS

systems-level interventions. In a survey conducted by Bahr et al., (2017), 64% of the respondents indicated problem-solving consultation was one of their top five preferred activities. Respondents' third and fourth choices of preferred activities were participation on school-based teams or data teams (79 responses) and participating in interventions for academic problems (64 responses). Approximately half (52.7%) of the 557 school psychologists surveyed reported employment in sites using MTSS and 87.5% of them reported involvement in its implementation. These respondents also reported more than a quarter of their time being spent on academic interventions and a decrease (58%) in the number of special education evaluations completed. MTSS efforts were not significantly related to a perceived impact on the numbers of special education evaluations but were significantly related to the amount of time spent providing academic interventions. The study conducted by Bahr, et al., (2017) appears to be the first to find school psychologists spending the greatest amount of their time on problem-solving consultation, as opposed to diagnostic assessment; however, it only surveyed school psychologists from three states. Implementation of early intervention allows school psychologists to broaden their role, encompassing assessment, consultation, and intervention, thereby enabling them to meet the needs of the entire school population, not just students suspected of requiring or receiving special education services. Improvements in students' academics may also positively affect their behavior and mental health (Berninger, 2006).

Mental health.

The role of school psychologists is also being affected by school violence extending beyond school shootings to include socially and psychologically harmful behaviors (Bramlett, et al., 2002; Furlong et al., 2000). School psychologists have

training related to delivering school mental health services, as well as working collaboratively across disciplines. School psychologists also possess knowledge regarding multiple factors influencing school mental health programs and services such as an understanding of child development, psychoeducational assessment, special education law, consultation methodology, program evaluation, and intervention (Splett, Fowler, Weist, McDaniel, & Dvorsky, 2013). Furlong et al., (2000), propose school psychologists can assist schools in identifying and modifying conditions of school campuses that may cause distress and harm to students in ways that could lead to school violence. They can help develop safe school practices to enhance the safety, development, and resiliency of students. According to a survey conducted by Bramlett et al., (2002), 45% of the school psychologists who responded reported they are greatly involved in school crisis teams. Results of the survey conducted by Bahr et al., (2017) indicate 54% of respondents preferred to provide mental health interventions.

Although assessment has been the primary role of school psychologists, if school psychologists are provided opportunities to engage in the range of activities included in the broader roles outlined by the NASP Practice Model such as consultation and collaboration, intervention and instructional support to develop academic skills, and interventions and mental health services to develop social and life skills, they can make a more comprehensive and effective contribution leading to more positive outcomes for children and families. These outcomes can include more supportive, positive school climates (including strong family-school partnerships), improved instruction and learning, and improved assessment and accountability.

An additional activity within school psychologists' broader role is involvement in the transition process of students with disabilities leaving high school. School psychologists, by participating in transition planning and support to ensure the success of students with disabilities after leaving high school, can positively influence children, their families, and the communities in which they reside, as well as improve family-school partnerships, assessment, instruction, and learning. It is necessary for school psychologists to expand their role beyond primarily assessment into broader, more proactive roles promoted by NASP such as integrated service delivery. The process of transition falls under this umbrella. By school psychologists contributing to transition programming, they proactively meet the needs of students and their families, ideally from the time students enter school to when they exit. School psychologists will then also have the opportunity to form partnerships and collaborate with other individuals and agencies working with students ensuring students are provided the greatest opportunity for success after high school.

Secondary transition.

Improving student outcomes for students transitioning from high school to higher education, employment, and independent living is important for all students, including students with disabilities, their families, individuals who work with them, and the communities in which they reside. However, research has found students with disabilities are more likely to be unemployed, work for lower wages, and be isolated from their communities and friends after leaving high school. (National Longitudinal Transition Study-2, 2003). Successful transition also includes living in one's community,

exercising self-determination, and being a productive citizen (The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 2015).

A delphi study by Rowe, Alverson, Unruh, Fowler, Kellems, and Test (2015) defined sixteen predictors of postschool success for students with disabilities, as well as program characteristics of each predictor. The predictors included career awareness, occupational courses, paid employment/work experience, vocational education, work study, community experiences, exit exam requirements/high school diploma status, inclusion in general education, program of study, self-determination/self-advocacy, self-care/independent living skills, social skills, interagency collaboration, parental involvement, student support, and transition program.

Postschool outcomes for students with disabilities were influenced by these predictors according to Test, Mazzotti, Mustian, Fowler, Kortering, and Kohler, (2009). The predictors of inclusion in general education, paid work experience, self-care/independent living, and student support predicted improved outcomes in the areas of education, employment, and independent living. Career awareness, interagency collaboration, occupational courses, self-advocacy/self-determination, social skills, transition program, and vocational education predicted improved outcomes in the areas of education and employment. Finally, community experiences, exit exam requirements/high school diploma status, parental involvement, program of study, and work study predicted improved outcomes in the area of employment.

The Taxonomy for Transition Programming 2.0 was developed by Kohler, Gothberg, Fowler, and Coyle (2016) as a model to assist with planning, organizing, and

evaluating transition education, services, and programs. It provides specific practices in order to implement effective, transition-focused education.

Taxonomy for transition programming.

Landmark, Ju, and Zhang (2010) reviewed 29 documents to extend Kohler's 1993 review of best practices which led to the development of the Taxonomy for Transition Programming by Kohler in 1996. Substantiated practices included paid or unpaid work experience, employment preparation, family involvement, general education inclusion, social skills training, daily living skills training, self-determination skills training, and community or agency collaboration. The Taxonomy for Transition Programming 2.0 (Kohler et al., 2016) is based on the philosophy that the education students receive in kindergarten through high school should be transition-focused. The model also illustrates transition goals alone should not be considered the only thing necessary to ensure students' success after high school. The taxonomy builds upon the fact students are able to obtain improved adult outcomes when everyone (e.g., students, their families, educators, community members, and organizations) works together. It includes five primary practice categories: student-focused planning, family engagement, program structures, interagency collaboration, and student development.

A systematic review conducted by Cobb and Alwell (2009) of 31 studies of 859 youth supported the effectiveness of student-focused planning and student-development interventions in improving transition-related outcomes. The interventions were drawn from the five intervention constructs identified by Kohler and Field (2003): student-focused planning, student development, interagency and interdisciplinary planning, family involvement, and program structure.

The taxonomy is considered a framework for comprehensive education and services in secondary transition (Test, Fowler et al., 2009). Evidence-based practice and predictors in secondary transition have been identified by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) (2019) in order to promote positive postschool outcomes for all students with disabilities.

Evidence-based practices and predictors.

IDEA mandates transition practices for students receiving special education once they are sixteen years old. At that point, a statement of transition services is necessary in order to prepare for postschool outcomes and is required in students' IEPs. IDEA describes transition services as "... a coordinated set of activities, designed with an outcome-oriented process, that promotes movement from school to postschool activities, including post-secondary education, vocational training, integrated employment, (including supported employment, continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, or community participation)... based on the individual student's needs taking into account the student's preferences and interests, and include needed activities in the areas of: instruction, community experiences, the development of employment and other postschool adult living objectives, and, if appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills and functional vocational evaluation" (20 U.S.C. 1401 [a][19]). Effective transition services provided to students while they are in school lead to improved outcomes after they exit high school.

Predictors lead to improved practices which should be used to teach skills necessary to increase improved outcomes. Predictors and practices of postschool success are classified as evidence-based, research-based, or promising regarding their levels of

evidence in the areas of education, employment, and independent living. Test et al., (2009), Rowe et al., (2015), and Mazzotti, Rowe, Sinclair, Poppen, Woods, and Shearer (2015), identified 20 evidence-based predictors of postschool employment, education, and independent living success. They include career awareness, community experiences, exit exam requirements/high school, goal-setting, inclusion in general education, interagency collaboration, occupational courses, paid employment/work experience, parent expectations, parental involvement, program of study, self-advocacy/self-determination, self-care/independent living, social skills, student support, transition program, travel skills, vocation education, work study, and youth autonomy/decision-making. Correlational evidence exists between the predictors of community experience, exit exam requirements/high school, parent involvement, program of study, travel skills, and work study and the outcome of employment. The predictors of career awareness, goal-setting, interagency collaboration, occupational courses, self-advocacy/self-determination, social skills, transition program, vocation education, and youth autonomy/decision-making were correlated with the outcomes of education and employment. Lastly, the predictors of inclusion in general education, paid employment/work experience, parent expectations, self-care/independent living, and student supports were correlated with all three outcomes (education, employment, and independent living).

The list of effective practices continues to evolve as the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) periodically updates the literature review. Evidenced-based practices have shown to improve outcomes, employ rigorous research designs for evaluation, and adhere to quality research indicators. Examples of evidence-

based practices include published curricula to teach student involvement in the IEP process, anchored instruction to teach math, Self-Determined Learning Model of Instruction (SDLMI) to teach goal attainment, and constant time delay to teach food preparation skills (NTACT, 2019). Research-based practices have a satisfactory record of successfully improving outcomes, use rigorous research designs for evaluation, and may adhere to quality research indicators. Examples of research-based practices include *Check and Connect* for staying and progressing in school, graphic organizers to teach reading comprehension, response prompting to teach employment skills, and community-based instruction to teach purchasing and safety skills. Lastly, promising practices have demonstrated some success for improving outcomes and may use rigorous research designs for evaluation and adhere to indicators of quality research. Examples of promising practices include social and behavior intervention programs for dropout prevention and community-based instruction to teach employment and grocery shopping skills (NTACT, 2019).

Transition outcomes.

Transition outcomes targeted through intervention include participation in postsecondary education, obtaining employment, independent living, and community participation. The National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) was funded by the U.S. Department of Education to document the experiences of a national sample of students who were thirteen to sixteen years of age in 2000 as they moved from secondary school into adult roles. At the time of the final data collection in 2009, they were 21 to 25 years old.

Information obtained by the NLTS2 includes data related to postsecondary education. According to Cameto, Levine, and Wagner, (2004), postsecondary education is a primary goal for more than four out of five students with disabilities after leaving high school. Corresponding to the NLTS2, 60% of students with disabilities enroll in postsecondary programs as opposed to 67% of students without disabilities. Within eight years of leaving high school, 60% of students with disabilities were reported to be enrolled in postsecondary education (two-year or community colleges-44%; vocational, business, or technical schools-32%, and four-year colleges or universities-19%). When enrolled in postsecondary education, 19% of the students received accommodations or supports from their schools as opposed to 87% of them receiving accommodations or supports in high school. At the time of the Wave 5 interview, 41% had completed two-year college programs; 57% had completed vocational, business, or technical school programs; and 34% had completed four-year college programs. Forty percent of the general population attended a four-year university as opposed to 19% of students with disabilities. Additionally, according to the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) Transition Steering Committee Data Fact Sheet (2015), young adults with disabilities who have been out of school up to eight years and were 21 to 25 years old were less likely to enroll in postsecondary education, have been enrolled in postsecondary education at the time of the interview, have been enrolled in any postsecondary education in the past two years, and more likely to have been enrolled in two-year or community colleges than their same-aged peers in the general population.

Given this data, a recent focus of secondary transition services is student participation in post-secondary education. There are more than eighteen million students

attending colleges and universities in the United States according to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE, 2009). Additionally, in 2009, approximately 11% of undergraduate students and 8% of graduate students had a diagnosed disability (USDOE, 2008). Some of the disabilities included learning disabilities with 23% of students who graduate from high school with a learning disability going on to attend community colleges and 11% percent attending four-year colleges (Wagner, Newman, Cameto, Garza, & Levine, 2005). NASP (2020) promotes the growth and development of all students, including those attending postsecondary education. Postsecondary education includes vocational and technical schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities. Additionally, mental health concerns also occur during college; another aspect school psychologists are trained to address (NASP, 2020). Storrie, Ahern, and Tucker (2010) concluded half of students with mental health concerns (e.g., depression, anxiety, substance abuse) experience the onset of these concerns during college.

Preparation for employment is a primary focus of many transition services and achieving employment is the primary transition goals for many high school students with disabilities (Cameto et al., 2004). Ninety-one percent of students who left high school within the past eight years had been employed (holding an average of four jobs during that time); however, students with disabilities earned an average of \$10.40 per hour compared to \$11.40 for individuals within the general population. According to OSERS's Transition Steering Committee Data Fact Sheet (2015), young adults with disabilities were approximately as likely to have a paid job at the time of the interview as their same age peers in the population (60% vs. 66%); however, their mean hourly wage was less (\$9.40 vs. \$13.20).

Like all students, students with disabilities need to possess skills allowing them to live as independently as possible, participate within their communities, and contribute to the workforce after leaving high school. However, research has found students with disabilities are more likely to be unemployed, work for lower wages, and be isolated from their communities and friends after leaving high school. (National Longitudinal Transition Study-2, 2003). For example, students with intellectual and developmental disabilities are among the largest source of under-utilized talent in the labor force (Green & Brooke, 2001). Only about a third of students with all levels of intellectual disability gain employment and the number is likely lower for those with more severe disabilities (Carter, Austin, & Trainor, 2012; National Longitudinal Transition Study-2, 2003).

Whether students opt for postsecondary education or immediate employment, in order for students with disabilities to be successful after high school they need to participate in structured and meaningful transition opportunities that will provide the foundation for success after high school. As previously mentioned, IDEA (2004) mandates the inclusion of transition goals in the IEPs of students at the time of their sixteenth birthdays and then for them to be reviewed annually. Transition goals are derived from transition assessments related to students' training, education, employment, and, when appropriate, independent living skills in order for them to be successful after exiting high school. Goals should reflect the current evidence base in promising transition programming.

Well-written transition plans are valuable for various reasons, including promoting self-advocacy which is important for students currently attending high school, as well as once they have exited. Thoughtful transition planning is also necessary in order for students to improve their quality of life by outlining the provision of instruction

and improvement of skills related to training, education, employment, and independent living skills while in school. Transition plans written in high school are intended to assist students with disabilities to successfully move to postsecondary education, employment, and/or into the community after leaving high school.

Transition plans.

A transition plan is required for students with disabilities once they turn sixteen in order to determine what they want to do after high school and what supports are necessary in order for them to accomplish their goals. Although the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) (HR 1350) mandates transition planning services, it does not indicate who is responsible for organizing and providing services. IDEA mandates IEP teams must consist of multiple individuals. These individuals include the parents of the students; a regular education teacher; a special education teacher; a representative of the school district who is qualified to provide (or supervise the provision of) specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of the students and is knowledgeable of the general education curriculum and the district's availability of resources; an individual who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results; other individuals who have knowledge of or special expertise regarding the students; and, when appropriate, the students themselves.

Transition planning.

Transition planning is complex, should be individualized, and should begin early in students' educational careers. Transition planning should consider academic programming, as well as necessary functional skills in order for students to be successful after leaving high school. Team members involved in the transition planning process can

include the student, their parents, educators, related service providers, and representatives from adult service agencies. When planning for transition, team members are to begin with the end in mind (e.g., what would the student like to accomplish after leaving high school). A fit is to be made between students' abilities, needs, preferences, and the environments they will participate in after leaving high school.

Although several planning approaches exist, the methods of person-centered and courses of study encompass the diverse planning approaches. Person-centered planning is goal-directed and focuses on students' strengths, abilities, supports, and needs (Morgan & Riesen, 2016). Person-centered planning focuses on an individual's capabilities rather than limitations. Course of study is a multiyear description of courses necessary to graduate high school. Academic courses can be matched to students' strengths, preferences, and interests.

Transition assessments are administered in order to determine students' academic skills and career preferences. They can be informal and/or formal and include interviews, observations, transition planning inventories, interest inventories, personality or preference tests, career development measures, etc. (Walker, Kortering, Fowler, Rowe, Bethune, & Terrell, 2016). Walker et al., (2016) suggest assessment begin as early as elementary school. Some assessments should occur yearly while others should be administered occasionally. Examples of individuals who can administer transition assessments included in the Survey of Transition Assessment Planning Practices (NTACT, 2016) were students (self-assessment), parents, special education teachers, general education teachers, paraprofessionals, and transition coordinators. Then, a transition plan is written, with considerations given to students' academic and functional

skills, and included in students' IEPs. Steps to writing individualized transition plans as outlined by Morgan and Riesen (2016) are as follows:

1. Interpret transition assessment results: Information should include results, as well as standard scores, percentiles, grade or age equivalents, preferences for adulthood, interest areas, etc. Information can be used to determine the extent to which students' academic and functional skills match their postsecondary goals; their strengths; family/community supports; barriers/limitations; and the degree to which students have committed to their postsecondary goals.

2. Develop present levels of performance which summarize assessment results and describe the extent to which present levels are related to performance standards.

3. Develop measurable postsecondary goals to include education/training, independent living, and employment. IDEA (2004) states, "The IEP must include appropriate measurable post-secondary goals based on age-appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment and, when appropriate, independent living skills..." (34 C.F.R. §300.320[b]). It must also be linked to the present level of performance statement. Goals should be measurable, include when they will be achieved (e.g., after special education services end), specific and well-defined, identified for employment and independent living, based on age-appropriate transition assessments, and align with the students' courses of study. Therefore, all goals should include a time frame, behavior, and criteria in order to measure attainment.

4. Annual transition goals should be based on assessment results in order for students to meet their postsecondary goals. Goals should include input from students and

transition teams and contain condition statements, behaviors to be performed, and criteria in order to measure success. Goals should be measurable and include high expectations.

5. Transition services that will be employed in order to improve academic, functional, and independent living skills in order to meet annual and postsecondary goals related to students' strengths and needs are described. Services address gaps between students' current skills and those needed after high school in order for them to obtain their goals.

As recommended by NTACTION, transition planning should begin as early as elementary school. IDEA mandates transition planning services, although it does not indicate who is responsible for organizing and providing services. School psychologists possess the training and skills in order to be valuable assets in the transition planning process.

School Psychologists' Involvement in Transition

Preparation.

Skills school psychologists possess can be used to contribute to the transition planning process. Kellems et al., (2016) assert school psychologists can assist with assessments related to transition and provide documentation of necessary accommodations students require after leaving high school. Kellems et al., (2016) feel students should exit school with recent testing information, a responsibility of the school psychologist, in order to avoid having to pay for testing later. School psychologists can support transition by collaborating with IEP teams in order to carry out roles as outlined by the NASP Practice Model. Although the roles of school psychologists in transition can vary, the administration of assessments, interpretation of results, and application of

evidence-based instructional recommendations are considered to be the responsibilities of school psychologists (Kellems et al., 2016). School psychologists are also responsible for providing assessment information used to create and implement transition plans.

Additionally, school psychologists are aware of available assessments and their appropriateness for specific students, including their proper use and interpretation. The information from assessments administered by school psychologists can provide IEP teams with information necessary in order to establish transition efforts and help to continue to determine what services and supports will be needed in the future.

Lillenstein et al., (2006) suggest school psychologists can evaluate the anticipated effectiveness of transition plans (e.g., related to success in vocational settings and areas of need where interventions can be provided) to facilitate preparation of skills necessary for students to be successful after leaving high school. Information within transition plans can also be used by teams to anticipate the level of success students will have after high school in institutions of higher education or at specific jobs and can be used to strengthen identified areas of need (Lillenstein, et al., 2006). Additionally, school psychologists can assist IEP teams in identifying and selecting appropriate transition goals; conducting professional development and parent trainings; and facilitating groups to promote cooperation and coordination among team members. Finally, school psychologists can develop and/or implement social skills or behavior management programs.

Thirty-eight school psychologists employed in a large school district in Georgia completed a survey and seven of the same respondents participated in interviews in a study conducted by Ducharme, Roach, and Wellons (2020) in an effort to gather information regarding their experiences, attitudes, and training related to the school-to-

employment transition process. Responses on surveys indicated school psychologists feel they possess skills that can contribute to the transition process but experience barriers (e.g., time demands, resource allocation, lack of training, and minimal knowledge of the empirical support for transition services) making participation in the process difficult. Survey responses and interviews indicated participants were minimally involved in transition assessment, transition planning, or IEP transition goal development. Only seven out of 36 school psychologists indicated they had been exposed to pre-service training related to transition such as exposure to transition related content in a class (six respondents) or through an internship or graduate research assistantship (one respondent). Twelve out of the 37 respondents indicated they had received training related to transition services through their places of employment. When respondents were asked how many times a year they were involved with employment-focused transition planning, 26 participants indicated they never participated in transition planning; five reported participating one to two times during a year; and no participant indicated participating more than twice yearly. Through interviews, respondents indicated their perception of the ideal role of school psychologists related to transition would be involvement in the assessment of students' abilities and provision of explanations of the results of standardized assessments. Several participants indicated increased participation of school psychologists in the IEP goal development process would be meaningful. School psychologists felt they could assist in meeting the requirement of the state VR agency for a current psychological evaluation to determine eligibility for services. Each participant indicated a lack of explicit preparation on how to provide transition services; however, several school psychologists noted while they received little explicit training on

transition, other elements of their training (e.g., assessment and consultation) were applicable to the transition process. Barriers identified by respondents included a perceived lack of data-driven research on the outcomes of transition services and lack of access to information on transition services (specifically, a lack of clarity as to how to enter into the transition process).

Lillenstein et al., (2006) conducted a study in order to determine the levels of involvement and perceived importance of school psychologists' involvement in transition related tasks. In the study, school psychologists and transition coordinators in Pennsylvania completed a questionnaire looking at how often tasks were performed by school psychologists and the perceived importance of involvement by school psychologists in the following areas: consultation, psychological and psycho-educational assessment; direct services; and program planning and evaluation. One hundred twenty-five school psychologists and 66 transition coordinators completed the survey. Ratings were given using a Likert scale: 1=never/definitely should not; 2=occasionally/probably should not; 3=frequently/probably should; and 4=regularly or routinely/definitely should.

More than half (54.4%) of school psychologists reported knowing some information about transition but felt they needed to be more knowledgeable in order to complete transition activities. Less than one percent (0.8%) of school psychologists reported receiving transition training through a graduate program. Over half (54.4%) of school psychologists surveyed reported knowing some information about transition planning but needing additional information in order to complete transition activities; less than eleven percent (10.4%) of school psychologists reported being well prepared; 25.6%

reported being adequately prepared; and 9.6% reported they were not prepared to participate in transition.

Skills school psychologists possess can be used to contribute to the transition planning process and support it in various ways. Responses of a study conducted by Ducharme et al., (2020) indicated school psychologists felt they possess skills that can contribute to the transition process but experience barriers making participation in the process difficult. Responses also indicated minimal training and involvement. Each participant indicated a lack of explicit preparation on how to provide transition services; however, several school psychologists noted while they received little explicit training, other elements of their preparation were applicable. Similarly, in the study conducted by Lillenstein et al. (2006), more than half of school psychologists reported knowing some information about transition but felt they needed to be more knowledgeable in order to complete transition activities and less than one percent of school psychologists reported receiving transition training through a graduate program.

Current Practices.

Increased training and experience can lead to school psychologists' enhanced engagement in activities supporting transition. They can collaborate, administer assessments, provide strategies and services, and advocate for postsecondary needs of students. In accordance with NASP's Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological services, as Ducharme et al., (2020) state, "School psychologists have a responsibility to be knowledgeable about transition-related supports". Wilczenski et al., (2017) propose school psychologists are well positioned to address transition due to their involvement in general and special education and can offer expertise related to individual

differences and lifespan development; provide direct services and strategies; and advocate for postsecondary needs of students including collaboration with students and their families.

In a study conducted by Talapatra et al., (2019), individuals who felt more effective due to experiences (e.g., transition-related services in job descriptions and working with secondary students) reported increased engagement in activities supporting transition. Additionally, increased knowledge and experiences positively impacted service delivery. School psychologists who did not report transition-related components of their official job description were more likely to spend less time completing transition-related activities. One hundred twenty-one respondents indicated collaboration/communication/relationships was the most frequently expressed facilitator contributing to transition-related activities. This facilitator included school psychologists' ability to get along; develop relationships with students, parents, staff, and community agencies; and work in collaborative team environments. The second most cited facilitator was knowledge/experience/training (e.g., specific experience or training in working with the population of students they utilized or the ability to ask knowledgeable others for help) (114 responses out of 282 participants). Finally, the third most cited facilitator (66 responses) was evaluations, reevaluations, and IEP meetings. Respondents indicated conducting evaluations and being included in IEP meetings helped them provide transition services. Survey results and responses obtained during interviews indicate participants are minimally involved in transition assessment, transition planning, and IEP transition goal development.

In a study described earlier, Lillenstein, et al., (2006) found that although school psychologists can significantly contribute to transition planning, their actual involvement continues to be limited. There were no functions under the categories of consultation, psychological and psycho-educational assessment, direct services, and program planning and evaluation listed by school psychologists or transition coordinators as being performed regularly/routinely by school psychologists. School psychologists rated 70% percent of the psychological and psycho-educational assessment tasks as being performed occasionally and 30% of the tasks being performed frequently. Transition coordinators rated 80% of the tasks being performed occasionally and 20% of the tasks being performed frequently. The psychological and psycho-educational assessment tasks school psychologists rated as frequently performed included reviewing student records to assist in transition planning, completing reevaluations to meet transition planning needs, and conducting functional behavior assessments. Within the area of direct services (e.g., attending secondary IEP meetings where transition is being discussed; providing student training on self-determination/self-advocacy, interpersonal/social skills, and career decision making; identifying “at-risk” students and initiating transition planning; providing input for placement; providing short-term counseling to families; conducting workshops on the use of assessment data in transition planning), both school psychologists and transition coordinators rated 44% of the tasks as never being performed and 44% of the tasks occasionally being performed. School psychologists and transition coordinators rated the task of providing input for placement and support for curricular areas as being performed frequently. Within the category of program planning and evaluation, school psychologists rated 70% of the tasks as never being performed and

30% of the tasks being occasionally performed compared to transition coordinators' ratings of 80% and 20% respectively.

School psychologists do not report receiving training related to transition programming and are minimally involved in transition assessment, transition planning, and IEP transition goal development. Additional knowledge and experiences lead to increased engagement in activities supporting transition (Talapatra et al., 2019). Skills and abilities school psychologist already possess (e.g., collaboration/communication/relationships, conduction of evaluations and reevaluations, and, participation in IEP meetings) are applicable to transition programming and facilitate their participation in transition planning. Increased training and experiences involving transition programming will better position school psychologists to support the practices promoted by NASP and school psychologists' desire to broaden their roles.

Proposals for Changing Roles Related to Secondary Transition

Including school psychologists in transition programming can promote interdisciplinary collaboration and support students, families, teachers, and individuals from other agencies (Kellems et al., 2016; Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018; Talapatra et al., 2019). Additionally, through collaboration with families and teachers, school psychologists can abide by NASP's requirements of promoting cultural competency in an effort to ensure all team members' postschool expectations align.

School psychologists should be knowledgeable of students' strengths in order to assist teams in formulating transition goals and explore postschool options. They can aid in determining strength-based, goal-orientated, and realistic expectations for students. School psychologists, as well as other team members, should possess an understanding of

available postsecondary education options in order to promote successful transition and support students' postsecondary goals (Talapatra et al., 2018; Morales and Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018; Wilczenski et al., 2017). By doing so, the team can better determine if postschool settings will effectively meet students' goals, strengths, and needs. Wilczenski et al., (2017) and Morales and Hagermoser Sanetti (2018) propose school psychologists can help provide interventions, such as those to increase self-determination, which will allow students to experience greater success after leaving high school. Through interventions and curriculum-based instruction, school psychologists can promote school environments that promote caring and supportive learning practices (Wilczenski et al., 2017; Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018). In addition to student and family engagement, school psychologists can encourage inclusive practices within school settings and organize and monitor service-learning opportunities.

Fives (2014) proposed various ways to incorporate transition activities into the tasks school psychologist already perform such as traditional assessment, consultation, and direct service roles. Kellems et al., (2016) also stressed the importance of assessments. In order to make assessments completed by school psychologists relevant to transition, school psychologists should consider if the assessments include information relevant to transition planning; if traditional aspects should be supplemented with transition-specific measures and techniques; and the eligibility requirements of postsecondary supports and programs. School psychologists should be knowledgeable of how assessment results affect eligibility of available post-secondary supports and can design ratings forms to track students' behavior in work settings, as well as observe the behavior in those settings (Fives, 2014).

Ducharme et al., (2020) attest, “Integrating information that is relevant to VR services into reports and IEPs is an immensely resource efficient way to contribute to the transition process” (p. 19). For example, the inclusion of school psychologists as members of IEP teams would allow teams to make connections between strengths and weaknesses identified during psychological testing to real-world job practices. Ducharme et al., (2020) also suggest school psychologists should be aware of what VR counselors look for in psychoeducational reports in an effort to collaborate. This may result in expediting access to community-based services. Additionally, Ducharme et al., (2020) affirm school psychologists are thoroughly trained to provide interventions; however, barriers (such as caseloads, role restrictions, etc.) prevent them from doing so. Nevertheless, through consultation with other professionals, school psychologists can influence data-based decision making. Collaboration also includes engaging parents (Ducharme et al., 2002). This can include something as easy as preparing a fact sheet of available transition resources to distribute to parents during eligibility and IEP meetings. School psychologists can gain additional training related to transition through transition-focused coursework and practice in graduate training (e.g., writing strength-based reports, incorporating self-determination assessments and interventions, and providing an overview of existing VR or community-based adult services) and by participating in ongoing professional development provided by school districts, school psychology associations, etc. Ducharme et al., (2020) propose small group training (e.g., professional learning communities) could be provided by school districts in an effort to maximize time and resources.

Talapatra et al., (2019) and Kellems et al., (2016) support school districts and graduate training programs including transition-related content into coursework and professional development. Wilczenski et al., (2017) suggest addressing potential transition knowledge and skills gaps among school psychologists at the preservice and/or in-service levels, as well as professional associations sponsoring training led by transition specialists. Respondents who participated in a study conducted by Ducharme et al., (2020) and Morales and Haggmoser Sanetti (2018) also mentioned having a better idea of what is available (e.g., training) in order to make educated, applicable recommendations.

Responses to the TKABS in the study conducted by Talapatra et al., (2019) suggests addressing the barrier of time, which could occur through advocacy. Additionally, not wanting to overstep boundaries was a theme among respondents in the interviews conducted by Ducharme et al., (2020). One respondent indicated, “We would have to take the initiative to say that we have something to offer. Really assert ourselves into this situation” (p. 16). Job requirements can also be shifted given the need for expanding the role of school psychologists.

There are additional ways school psychologists can support transition programming. Regarding training, graduate training programs can include additional transition-related content into coursework and school districts and professional organizations can offer professional development opportunities related to transition programming. School psychologists should be knowledgeable of students’ strengths and possess an understanding of available postsecondary education options in order to support successful transition and students’ postsecondary goals. Integrating information

relevant to VR services into reports and IEPs is also useful. School psychologists can also address transition programming through collaboration, addressing the barrier of time, and advocating for other duties not typically assigned to them. They can also provide interventions and curriculum-based instruction, promote inclusive practices within school settings, and organize and monitor service-learning opportunities. There are also opportunities for school psychologists to support transition programming beyond high school.

School Psychologists Employed at Institutions of Higher Education

Joyce and Rossen (2009) believe school psychologists have many opportunities to positively influence college outcomes as students transition from high school to postsecondary education. An emerging role of school psychologists is one in higher education which allows transition services to occur after high school through postsecondary education. This role provides school psychologists additional opportunities to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Sulkowski and Joyce (2012) believe school psychologists possess a diverse skill set which supports their ability to improve service delivery efforts for college students. Part- or full-time employment of school psychologists at postsecondary institutions can include evaluation, as well as academic and/or clinical positions (Sulkowski & Joyce, 2012). Although school psychologists may hold teaching positions within higher education, they can also be employed by institutions to provide direct services to students.

According to Schneider (2009), institutions of higher education are being criticized for not doing enough to support the needs of struggling students. For example, according to NLTS2 data, at the time of the Wave 5 interview, 41% of postsecondary

students had graduated from their most recent postsecondary program; 31% had left their most recent postsecondary school prior to completion; and the remaining students were currently enrolled in their postsecondary program. Forty-one percent had completed two-year college programs; 57% had completed vocational, business, or technical school programs; and 34% had completed four-year college programs. School psychologists' training in the areas of differential instruction, universal design, and welfare strategies to support all students can improve enrollment rates and graduation outcomes for college students with disabilities (Sulkowski & Joyce-Beaulieu, 2018). O'Connell (2017) believes school psychologists employed by postsecondary institutions "are uniquely qualified to develop educational programming to meet the needs of diverse college-age learners, support the pedagogical skills of faculty, and develop methods of systematically making educational decisions about student progress" (p. 23).

School psychologists can also plan, implement, and evaluate organizational-level postsecondary programs when practicing in colleges and universities (Beaujean & Fearon-Drake, 2017). Working at the organization level can include providing consultation, assessment, and program planning for all students. Sulkowski and Joyce (2012) propose a three-tiered model for postsecondary services, similar to the MTSS model. In the first tier, school psychologists support the entire student body, including consulting with administration and instructors in order to promote appropriate instruction. In tier two, students with disabilities are identified and appropriate services coordinated. Counseling for students who do not have a disability but need support adjusting to the demands of attending college or universities is also a service school psychologists can provide under tier two and possibly under tier three depending on the severity of

students' needs. Tier three can also include career coaching, psychoeducational assessments for disability accommodations, or threat assessments (Sulkowski & Joyce 2012) since school psychologists are trained to address safety which is a consideration for all school campuses.

The range of skills school psychologists possess can also be utilized in various ways at the post-secondary level in order to continue to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. This can be done through evaluation, as well as employment in institutions of higher education. Furthermore, school psychologists can support the graduation rate of students with disabilities through their training in the areas of differentiated instruction, universal design, and welfare strategies. They can also support student success by planning, implementing, and evaluating organizational level programs.

Perceptions Related to Transition Services

Although NASP's Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services Principles (2020) does not include a specific standard dedicated to transition planning, such practices fall under the domains of consultative practice and family-school collaboration services. Talapatra et al., (2018) and Kellems et al., (2016) believe the area of consultation is valuable and should be expanded upon by school psychologists and propose this can be accomplished by increasing their role in transition planning. School psychologists can aide in building strong relationships with family members, educating them about the transition process (including evaluation) and students' legal rights, and fostering two-way communication (Talapatra et al., 2018).

In the study conducted by Talapatra et al., (2019), Canadian and American school psychologists reported similar views related to the importance of their involvement in

transition planning, as well as their lack of involvement. For example, respondents somewhat agreed and strongly agreed it was important for them to be involved in transition planning for students with intellectual disabilities and have a professional interest in performing transition-related activities for students with intellectual disabilities. Heavy caseload/limited time was cited as the primary factor hindering provision of transition services. Limited knowledge was the second most cited factor. The responses of school psychologists through interviews conducted by Ducharme et al., (2020) noted services provided by school psychologists could be useful to meeting the requirement of Georgia's Vocational Rehabilitation agency for a current psychological evaluation to determine eligibility for services, as well as the interpretation of psychological reports to assist in transition planning. Several school psychologists who were interviewed indicated increased participation in the goal development process of IEPs would be meaningful in order to develop more specific goals.

Lillenstein et al., (2006) concluded school psychologists and transition coordinators agreed regarding the importance of school psychologists' involvement in each transition task. The ratings of school psychologists and transition coordinators were similar with no significant differences being noted related to any tasks within any of the categories. The ratings of school psychologists and transition coordinators were the same in the area of consultation. They both agreed school psychologists should be involved in 92% of the tasks and should not be involved in the task of coordinating referrals between school and postschool agencies. In the area of psychological and psycho-educational assessment, transition coordinators reported school psychologists probably should be involved in all tasks while school psychologists felt they probably should be involved in

90% of the tasks and definitely should be involved in the tasks of conducting functional behavior assessments. Results illustrate transition coordinators believe school psychologists probably should be involved in all tasks within the area of direct services, while school psychologists felt they should be involved in 89% of the tasks and they should probably not perform the task of providing student training on career decision making. Regarding program planning and evaluation, school psychologists felt they should be involved in 40% of the tasks (e.g., curriculum development committees, developing social skills training programs, and conducting formal needs assessments in transition areas) and probably not involved in 60% of the tasks. Similarly, transition coordinators felt school psychologists probably should be involved in 30% of the tasks and probably should not be involved in 70% of the tasks. Based on the results of the study, both school psychologists and transition coordinators agree school psychologists should be more involved in transition planning than they are.

Although NASP's Model (2020) does not include a specific standard dedicated to transition planning, school psychologists' skills in collaboration, including communication and counseling, can support transition programming, as well as assist with intervention implementation. Although barriers exist, school psychologists feel it is important to be involved in transition programming and have a professional interest in doing so (Talapatra et al., 2019; Lillenstein et al. 2006). In the survey conducted by Lillenstein, et al., (2006), school psychologists' involvement was also important to transition coordinators and both school psychologists and transition coordinators agreed school psychologists should be more involved in transition planning than they are.

Barriers.

A study conducted by Talapatra et al., (2019) suggested previous requests for school psychologists to increase their participation in transition services have not been heard. Insufficient amounts of time, large ratios, perceived lack of data-driven research related to outcomes of transition services, and lack of access to information and training on transition services were identified as barriers by respondents in the interviews conducted by Ducharme et al., (2020). Reschly (2000) indicated opportunities to provide services other than evaluation is difficult with large student-to-psychologist ratios. In the study conducted by Talapatra et al., (2019), the primary barrier to providing transition services, as indicated by 229 responses out of 282 individuals who participated, was heavy caseload/limited time (respondents felt they were spread too thinly to provide high-quality service and other responsibilities). Limited knowledge was the second most frequently cited factor (132 responses) and job description was the third most cited factor (110 responses) hindering provision of services. A problem identified by all interviewees (seven) by Ducharme et al., (2020) was a lack of explicit preparation in their graduate programs pertaining to how to provide transition services. However, several respondents indicated other elements of their training (e.g., assessment and consultation) were applicable to the transition process.

Both school psychologists and transition coordinators identified the following barriers of involvement in the study conducted by Lillenstein et al., (2006): transition is not part of the job description; lack of interest in transition activities; lack of training in transition; referral backlog; little secondary work; not invited to participate; lack of awareness; role restriction; and number of buildings served. More than half of school

psychologists (58.4%) reported high caseloads as a significant barrier while only 40.6% of transition coordinators reported it as a significant barrier. Respondents to surveys and interviews administered by Ducharme et al., (2020) indicated barriers to school psychologists' participation in transition activities include resource allocation, lack of training, and minimal knowledge of the empirical support for transition services.

Morales and Hagrrmoser Sanetti (2018) and a school psychologist interviewed by Ducharme et al., (2020) mentioned the benefit of multidisciplinary teams in promoting meaningful transition services. The silos of school psychologists, special education teachers, and families must be deconstructed and the services school psychologists can provide, as well as the fact individuals on the team are working towards the same goal, must be acknowledged (Talapatra et al., 2018). Although the importance of school psychologists' involvement in transition programming has been recognized, barriers continue to exist such as transition activities not included in job descriptions, lack of training, referral backlog, not invited to participate, lack of awareness, role restriction, number of buildings served, etc. (Ducharme et al., 2020; Lillenstein et al., 2006). School psychologists must collaborate as opposed to team members attempting to support students working in isolation.

Summary

School psychologists continue to spend approximately half their time completing assessments (Fagan & Wise, 2007; Rossen & Charvat, 2011; Walcott et al., 2018). Engagement in broader roles identified by legislation and outlined by NASP continues to be lacking, although school psychologists desire to be involved in broader roles, one of which is in transition programming (Talapatra et al., 2019; Lillenstein et al., 2006).

Although school psychologists desire to be involved in transition programming, many barriers exist. It is imperative to gather additional information concerning the training of school psychologists related to transition, as well as their current involvement in the transition process. Through a review of the minimal amount of literature, school psychologists appear to receive little if any training related to transition while in graduate school or through professional development while employed; however, school psychologists would be more likely to increase their involvement in transition programming and would feel more comfortable doing so with the acquisition of additional knowledge. The involvement of school psychologists in transition programming would contribute to increased positive outcomes for students with disabilities through assessment, collaboration, provision of interventions and curriculum-based instruction, etc. The purpose of this study will be to determine if school psychologists need more preparation in the area of transition, as well as their involvement, and perceptions of involvement, in transition programming. Additionally, what school psychologists would like their roles in transition programming to be and how to make this a reality in the future will also be explored.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to determine school psychologists' self-reported training and involvement in transition programming. An understanding of the perceived training of school psychologists and their involvement in transition assessment, programs, and practices will help determine if school psychologists are being utilized to their fullest potential based on their roles, responsibilities, and capabilities. The study addressed the following research questions:

1. To what extent do school psychologists report their training programs addressed involvement in transition (e.g., planning, monitoring, and evaluation)?
2. How involved are school psychologists in transition programming (e.g., assessment, collaboration, IEP development, implementation, data collection) for elementary, middle, and high school students?
3. To what extent do school psychologists want to be involved in transition programming (e.g., assessment, collaboration, IEP development, implementation, data collection)?
4. What factors influence school psychologists' involvement in the transition process (e.g., caseload, presences of a transition coordinator)?
5. Does training in transition programming affect school psychologists' involvement and perceptions of their role in the process?

This research addressed these questions by gathering and analyzing school psychologists' responses. Results of this research was used to determine school psychologists' perceptions of training received related to transition and their desire, as well as the amount of involvement in the transition process. The information gathered through answering the research questions will be useful for the field of school psychology and special education, as well as for school psychology training programs, and school districts at the national level in order to determine if school psychologists are being utilized to their full potential and if additional training related to transition assessment, programs, and practices is warranted. In turn, school districts should capitalize on school psychologists' skill sets to assist in transition programming and training programs should prepare school psychologists to be capable of doing so.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a summary of the methodology of how participants were chosen, as well as their demographics. The summary also includes a description of the survey instrument, as well as procedures for data collection and data analysis.

Study Design

This study was designed to assess school psychologists' reported training and involvement in the transition programming process through an electronically administered survey. The survey included close- and open-ended items to assess school psychologists' training related to the transition programming process; their involvement in it; and the degree to which they wanted to be involved in the process. The study was conducted with school psychologists in five states in the south east. Approval from the

Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of South Carolina was obtained (see Appendix A).

Survey Participants

A Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request was submitted to and approved by the South Carolina State Department of Education in August soliciting the electronic mailing addresses of individuals holding certificates in the area of School Psychology. Additional requests were submitted to the Departments of Education in the following states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Florida, Maryland, and North Carolina. Alabama was not included in the study because psychometrists are employed, not school psychologists. North Carolina did not respond to a records request. Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, and Virginia did not have lists of electronic mailing addresses of individuals holding certificates in the area of School Psychology. Therefore, districts within the states of Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, and Virginia were contacted by electronic email or phone in an effort to obtain electronic mailing addresses of the school psychologists employed. Not all districts within each state were able to be reached or responded. Districts within the state of Maryland were not included due to the significant amount of time it took for the Maryland State Department of Education to respond to the request. Additionally, research proposals were sent to the Georgia Association of School Psychologists (GASP) and the Florida Association of School Psychologists (FASP). The proposal was accepted by GASP and an initial and reminder email was sent to 422 members. FASP did not respond to the proposal submission.

In addition to GASP's submission, the survey was sent to 1,310 school psychologists in Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Virginia. Collecting

information from individuals in five states provided a greater sample frame, as well as included responses from individuals who have attended a variety of preparatory programs and are working in a range of locations. A total of 415 participants completed the web-based survey. Although 415 respondents completed the survey, if they indicated they were not currently employed, the survey ended after the first question. Therefore, only 376 participants proceeded to the remaining survey questions. Not all participants responded to every question; therefore, the sample varies across questions as indicated in data tables.

Instrumentation

Information for this study was gathered through an online survey (Survey Monkey™, 1999-2020). Items were designed based on a review of literature related to school psychology and the transition planning process. Please refer to Appendix B for a chart showing the alignment between survey items and research.

Survey Pilot

A preliminary version of the survey was developed based upon the literature review. Four school psychologists reviewed the survey and provided feedback regarding the content and recommendations for wording the questions. The survey was revised based on their feedback. The survey is included in Appendix C.

Survey Design

The web-based survey consisted of 33 items including 25 items related to transition and eight demographic questions. Twelve of the 25 items related to transition required respondents to use a rating scale. Three of the questions with a rating scale involved ratings of Not Familiar, Minimally Familiar, Moderately Familiar, and

Extremely Familiar. Two items involved a rating scale with the ratings of Never, Rarely/Sometimes, Often, and Almost Always/Always. Two questions involved a rating scale including the ratings of Not Addressed, Minimally Addressed, Moderately Addressed, and Thoroughly Addressed. One question involved the rating scale of Not at All Important, Minimally Important, Moderately Important, and Extremely Important. One question involved the rating scale of Not a Factor, a Minimal Factor, a Moderate Factor, and an Extremely Important Factor. One question involved a rating scale of Not Prepared, Minimally Prepared, Moderately Prepared, and Extremely Prepared. Lastly, two questions involved the rating scale of Not Satisfied, Minimally Satisfied, Moderately Satisfied, and Extremely Satisfied. There was a multiple-choice question related to how often respondents have received professional development related to transition programming post-graduate school. There were four fixed choice (yes/no) questions related to if transition programming listed within respondents' job descriptions; if respondents' settings employ a transition coordinator; if respondents were aware of a transition team at the school, state, and district level; and if respondents were members of a transition team outside or in addition to an IEP team. There were two open response questions where respondents could list how pre-service training programs in school psychology could improve education provided related to transition programming, as well as how professional development related to transition programming could be improved. Four questions asked respondents to estimate the percentage of time they were involved in areas of transition programming and the time they devoted to teaching life skills for elementary and middle and/or high school students. There was one multiple response question asking respondents to indicate how their pre-service training program in school

psychology provided training related to transition programming. Lastly, in regard to the questions pertaining to transition, there was an open response question relating to additional information participants would like share that was not previously addressed by the survey items. There are eight questions related to demographics which require participants to respond using multiple choice. The questions were related to respondents' current employment as a school psychologist, gender, level of education, years of experience, the state respondents were currently working in, settings, locations, and caseloads. The survey was created using Survey Monkey TM (1999-2020). The use of a web-based instrument allowed school psychologists to complete the survey at a time and location most convenient for them (Fowler, 2014). The survey was designed to take approximately fifteen minutes.

Procedures

Data was collected via an online survey. Participants were provided a secure link to the survey automatically generated by Survey Monkey TM (1999-2020) within an email explaining the purpose of the study and seeking their participation (see Appendix D). The email was sent to individuals as identified by South Carolina's State Department of Education and electronic mailing addresses obtained for individual employed in the Florida, Georgia's, Kentucky, and Virginia. Respondents provided consent to use their responses through their participation in the survey. Participants were not asked to provide their names in the survey and other identifying information was not recorded through responses. Therefore, responses were anonymous. To encourage individuals to respond, two reminder emails were sent after the initial email. A third reminder email was sent to

school psychologists identified by South Carolina's State Department of Education due to the time of year the initial and two reminder emails were sent.

Data Analysis

The items included in this survey reflected aspects related to transition planning, programming, and practices. The survey included a section containing eight items to gather demographic information. A summary of participants' demographic characteristics is provided in Appendix G (Table G.1). Because a response to these items was encouraged but not required, only 339 - 415 of the 415 participants provided responses to at least one of the items in the demographics section. The majority of the participants were female (88%, n=299) and held a specialist degree in school psychology (79%, n=269). The largest percentage of participants have been employed as school psychologists for over 21 years (27%, n=92), followed by six to ten years of employment (20%, n=68). The largest percentage of participants (42%, n=142) currently worked in the state of South Carolina, followed by Georgia (31%, n=105). Participants most frequently reported working in a suburban (49%, n=166), elementary setting (80%, n=275), and having caseloads of less than 1,000 students (29%, n=98).

Quantitative and descriptive analysis were used to examine survey responses and answer the research questions. Responses were exported to a spreadsheet in order to analyze the results. Items 24 and 29 are closed response and will be analyzed statistically in order to report frequency. Information obtained from item number 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 will be used to answer the first research question (i.e., the extent school psychologists report their training programs addressed involvement in transition). Additionally, information from number 29 will be used to determine if school psychologists have

received professional development related to transition. The items involving rating scales (items 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, and 31) will be analyzed statistically in order to report frequency. Information from items twelve, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty, and twenty-one will be used to answer the second research question (i.e., school psychologists' amount of involvement in transition programming) and information from number 22 will be used to answer the third research question (i.e., the extent to which school psychologists want to be involved in transition programming). Responses to items nine, ten, eleven, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, and twenty-three regarding familiarity of transition planning, evidence-based transition practices, and areas of transition; factors influencing preferred level of involvement; transition programming listed as part of job description; the employment of a transition coordinator; the existence of a transition team outside; and demographic questions which are multiple choice (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) will be analyzed using descriptive statistics in order to report frequency. The results will answer the third research question (what factors influence school psychologists' involvement in the transition process). Items twelve, sixteen, seventeen, twenty-four, twenty-five, twenty-nine, and thirty will be used to answer the fifth research question (i.e., the affect training in transition planning has on school psychologists' involvement and perceptions of their role in the transition programming process). A Pearson correlation will be run using items (16, 22, and 25). Pearson correlation will determine if there is a relationship between school psychologists' training in transition planning (25) and their involvement in transition (16), as well as if there is a relationship between school psychologists' training in transition planning (25) and their perceptions of their role in the transition programming process (22). The item related to

aspect(s) of transition programming training programs addressed (item 25) and the extent of professional development related to transition programming and aspect(s) addressed (item 30) will be used to determine the frequencies of aspects addressed. Responses regarding how pre-service training programs in school psychology can improve education provided related to transition programming; how professional development related to transition programming can be improved; and additional information shared regarding transition programming not specifically addressed by the survey (item 28, 32, and 33) will be measured qualitatively in order to determine if there is a theme in responses obtained.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability refers to the consistency of scores and the chance individuals in similar situations would answer questions in the same way (Fowler, 2014; Johnson & Morgan, 2016). There are various types of errors which may lead to inconsistency resulting in decreased reliability. One of these errors is nonresponse which occurs when a large number of possible respondents do not complete a survey and their responses may differ from the ones obtained. The possibility of nonresponse error was present with this survey (i.e., the possible responses of individuals employed as school psychologists in Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Virginia, and South Carolina who did not respond differing from those who did respond). To help avoid nonresponse error, reminder emails were sent after the initial email. The format of the survey is a self-administered online instrument. Use of an online survey allowed participation to remain confidential and encouraged a better response rate, as well as honesty.

The concept of validity refers to being able to draw accurate conclusions from the responses (Johnson & Morgan, 2016). Four school psychologists reviewed the survey in order to discover concerns related to its content or design in an effort to ensure it was designed to measure what it was intended to so accurate conclusions could be drawn. Additionally, Appendix B illustrates the alignment of each survey item to the literature review.

The target population included individuals who held certificates in the area of School Psychology as identified by South Carolina's State Departments of Education, as well as individuals employed as school psychologists in Florida, Gregoria, Kentucky, and Virginia. A possible survey bias related to surveying only individuals currently employed as school psychologists in five south eastern states may have affected results due to not surveying school psychologists throughout the nation. Additionally, potential responses of individuals who did not completed the survey may differ from individuals who did respond.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine school psychologists' reported training and involvement in transition assessment, programs, and practices and the relationship between their reported training and involvement in transition programming in order to determine if school psychologists are being utilized to their fullest potential. A survey was used to gather information for the purpose and goals of this study. The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings. The chapter begins with a description of the sample, followed by the results obtained by analyzing the five research questions addressed by the study.

Discussion of Findings

Research Question #1: To what extent do school psychologists report their training programs addressed involvement in transition (i.e., planning, monitoring, and evaluation)?

Information obtained from item numbers 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 were used to answer the first research question. Participants were asked to indicate in what way their school psychology pre-service training programs provided training in transition programming. All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Table 4.1. No training was provided by over half of the participants' pre-service training programs. If the participants' pre-service training programs in school psychology addressed transition programming, transition assessments, instruction, evaluation of instruction, involvement

of families, and collaboration of stakeholders were typically not addressed. All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Appendix G (Table G.2).

Table 4.1 *How Pre-service Program Provided Training*

	n	%
Classes	52	19.19
Practicum Experience	50	18.45
Internship	58	21.40
No training provided	178	65.68
Other	13	4.80

Note. n = 271.

Participants were asked, based on the education they received during their pre-service training in school psychology, how prepared they were to address transition programming (e.g., assessment, interagency collaboration, transition planning as part of IEP development, implementation of instructional strategies, vocational education/integrated employment/continuing education, interviews/surveys/direct observations/questionnaires/transition-planning inventories). All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Table 4.2). Only four respondents (2%) felt extremely prepared. Thirty-six percent of the respondents felt they were not prepared. Over half of the participants (51.52%) reported they felt minimally prepared, while 11% of the participants felt moderately prepared.

Table 4.2 *Preparedness to Address Transition Based on Pre-service Education*

Level	n	%
Not Prepared	94	35.61
Minimally Prepared	136	51.52
Moderately Prepared	30	11.36
Extremely Prepared	4	1.52

Note. n = 264.

Participants rated their level of satisfaction regarding the education related to transition programming they received during their pre-service training in school psychology. All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Table 4.3. Seventy-five percent of respondents were not satisfied or minimally satisfied with the training they received in transition, while only 24% reported they were extremely satisfied or moderately satisfied with the education they received.

Table 4.3 *Satisfaction of Pre-service Transition Education Training Received*

Level	n	%
Not Satisfied	78	29.43
Minimally Satisfied	123	46.42
Moderately Satisfied	58	21.89
Extremely Satisfied	6	2.26

Note. n = 265.

One hundred twenty-eight participants provided open-ended responses regarding how pre-service training programs in school psychology could improve the education provided related to transition programming. Responses are described in Appendix H. While some responses indicated additional training related to transition programming laws, the role of school psychologists, applicable assessments, and information regarding related agencies would be beneficial, not all respondents agreed. Some participants indicated training in transition was not necessary, as transition programming requirements and services varied from state-to-state; transition programming was not part of their job descriptions; transition programming could not be implemented due to school psychologists' current responsibilities (including lack of time, size of caseloads); or transition programming was not their responsibility, but assigned to other individuals. The possibility of receiving training in secondary transition through practica, internship, on-the-job, and professional development was also mentioned by several respondents.

Some participants felt they did not receive training because they had received their training years ago; however, the amount of training reported did not appear to increase if participants had recently graduated. Responses also indicated participants felt their participation in transition programming was more applicable for school psychologists employed in high school settings.

Research Question #2: How involved are school psychologists in transition programming (e.g., assessment, collaboration, IEP development, implementation, data collection) for elementary, middle, and high school students? Participants were asked how involved they were in transition programming for elementary school students (e.g., functional skills focused on post-secondary outcomes). All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 *Involvement in Transition for Elementary School Students*

Level of Involvement	n	%
Never	198	66.89
Sometimes	92	31.08
Often	6	2.03
Almost Always	0	0.00

Note. n = 296.

Sixty-seven percent of participants reported they were never involved in transition programming for elementary school students. Respondents reported they had no

involvement in any areas of transition programming for elementary school students 74-83% of the time. Frequencies and percentages are detailed in Appendix G (Table G.3).

Participants were asked to estimate the percentage of time devoted to teaching life skills (e.g., communication, domestic, recreational, social-emotional, transportation, vocational/employment) to elementary school students, which could be interpreted as early preparation in transition from school to home or community environments.

Estimates ranged from 0-60%, with the great majority, 75% of respondents, indicating they did not devote any of their time to teaching life skills to elementary school students.

Participants were asked how involved they were in transition programming for middle and/or high school students. All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Table 4.5. Most participants (91.45%) reported they were never or rarely involved in transition programming for middle and/or high school students. Respondents reported they had no involvement in identified areas of transition programming for middle and/or high school students 64-82% of the time. Frequencies and percentages are detailed in Appendix G (Table G.4).

Table 4.5 *Middle/High School Transition Programming Involvement*

Level of Involvement	n	%
Never	143	45.25
Rarely	146	46.20
Often	24	7.59
Always	3	0.95

Note. n = 316.

Finally, participants were asked to estimate the percentage of time they devote to teaching life skills (e.g., communication, domestic, recreational, social-emotional, transportation, vocational/employment) to middle and/or high school students. Estimates ranged from 0-45%, with 79% of respondents indicating they did not devote any of their time to teaching life skills to middle and/or high school students.

Research Question #3: To what extent do school psychologists want to be involved in transition programming (i.e., assessment, collaboration, IEP development, implementation, data collection, etc.)? Participants rated the level of importance (i.e., not at all important, minimally important, moderately important, or extremely important) of school psychologists' involvement in areas of transition programming. Almost 70% (67.78%) of respondents reported it was moderately or extremely important to be involved in transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings.

Similarly, almost 70% (67.41%, n=183) of respondents felt collaboration of stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families was moderately or extremely important. Approximately 65% (64.94%, n=176) of respondents felt it was moderately or extremely important to be engaged in individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services and promote active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process. Participants most often indicated it was minimally important to be involved in instruction and related activities (49.26%, n=133) and evaluation of instruction and related activities related to postsecondary goals (39.48%, n=107). Frequencies and percentages are detailed in Appendix G (Table G.5).

Research Question #4: What factors influence school psychologists' involvement in the transition process? Participants were asked to rate factors, as well as their knowledge of transition programming, evidence-based transition practices, and areas of transition service delivery; if transition programming was listed as part of their job descriptions; and if their settings employed transition coordinators.

When participants were asked to rate factors influencing their involvement in transition programming, they indicated current responsibilities, current settings, transition programming not a part of job descriptions, and size of caseloads as having the greatest influence and instruction provided by pre-service training programs, professional development received related to transition programming, and knowledge of transition programming as being the least influential factors. All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Appendix G (Table G.6).

Participants most often reported they were minimally familiar with supports provided to transition-age youth (i.e., students thirteen years or older) and areas of transition service delivery and not familiar with evidenced-based transition practices (e.g., teaching methods used to teach skills that have been shown to be effective based on high-quality research). All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Table 4.6 and 4.7 and Appendix G (Table G.7).

Table 4.6 *Familiarity with Supports Provided to Transition-age Youth*

Level of Familiarity	n	%
Not Familiar	55	16.08
Minimally Familiar	166	48.54
Moderately Familiar	110	32.16
Extremely Familiar	11	3.22

Note. n = 342.

Table 4.7 *Familiarity with Evidence-based Transition Practices*

Level of Familiarity	n	%
Not Familiar	160	50.63
Minimally Familiar	120	37.97
Moderately Familiar	29	9.18
Extremely Familiar	7	2.22

Note. n = 316.

Participants were asked if transition programming was listed as part of their job description. All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Table 4.8. Seventy-three percent of participants indicated transition programming was not listed as part of their job description.

Table 4.8 *Transition Listed as Part of Job Description*

	n	%
Yes	36	10.56
No	250	73.31
I do not know.	43	12.61
Not Applicable	12	3.52

Note. n = 341

Finally, participants were asked if their settings employed a transition coordinator (i.e., an individual primarily responsible for preparing students receiving special education for life after graduation; linking school staff, families, community, and resource providers; ensuring students and families have access to available services; etc.). All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Table 4.9. Almost half (47%, n=162) of participants indicated their settings employed a transition coordinator.

Table 4.9 *Settings' Employment of Transition Coordinator*

	n	%
Yes	162	47.37
No	111	32.46
I do not know.	69	20.18

Note. n = 342

In summary, size of caseload, current responsibilities, transition programming not a part of job descriptions, and current setting were the factors reported to have the greatest influence on involvement in transition programming. Transition programming may not be listed as part of school psychologists' job descriptions since almost half of respondents indicated their settings employed a transition coordinator. Participants were typically minimally familiar with transition service delivery and supports provided to transition-age youth and not familiar with evidenced-based transition practices.

Research Question #5: Does training in transition programming affect school psychologists' involvement and perceptions of their role in the process? This question was answered by two sets of correlations, one looking at transition training and reported involvement, and one looking at transition training and perceptions of school psychologists' roles.

Participants were asked to indicate how their pre-service training programs in school psychology provided training related to transition programming. All frequencies and percentages are detailed in Table 4.10. The first correlation examined the relationship between respondents' preservice training (survey item 25) and professional development received (survey item 29) related to their involvement in transition programming at the elementary and middle/high school levels (survey items 19 and 16). Pearson correlations were conducted to determine participants' involvement in transition programming correlated to their pre-service training in specific areas of transition programming. All correlations are detailed in Table 4.11 and 4.12. Participants were also asked how often in the last three years they had received professional development related to aspects of transition programming after completing graduate school for school psychology. Frequencies and percentages for these program aspects are detailed in Table 4.13. Pearson correlations were conducted to determine respondents' ratings of involvement in transition programming for elementary and middle/high school students related to the professional development received. All correlations are detailed in Table 4.15. Likely due to the number of responses, all correlations were significant but most correlations were low enough to not appear to be clinically meaningful. A correlation is considered to be perfect if the value is ± 1.0 ; strong if the value lies between ± 0.5 and 1.0 ; moderate if the

value lies between ± 0.3 and 0.49 ; small if the value lies below ± 0.29 ; and there is no correlation if the value is 0.0 (“Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient,” n.d.). Based on the largest of these correlations, pre-service training in the area of assessment appeared to be more likely to increase involvement in transition programming for middle and/or high school students. However, training in the area of collaboration appeared to be more likely to increase transition programming at the elementary level. Professional development appeared to be more likely to have a greater impact on involvement in transition programming at the middle/high school level as opposed to the elementary level.

Table 4.10 *How Pre-service Training Provided Transition Training*

	n	%
Classes	52	19.19
Practicum experience	50	18.45
Internship	58	21.40
No training provided	178	65.68
Other	13	4.80

Note. n = 271.

Table 4.11 *Middle/High School Involvement Correlated to Pre-service Training*

	Involvement	
Training		
Assessment	.299**	
Instruction	.277**	
Evaluation of Instruction	.214**	
Involvement		.203**
Collaboration		.208**

**Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.12 *Elementary Involvement Correlated to Pre-service Training*

	Involvement	
Training		
Assessment	.197**	
Instruction	.238**	
Evaluation of Instruction	.201**	
Involvement		.203**
Collaboration		.253**

**Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.13 *Professional Development Received Related to Transition*

Frequency	n	%
0 times	187	70.57
1-2 times	62	23.40
3-4 times	10	3.77
5 or more times	6	2.26

Note. n = 265.

Table 4.14 *Involvement in Transition Correlated to Professional Development*

Involvement	Professional Development
Elementary	.152**
Middle and/or High	.329**

**Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The second correlation examined the relationship between participants' pre-service training (survey item 25) and professional development received (survey item 29) related to the level of importance of their involvement in areas of transition programming (survey item 22). Pearson correlations were conducted to determine how respondents' ratings of importance in each area correlated to their pre-service training. All correlations are detailed in Appendix G (Table G.8). Again, all correlations were statistically

significant, although not clinically significant. Pre-service training related to the involvement of families had the highest level of importance related to participants' involvement in transition programming.

Lastly, participants were asked their familiarity related to the supports provided to transition-age youth, as well as their familiarity with multiple areas of transition service delivery. Pearson correlations were conducted to determine respondents' overall and specific familiarity of supports correlated to the professional development received. All correlations are detailed in Table 4.15. Familiarity with the support of instruction, followed by evaluation of instruction, and then by laws and policies had the greatest correlation related to professional development. Again, although the correlations were statistically significant, they did not approach clinical significance.

Summary of Results

The purpose of this dissertation was to determine school psychologists' self-reported training and involvement in transition programming. The research questions guiding this study were: (1) To what extent do school psychologists report their training programs addressed involvement in transition programming, (2) How involved are school psychologists in transition programming for elementary, middle, and high school students, (3) To what extent do school psychologists want to be involved in transition programming, (4) What factors influence school psychologists' involvement in transition programming, and (5) Does training in transition programming affect school psychologists' involvement and perceptions of their role in the process?

Results indicated participants' pre-service training programs did not provide training related to transition programming, nor had participants received professional

development related to transition programming in the last three years. Participants reported they were rarely or never involved in transition programming and did not teach life skills at the elementary, middle, and/or high school levels. Yet, the majority of participants believed it was minimally to moderately important to be involved in aspects of transition programming. Respondents indicated caseload size, current responsibilities, transition programming not being a part of their job descriptions, and their current work setting as the factors having the greatest influence on involvement in transition programming.

Due to the absence of pre-service training, a relationship between training and participants' involvement and perceptions of their role in transition programming could not be concluded. Responses indicated involvement in transition programming would increase if pre-service training was provided and professional development seemed to be important, particularly at the secondary level. If assessment were to be addressed by pre-service training programs, it appeared to be the aspect more likely to correlate to involvement in transition programming at the middle/high school level. Collaboration appeared to be the aspect more likely to correlate to involvement in transition programming at the elementary level. Responses also indicated participants felt their participation in transition programming was more applicable for school psychologists employed in high school settings.

Table 4.15 *Familiarity of Supports Correlated to Professional Development*

		Professional Development			
Familiarity					
General	.317**				
Laws and Policies		.354**			
Assessment			.311**		
Instruction				.361**	
Evaluation of Instruction					.357**
Advocacy					.323**
Involvement					.290**
Collaboration					.338**

**Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this dissertation was to determine school psychologists' self-reported training and involvement in transition programming. The research questions guiding this study were: (1) To what extent do school psychologists report their training programs addressed involvement in transition programming?, (2) How involved are school psychologists in transition programming for elementary, middle, and high school students?, (3) To what extent do school psychologists want to be involved in transition programming?, (4) What factors influence school psychologists' involvement in transition programming?, and (5) Does training in transition programming affect school psychologists' involvement and perceptions of their role in the process? This study's research questions, methodology, and the data analysis informed overarching implications to the field of school psychology and suggestions for future research. The results were additionally tied to the supporting literature presented in this dissertation. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the study, discuss the results, and present limitations, implications for practice, and directions for future research.

Summary of Study

A total of 415 school psychologists in the states of Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Virginia completed an anonymous, web-based survey in order to gather information for the purpose and goals of this study. The survey included close- and open-ended items meant to assess respondents' training related to the transition

planning process; their involvement in the transition planning process; and the degree to which they wanted to be involved in the transition planning process. A minimum of two reminder emails were sent after an initial email in an effort to increase response rate. Quantitative and descriptive analysis were used to examine survey responses and answer the research questions. This study resulted in three key findings: School psychologists have not received pre-service training or professional development related to transition programming; they typically are not involved in transition programming at the elementary, middle, or high school levels; and various barriers hinder their involvement in transition programming.

Discussion of Findings

Barriers.

Similar to a study conducted by Ducharme, Roach, and Wellons (2020), results of the present study indicate school psychologists report experiencing barriers to their involvement in aspects of transition programming such as large caseloads, time demands, and lack of training. Furthermore, some school psychologists believe their involvement in transition programming is not necessary because it is not included in their job description, other individuals are better prepared to provide it, and/or it is only applicable to school psychologists working with high school students. As a result of the obstacles and the opinions of some school psychologists, the majority of the school psychologists included in the study are not involved in any aspects of transition programming at the elementary, middle, or high school levels. This is in stark contrast with current legislation, NASP, and school psychologists' documented desire to have a broader role than simply assessors

(Lillenstein et al., 2006; Rossen & Charvat, 2011; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Talapatra et al., 2019; Walcott et al., 2018).

Concerning the cited barrier of high caseloads and school psychologists' documented desire to be more than simply assessors, NASP's promotion of a 1:500 school psychologist-to-student ratio is idealistic. The average student-to-school psychologist ratio was 1,381:1 according to the 2015 Membership Survey (Walcott et al., 2018). Since school psychologists' have larger caseloads than what is advocated for or ideal, they continue to report they are unable to engage in activities beyond assessing. This concern has consistently been an issue, since the practice of school psychology was established (Fagan & Wise, 2007; Kaplan & Kaplan, 1985; Merrell, Ervin, Gimpel Peacock, 2012; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). Participants of the study indicated although multiple individuals can be trained to implement aspects of transition programming, only school psychologists are specifically trained to perform the responsibilities defined by their job descriptions, which does not include aspects of transition programming. Therefore, their primary responsibility of school psychologists continues to be assessment.

It is likely that various changes are necessary in order for school psychologists to be involved in transition programming. Foremost, school psychologists need to recognize that their involvement in transition can further support others, as well as promote their role as more than assessors. School psychologists' willingness to be involved in transition programming is likely to increase if they receive training related to it and have smaller caseloads, resulting in additional time to engage in activities besides assessment.

Furthermore, if involvement in transition programming is included in school psychologists' job descriptions, they will be held accountable to participate in it.

Promotion of school psychologists' involvement in transition programming needs to come from NASP. NASP encourages a broader role for school psychologists and has the ability to require pre-service training programs to provide instruction related to transition programming. However, the likelihood of this occurring is uncertain due to the vast amount of information programs are required to cover. Furthermore, even with training provided, in order for school psychologists to have the time to engage in aspects of transition programming, smaller caseloads are necessary. The size of caseloads is unlikely to decrease until there is no longer a shortage of school psychologists. Moreover, it is unlikely aspects of transition programming will be including in school psychologists' job descriptions until NASP specifically promotes the involvement of school psychologists in transition programming and school districts recognize the unique role school psychologists can fulfill in the process.

Involvement.

Researchers suggest the skills school psychologists possess can be used to contribute to the transition planning process (Ducharme et al., 2020; Kellems et al., 2016; Lillenstein et al., 2006; Wilczenski et al., 2017). Engagement in broader roles such as supporting strong family-school partnerships; improving instruction and learning; improving assessment and accountability through consultation and collaboration; providing intervention and instructional support to develop academic skills; and providing interventions and mental health services to develop social and life skills is supported by legislation and outlined by NASP. However, results of the existing research

(Talapatra et al., 2019; Lillenstein et al., 2006), including this study, indicate participation in broader roles, including aspects of transition programming, continues to be lacking.

Conclusions from NASP's SATSP show school psychologists continue to engage in the traditional role of test-and-place despite federal legislative and policy changes calling for a more comprehensive and integrated service delivery model (Walcott, McNamara, Hyson, & Charvat, 2018). Results from a survey conducted by Bramlett et al., (2002) indicate NASP members estimate the majority of their time is spent engaged in assessment. Similar to the current study, results of a study conducted by Ducharme et al., (2020) indicate participants are minimally involved in transition assessment, transition planning, and IEP transition goal development. Additionally, in a study conducted by Lillenstein et al., (2006), although it was suggested that school psychologists can significantly contribute to transition planning including collaboration with IEP teams, administration of assessments, interpretation of assessment results, and provision of evidence-based recommendations, their actual involvement continues to be limited. Lack of school psychologists' involvement is further supported by the results of this study revealing school psychologists are not involved in aspects of transition programming, nor do they teach life skills at the elementary or middle/high school levels. Findings indicated assessment was the aspect of transition programming school psychologists were most likely to be engaged in at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. However, there was only a 26% chance of school psychologists having some involvement in transition assessment at the elementary level and a 36% chance at the middle/high school level. Additionally, of the school psychologists surveyed, 75%

stated they do not teach life skills at the elementary level while 79% of participants said they do not teach life skills at the middle or high school levels.

Respondents in the study felt it was most important to be involved in a few aspects of transition programming, including transition assessments and procedures, collaboration of stakeholders, engagement in individual advocacy, promotion of active involvement of families, and collaboration, all of which are included within the domains of NASP's Model (2020). The importance of assessment was previously highlighted in a study conducted by Ducharme et al., (2020) and the importance of collaboration has also been documented (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). Additionally, a study conducted by Kellems et al., (2016) supports the administration of assessments, interpretation of results, and application of evidence-based instructional recommendations are considered to be the responsibilities of school psychologists. Interviews conducted by Ducharme et al., (2020) noted school psychologists can assist with assessments related to transition and provide documentation of necessary accommodations to meet vocational rehabilitation agencies' requirements and aid in determining eligibility for services.

Although the primary role of school psychologists continues to be assessors, the results of the assessments administered are not being utilized for the purpose of transition programming. Fives (2014) proposed various ways to incorporate transition activities into the tasks school psychologist already perform such as traditional assessment, consultation, and direct service roles and Kellems et al., (2016) noted the importance of assessments and contended school psychologists can assist with assessments related to transition and provide documentation of necessary accommodations students require after leaving high school. However, results of the current study indicated this is happening

only 26% of the time at the elementary level and 36% of the time at the middle and high school levels.

In order for school psychologists to incorporate aspects of transition programming into their current roles, the current study, as well as studies conducted by Ducharme et al., (2020) and Morales and Hagermoser Sanetti (2018) highlight a need for pre-service and professional development training regarding available transition assessments, as well as how school psychologists can be valuable team members. Additionally, Wilczenski et al., (2017) propose school psychologists can advocate for postsecondary needs of students including collaboration with students and their families; however, results from the current study indicated this is happening only 23% of the time at the elementary level and 31% of the time at the middle and high school levels. Morales and Hagermoser Sanetti (2018) and a school psychologist interviewed by Ducharme et al., (2020) mentioned the benefit of multidisciplinary teams in promoting meaningful transition services. As Talapatra et al., (2018) noted, school psychologists, special education teachers, and families should collaborate and the services school psychologists can provide should be acknowledged by NASP, pre-service training programs, legislators, district personnel, administrators, etc. Furthermore, including school psychologists in transition programming can promote interdisciplinary collaboration and support students, families, teachers, and individuals from other agencies (Kellems et al., 2016; Morales & Hagermoser Sanetti, 2018; Talapatra et al., 2019).

Participants believed they were only slightly prepared to be involved in transition programming and some indicated pre-service training would be beneficial. However, others felt involvement in transition programming was unnecessary or unrealistic for

various reasons. The size of their caseloads, current responsibilities, current settings, and whether it was a part of their job descriptions had the largest influence on school psychologists' involvement. Knowledge of transition practices, pre-service training, and professional development had some influence on school psychologists' involvement in transition programming.

Training.

Survey results indicate school psychologists have not received professional development during the last three years related to transition programming, nor have they received pre-service training related to transition programming. These findings were similar to results of studies conducted by Ducharme, Roach, and Wellons (2020) and Lillenstein et al., (2006). Although respondents in the current study indicated dissatisfaction regarding their level of preparation related to pre-service training, some, but not all, agree additional training would be beneficial. Reasons for disagreement included transition programming requirements and services vary from state-to-state; transition programming was not part of their job descriptions; transition programming could not be implemented due to their current responsibilities or how their roles were perceived; or transition programming was not their responsibility, as other individuals were responsible for it. Additionally, some participants felt they did not receive training because they had received their education so long ago; however, this did not appear to be accurate, as respondents across all age levels reported little or no training. Results suggest if professional development was provided, school psychologists would be more compelled to be involvement in transition programming. However, based on this study, school psychologists felt they should have marginal involvement in aspects of transition

programming, regardless of training. Nevertheless, as previously mentioned, the culmination of additional factors (e.g., pre-service training, smaller caseloads, and transition programming included within their job descriptions) would likely have an even greater chance of increasing involvement.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study should be viewed in light of some limitations. A limitation of this study was related to the sample population. Each state included in the sample did not have a list of individuals who held licenses in school psychology within the state. Therefore, it was often necessary to contact each district within states in an effort to obtain the contact information of school psychologists employed by the districts. This process posed several limitations including not being able to reach the appropriate point of contact, not being provided the appropriate contact information, etc. Additionally, the sample was regional (e.g., the South Eastern part of the country). A national sample would include different training programs and possibly training practices, which may result in different study outcomes.

Another limitation included the time frame during which data was collected, which may have not been ideal. As schools continue to cope with challenges created by COVID-19, it is possible points of contact within the districts, as well as school psychologists asked to participate in the study, had multiple responsibilities, faced time constraints, and did not respond to inquiries related to contact information or complete the survey. Therefore, findings may not reflect the practices and perceptions characteristic of school psychologists whose contact information was not obtained or who

did not complete the survey, as well as school psychologists in other districts/states across the nation not included in the sample.

Additionally, some of contact information (e.g., email addresses) obtained was invalid, decreasing the potential sample size. Although 415 participants attempted the survey, 415 responses were not obtained for every question. Future research may aim not only to include a larger sample size, but also examine survey items in an effort to determine why responses to various questions were not provided.

Implications for Practice

This study begins to address the current gap in research focusing on school psychologists' training and involvement in transition programming. This was accomplished through school psychologists completing a survey. The results of this study not only contribute to the literature in the field but also have implications for school psychologists, district/administrative staff, school psychologists' pre-service training programs, NASP, and legislation.

Legislation and NASP promote broader roles for school psychologists such as providing direct support and interventions; supporting school employees, families, school-family partnerships, and students' mental health; improving school-wide practices and policies; collaborating with community providers; increasing academic achievement and positive behavior; and assisting with individual and school-wide assessment and progress monitoring related to both academics and behavior. Furthermore, Furlong et al., (2000) suggest the responsibilities of school psychologists are changing due to legislation and policy initiatives. Additionally, legislation (e.g., Every Student Succeeds Act (2015), IDEA (2004), and MTSS) suggests school psychologists' involvement in an integrated

service delivery model should expand to include consultation and collaboration. However, results from this study and previous research illustrated school psychologists' responsibilities have not changed in practice and they are not engaged in broader roles. Although legislation and policy often impact the services school psychologists provide, they may be limited to testing and placement decisions depending on how localities interpret mandates (Ehrhardt-Padgett, Hatzichriston, Kitson, & Meyers, 2004; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Reschly, 2000). Eligibility determination is the foundation of financial support for school psychologists in nearly every state (Reschly, 2000) further contributing to why the primary role of school psychologists continues to be assessment. Specific characteristics of the educational settings in which school psychologists are employed (e.g., school psychologist-to-student ratios) impact the opportunities school psychologists have to fulfil expanded roles proposed by legislation and NASP (Walcott et al., 2018). Therefore, legislators and NASP must first not only promote, but also support school psychologists' abilities to be capable of more than simply assessing. This includes putting factors (e.g., salary incentives and an increase in school psychologists, available graduate education programs, faculty to train school psychologists, and district positions) in place in order to make NASP's proposed caseload a reality. Legislators need to acknowledge the value of school psychologists, including the extensive skill set they possess. NASP and school psychologists can assist with this realization by communicating the importance of school psychologists to congressional representatives. If services school psychologists are capable of providing are prioritized by legislation, localities will be obliged to prioritize the employment of school psychologists. Additionally, increasing the salaries of school psychologists would help encourage

interest in the field. An increase in salaries would likely need to occur through legislators, allowing localities to then acknowledge the value of school psychologists and obtain additional funds. Additional funding would likely be acquired through federal and then state channels; however, it is possible for localities to allocate existing funds for additional school psychologists from existing expenditures. An example of the federal government providing additional funds is the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund (ESSER Fund) which was awarded to state educational agencies to provide local education agencies (LEAs) with emergency relief to address the impact COVID-19 has had, and continues to have, on elementary and secondary schools. LEAs can use the funds to hire additional school psychologists or increase the salaries of their current school psychologists.

According to the present study, as well as previous research, school psychologists did not receive pre-service training or professional development related to transition programming. They were not involved in aspects of transition programming at the elementary, middle, or high school levels, although they feel their involvement in it is important. Training related to transition programming should be provided through pre-service training programs and later addressed through professional development. NASP can specifically highlight aspects of transition programming within their Practice Model. If NASP revises their Practice Model, which would likely be driven by NASP and school psychologists, and clearly includes transition programming in it, pre-service training programs will be obligated to provide training related to transition programming. Training can include providing a model, including how to collaborate with other team members; laws and what services are available in the state; discussion of IEP

development and available resources related to transition programming; instruction related to advocacy skills; case studies, practicum, and internship experiences; presentations by outside agencies, etc. Professional development can incorporate information presented by the state, as well as by agencies to include available resources; available assessments, instruction, and programming; and how school psychologists can be valuable team members. If districts are aware of the extensive functions school psychologists can engage in, districts can encourage the involvement of school psychologists in transition programming through collaboration with team members throughout the transition process. Districts can also include involvement in the transition process in job descriptions of school psychologists.

Although training and professional development are necessary, even if provided, their utility cannot be fully realized until school psychologists are able to practice what they have learned. NASP needs to continue to support legislation in order to achieve its promoted caseload size so school psychologist will be able to utilize the multitude of skills they possess.

NASP needs to determine if school psychologists should be involved in transition programming and, if so, what their role should be. For example, if school psychologists ought to be involved in assessment, training is necessary in the area of transition assessments. However, if NASP emphasizes school psychologists' role in transition planning and transition plans, then corresponding training and support is necessary. Based on results of this study, school psychologists would most like to be involved in the areas of collaboration, family involvement, and advocacy. NASP could survey school psychologists in order to determine what area(s) of transition programming they want to

be involved in. NASP could then determine if pre-service training programs should focus on transition programming in general, or have a more narrowed focus. The findings of this study suggest a need for training during school psychology pre-service training programs, as well as continued professional development once school psychologists are employed. Training can be interwoven into existing coursework or a stand-alone course designed to focus on transition programming. During pre-service training, school psychologists should be able to apply aspects of transition programming and be provided with support and feedback. Professional development can be provided by district and/or schools by individuals knowledgeable and experienced with transition programming (e.g., transition coordinators, members of transition teams, individuals from outside agencies) and should be ongoing. Pre-service training and professional development would increase school psychologists' exposure to transition programming, as well as how their involvement can be integrated into the practices they already engaged in and help ease concerns related to preparedness, size of caseloads, and other responsibilities.

Directions for Future Research

Participants reported receiving little to no pre-service training related to transition programming. Although they also reported little involvement in transition programming, they believed their involvement in parts of transition programming, specifically transition assessments and procedures, collaboration of stakeholders, engagement in individual student advocacy, and promotion of active involvement of families, was important. Future research, including identifying membership needs by NASP, can focus on aspects of transition programming school psychologists believe they are able to provide while also examining factors they have indicate as limiting their participation (e.g., size of

caseload, other responsibilities). Training to support school psychologists' skill development of these aspects is also important since respondents indicated no pre-service training related to transition programming had been received. Therefore, pre-service programs in school psychology can be surveyed in order to determine what training, if any, they are providing related to transition programming. If research indicates programs are providing training, the training can be further examined to include what aspects of transition programming are being taught, how they are being taught, and students' satisfaction regarding the training. Results of this research can be used to help determine areas of transition programming pre-service training programs should focus on and how they should be taught.

There is a need for pre-service programs in school psychology to provide training regarding transition programming. Future research could examine pre-service training programs in school psychology in order to determine if and how training in transition programming is being provided. Programs that include training in transition could be further explored in order to determine the specific quantity and quality of training provided and to determine if graduates use that training in practice.

Research should continue to explore and gain a deeper understanding of school psychologists' perceptions of training and involvement in transition programming across additional districts and states, beyond the ones included in this study. It is possible there is a discrepancy in school psychologists' training and involvement in transition programming when considering school psychologists in other districts and states who did not participate in this study. This possibility should be explored and, if it is a reality, the training received and school psychologists' participation in transition programming

should be further examined more intently to determine its impact. A nationwide sample may discover programs in other parts of the country that provide transition training and a relationship between preparation and practice could then be investigated more fully.

School psychologists' pre-service training related to transition programming; their involvement and desire to be involved in transition programming; factors influencing their involvement in transition programming; and if training in transition programming affected their involvement and perceptions of their role in transition programming was examined through an anonymous, web-based survey. School psychologists who completed the survey indicated they had not received pre-service training related to transition programming, nor were they involved in it at the elementary, middle, or high school levels. Although close-ended responses indicated respondents wanted to be involved in aspects of transition programming, open-ended responses indicated varying reasons for lack of involvement (e.g., size of caseloads, current responsibilities, current settings, and transition programming not a part of job descriptions). Pre-service training in the area of assessment appeared more likely to increase involvement in transition programming for middle and/or high school students. Additionally, providing professional development appeared to have a greater impact on involvement in transition programming at the middle/high school level. Training in the area of collaboration appeared to be more likely to increase transition programming at the elementary level. Pre-service training related to the involvement of families had the highest level of importance related to participants' involvement in transition programming.

REFERENCES

- Bahr, M. W., Leduc, J. D., Hild, M. A., Davis, S. E., Summers, J. K., & McNeal, B. (2017). Evidence for the expanding role of consultation in the practice of school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools, 54*(6), 581-595.
- Berninger, V. W. (2006). Research-supported ideas for implementing reauthorized IDEA with intelligent professional psychological services. *Psychology in School, 43*(7), 781-796.
- Blanchett, W. J. (2001). Importance of teacher transition competencies as rated by special educators. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 24*(1), 3-12.
- Bramlett, R. K., Murphy, J. J., Johnson, J., Wallingsford, L., & Hall, J. D. (2002). Contemporary practices in school psychology: A national survey of roles and referral problems. *Psychology in Schools, 39*(3), 327-335.
- Carter, E. W., Austin, D., & Trainor, A. (2012). Predictors of post-school employment outcomes for young adults with severe disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 23*(1), 50-63.
- Cameto, R., Levine, P., & Wagner, M., 2004. Transition planning for students with disabilities: A special topic report of findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS-2).
- Cobb, R. B., & Alwell, M. (2009). Transition planning/coordinating interventions for youth with disabilities: A systematic review. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 32*(2), 70-81.

- Congressional Research Service. (2018). *The individuals with disabilities educational act (IDEA) funding: A primer*. Retrieved from:
<https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R44624>
- Department of Education. (2015) OSERS transition data fact sheet. Retrieved from:
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/products/transition/osers-transition-activities-2015.pdf>
- Ducharme, D., Roach, A. T., & Wellons, Q. D. (2020). The role of school psychologists in employment-focused transition Services. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*. doi: 10.1080/15377903.2020.1749205
- Eagle, J. W., Dowd-Eagle, S. E., Snyder, A., & Holtzman, E. G. (2015). Implementing a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS): Collaboration between school psychologists and administrators to promote systems-level change. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 25, 160-177.
- Ehrhardt-Padgett, G. N., Hatzichriston, C., Kitson, J., & Meyers, J. (2004). Awakening to a new dawn: Perspectives of the future of school psychology. *School Psychology Review*, 33(1), 105-114.
- Fagan, T. K. (1992). Compulsory schooling, child study, clinical psychology, and special education. *American Psychologist*, 47(2), 236-243.
- Fagan, T. K. & Wells, P. D. (2000). History and status of school psychology accreditation in the United States. *School Psychology Review*, 29(1), 28-51.
- Fagan, T. K. & Wise, P. S. (2007) *School psychology: Past, present, and future*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

- Farrell, P. (2010). School psychology: Learning lessons from history and moving forward. *School Psychology International*, 31(6), 581–598.
- Fives, C. J. (2014). Supporting the transition needs of secondary students with disabilities: Suggested roles for school psychologists. *CAIISE Review*, 2.
- Forman, S. G., & Crystal, C. D. (2015). Systems consultation for multitiered systems of supports (MTSS): Implementation issues. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 25, 276–285.
- Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Francher, R. E. (1998). Alfred Binet, General Psychologist. In Wertheimer, M., & Kimble, G. A. (Eds.), *Portraits of pioneers in psychology: Volume III* (pp. 67-48). American Psychological Association
- French, J. L. 1984. On the conception, birth, and early development of school psychology with special reference to Pennsylvania. *American Psychologist*, 39(9), 976-987.
- Furlong, M., Morrison, G., & Pavelski, R. (2000). Trends in school psychology for the 21st century: Influences of school violence on professional change. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37(1), 81-90.
- Goldwasser, E., Meyers, J., Christenson, S., & Graden, J, 1983. The impact of PL 94-142 on the practice of school psychology: A national survey. *Psychology in the Schools*, 20, 153-165.
- Green, H. & Brooke, V. (2001). Recruiting and retaining the best from America's largest untapped talent pool. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 16, 83-88.
- Gross, F., P., & Farling, W., H., 1969. An analysis of case loads of school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, 6, 98-99.

- Hardman, M. L., & Dawson, S. A. (2010). Historical and legislative foundations. In John McDonnell & Michael L. Hardman, *Successful transition programs: Pathways for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities* (pp. 3-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act Public Law 108-446, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400 et seq. (2004).
- Johnson, R. L., & Morgan, G. B. (2016). *Survey scales: A guide to development, analysis, and reporting*. The Guilford Press.
- Kaplan, M. & Kaplan, H. 1985. School psychology: Its educational and societal connections. *Journal of School Psychology, 23*, 319-325.
- Kauffman, J. M., Hallahan, D. P., Pullen, P. C., & Badar J. (2018). *Special Education: What It Is and Why We Need It*. Routledge.
- Kellems, R. O., Springer, B., Wilkins, M. K., & Anderson, C. (2016). Collaboration in transition assessment: School psychologists and special educators working together to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. *Preventing School Failure, 60*(3), 215-221.
- Knott, L., & Asselin, S. B. (1999). Transition competencies: Perception of secondary special education teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education 22*(1), 55-65.
- Kohler, P. D., Gothberg, J. E., Fowler, C. and Coyle, J. (2016). Taxonomy for transition programming 2.0: A model for planning, organizing, and evaluating transition education, services, and programs.

- Landmark, L. J., Ju, S., & Zhang, D. (2010). Substantiated best practices in transition: Fifteen plus years later. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 33(3), 165-176.
- Larson, J. P., & Choi, H. (2009). The effects of university training and educational legislation on the role and function of school psychologists. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 26, 97-114.
- Lillenstein, D. J., Levinson, E. M., Sylvester, C. A., & 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.
- Martin, E. W., Martin, R., & Terman, D. L. (1996). The legislative and litigation history of special education. *Special Education for Students with Disabilities*, 6(1).
- Mazzotti, V. L., Rowe, D. R., Sinclair, J., Poppen, M., Woods, W. E., & Shearer, M. L. (2015). Predictors of post-school success: A systematic review of NLTS2 secondary analyses. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 39(4), 196-215.
- Merrell, K. W., Ervin, R. A., & Peacock, G. G. (2012). *School Psychology for the 21st Century: Foundations and Practices* (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press.
- 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.
- Morgan, R. L., & Riesen, T. (2016). Promoting successful transition to adulthood for students with disabilities. The Guilford Press.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2019). About NASP. Retrieved from:

<https://www.nasponline.org/utility/about-nasp>

National Association of School Psychologists. (2019). ESSA and multitiered systems of support for school psychologists. Retrieved from:

<https://www.nasponline.org/research-and-policy/policy-priorities/relevant-law/the-every-student-succeeds-act/essa-implementation-resources/essa-and-mtss-for-school-psychologists>

National Association of School Psychologists (2020). The Professional Standards of the

National Association of School Psychologists. Retrieved from:

<https://www.nasponline.org/x55315.xml>

National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLST2). (2009). *NLST 2 Wave 3 2005*

Parent/Youth Survey: Employment of youth out-of-secondary school a year or more. Retrieved from: www.nlts2.org

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition. (2019). *Effective practices and predictors matrix.* Retrieved from:

https://transitionta.org/system/files/epmatrix/EBPP_Matrix_Links_Updated_11-8-19_0.pdf

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition. (2016). *Survey of transition assessment planning practices.* Retrieved from:

<https://www.transitionta.org/system/files/toolkitevaluation/Survey%20of%20Transition%20Assessment%20Planning%20Practices.pdf>

- Newman, L., Wagner, M., Knokey, A.-M., Marder, C., Nagle, K., Shaver, D., Wei, X.,
with Cameto, R., Contreras, E., Ferguson, K., Greene, S., and Schwarting, M.
(2011). *The Post-High School Outcomes of Young Adults with Disabilities up to 8
Years After High School. A Report from the National Longitudinal Transition
Study-2 (NLTS2)* (NCSER 2011-3005). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
Retrieved from:
https://nlts2.sri.com/reports/2011_09_02/nlts2_report_2011_09_02_complete.pdf
- Osborne, A. G. & Russo, C. J., (2014). *Special Education and the Law: A Guide for
Practitioners*. Corwin.
- Pryzwansky, W. B. (1993). The regulation of school
psychology: A historical perspective on certification, licensure, and accreditation.
Journal of School Psychology, 31, 219-235.
- Reschly, D. J. 2000. The present and future status of school psychology in the United
States. *School Psychology Review, 29*(4), 507-522.
- Rowe, D. A., Alverson, C. Y., Unruh, D. K., Fowler, C. H., Kellems, R., & Test, D. W.
(2015). A delphi study to operationalize evidence-based predictors in secondary
transition. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals 38*(2),
113-126.
- Sheridan, S. M. & Gutkin, T. B. (2000). The ecology of school psychology: Examining
and changing our paradigm for the 21st century. *School Psychology Review, 29*(4),
485-502.
- Splett, J. W., Fowler, J., Weist, M. D., McDaniel, H., Dvorsky, M. (2013). The critical
role of school psychology in the school mental health movement. *Psychology in
the Schools, 50*(3), 245-258.

- Staab, M. J. B. (1996). *The role of the school psychologist in transition planning*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas].
- Sulliva, A. L., & Long, L. (2010). Examining the changing landscape of school psychology practice: A survey of school-based practitioners regarding response to intervention. *Psychology in the Schools, 47*(10), 1059-1070.
- Talapatra, D., Miller, G. E., & Schumacher-Martinez, R. (2019). Improving family-school collaboration in transition services for students with intellectual disabilities: A framework for school psychologists. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 29*(3), 314-336.
- Talapatra, D., Roach, A. T., Varjas, K., Houchins, D. E., & Crimmins, D. B. (2018). Transition services for students with intellectual disabilities: School psychologists' perceptions. *Psychology in the Schools, 56*(1), 56-78.
- Talapatra, D., Wilcox, G., Roof, H. & Hutchinson, C. (2019). Transition planning for students with disabilities: Perspectives of Canadian and American school psychologists. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology*. doi: 10.1080/21683603.2018.1558136
- Test, D. W., Fowler, C., & Kohler, P. (2010). Evidence-based practices and predictors in secondary transition: What we know and what we still need to know. Retrieved from:
https://transitionta.org/system/files/effectivepractices/EBPP_Exec_Summary_2016_12_13_16.pdf

- Test, D. W., Fowler, C. H., Richter, S. M., White, J., Mazzotti, V., Walker, A. R., Kohler, P., & Korterling, L. (2009). Evidence-based practices in Secondary transition. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 32*(2), 115-128.
- Test, D. W., Mazzotti, V. L., Mustian, A. L., Fowler, C. H., Korterling, 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.
- U.S. Department of Education (2015). OSERS transition data fact sheet. Retrieved from: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/products/transition/osers-transition-activities-2015.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education. Every student succeeds act (ESSA). Retrieved from: <https://www.ed.gov/ESSA>
- U.S. Department of Education. About IDEA. Retrieved from: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/about-idea/>
- Walcott, C. M., McNamara, K., Hyson, D., & Charvat, J. L. (2018). Results from the NASP 2015 membership survey, part one: Demographics and Employment conditions. *NASP Research Reports, (3)*1.
- Walker, A., Korterling, L., Fowler, C., Rowe, D., Bethune, L., & Terrell, M. (2016). Age appropriate transition assessment toolkit: 4.0 edition. National Technical Assistance Center for Transition. Retrieved from: https://transitionta.org/system/files/toolkitassessment/AgeAppropriateTransitionAssessmentToolkit2016_COMPLETE_11_21_16.pdf

Wilczenski, F. L., Cook, A. L., & Regal, C. P. (2017). Rethinking college: Roles for school psychologists in transition planning for students with intellectual disability.

Contemporary School Psychol, 21, 71–79.

Yell, M. L., Rgers, D., & Rogers, E. L. (1998). The legal history of special education:

What a long, strange trip it's been. *Remedial and Special Education*, 19(4), 219-228.

APPENDIX A
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR HUMAN RESEARCH
APPROVAL LETTER



OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR HUMAN RESEARCH
APPROVAL LETTER for EXEMPT REVIEW

Valerie Bell
820 Main Street
Columbia, SC 29208

Re: **Pro00100377**

Dear Mrs. Valerie Bell:

This is to certify that the research study ***School Psychologists' Involvement in Transition Programming*** was reviewed in accordance with 45 CFR 46.104(d)(2) and 45 CFR 46.111(a)(7), the study received an exemption from Human Research Subject Regulations on **5/29/2020**. No further action or Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight is required, as long as the study remains the same. However, the Principal Investigator must inform the Office of Research Compliance of any changes in procedures involving human subjects. Changes to the current research study could result in a reclassification of the study and further review by the IRB.

Because this study was determined to be exempt from further IRB oversight, consent document(s), if applicable, are not stamped with an expiration date.

All research related records are to be retained for at least three (3) years after termination of the study.

The Office of Research Compliance is an administrative office that supports the University of South Carolina Institutional Review Board (USC IRB). If you have questions, contact Lisa Johnson at lisaj@mailbox.sc.edu or (803) 777-6670.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Lisa M. Johnson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Lisa" being the most prominent.

Lisa M. Johnson
ORC Assistant Director and IRB Manager

APPENDIX B

Table B.1

Research Question/Survey Item Alignment

Research Question	Survey Item Number(s)	Citations(s)
Extent school psychologists report training programs addressed involvement in transition	24, 26, 27, 28	Kellems, R. O., Springer, B., Wilkins, M. K., & Anderson, C. (2016); National Association of School Psychologists (2010); Talapatra, D., Wilcox, G., Roof, H., & Hutchinson, C. (2019)
School psychologists' involvement in transition programming	12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21	Berninger, V. W. (2006); Blanchett, W. J. (2001); Knott, L., & Asselin, S. B. (1999); Lillenstein, D. J., Levinson, E. M., Sylvester, C. A., & Brady, E. E. (2006); Staab, J. B. (1996); Talapatra, D., Wilcox, G., Roof, H., & Hutchinson, C. (2019); Walker, a., Kortering, L., Fowler, C., Rowe, D., Bethune, L., & Terrell, M. (2016)

<p>Extent school psychologists want to be involved in transition programming</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>Berninger, V. W. (2006); Blanchett, W. J. (2001); Bramlett, R. K., Murphy, J. J., Johnson, J., Wallingsford, L., & Hall, J. D. (2002); Ducharme, D., Roach, A. T., & Wellons, Q. D. (2020); Knott, L., & Asselin, S. B. (1999); Lillenstein, D. J., Levinson, E. M., Sylvester, C. A., & Brady, E. E. (2006); Talapatra, D., Wilcox, G., Roof, H., & Hutchinson, C. (2019); Walcott, C. M., McNamara, K., Hyson, D., & Charvat, J. L. (2018)</p>
<p>Factors influencing school psychologists' involvement in the transition process</p>	<p>23</p> <p>9, 10, 13, 14, 15,</p>	<p>Blanchett, W. J. (2001); Bramlett, R. K., Murphy, J. J., Johnson, J., Wallingsford, L., & Hall, J. D. (2002); Ducharme, D., Roach, A. T., & Wellons, Q. D. (2020); Ehrhardt-Padgett, G. N., Hatzichriston, C., Kitson, J., & Meyers, J. (2004); Fagan, T. K. & Wise, P. S. (2007); Goldwasser, E., Meyers, J., Christenson, S., & Graden, J. (1983); Gross, F., P., & Farling, W., H., 1969; Knott, L., & Asselin, S. B. (1999); Lillenstein, D. J., Levinson, E. M., Sylvester, C. A., & Brady, E. E. (2006); National Association of School Psychologists (2010); Reschly, D. J. (2000); Sheridan, S. M. & Gutkin, T. B. (2000); Staab, J. B. (1996); Walcott, C. M., McNamara, K., Hyson, D., & Charvat, J. L. (2018)</p>

<p>Affect training in transition planning has on school psychologists' involvement and perceptions of their role in the transition programming process</p>	<p>12, 17, 22, 24, 25, 29, 30</p>	<p>Berninger, V. W. (2006); Blanchett, W. J. (2001); Bramlett, R. K., Murphy, J. J., Johnson, J., Wallingsford, L., & Hall, J. D. (2002); Knott, L., & Asselin, S. B. (1999); National Association of School Psychologists (2010); Walcott, C. M., McNamara, K., Hyson, D., & Charvat, J. L. (2018)</p>
--	-----------------------------------	---

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FOR WEB-BASED SURVEY

Please provide a response for each item.

By selecting “OK” and “Next”, you are providing consent to participate in the study.

1. Are you currently employed as a school psychologist?
Answer choices: yes, no
2. To which gender do you most identify
Answer choices: male, female, gender variant/non-conforming, not listed, prefer not to answer
3. Which best describes the level of your degree related to school psychology?
Answer choices: specialist, doctorate, other (please specify)
4. How many years have you been employed as a school psychologist?
Answer choices: I am a first-year school psychologist (<1 year)., 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21+ years
5. What state are you currently working in?
Answer choices: Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, South Carolina, Virginia, other (please specify)
6. How would you describe the location of your current setting?
Answer choices: urban, suburban, rural, other (please specify)
7. Current setting (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)
Answer choices: early childhood, elementary, middle school, high school, post-secondary, private practice, other (please specify)
8. Estimate of student caseload
Answer choices: Less than 1,000, between 1,000 and 1,500, between 1,501 and 2,000, greater than 2,000, other (please specify)
9. Is transition programming listed as part of your job description?
Answer choices: yes, no, I do not know., not applicable (please specify)
10. Does your setting employ a transition coordinator (i.e., an individual primarily responsible for preparing students receiving special education for life after

graduation; linking school staff, families, community, and resource providers; ensuring students and families have access to available services; etc.)?

Answer choices: yes, no, I do not know.

11. Are you aware of the existence of a transition team outside or in addition to an IEP team (e.g., a team that plans activities to assist parents, students, educators, and community members with the successful transition of students receiving special education services from primary and secondary education to the next environment) at the following levels?

Answer choices: yes, no, I don't know, not applicable

- School
- District
- State

12. Are you a member of a transition team outside or in addition to an IEP team (e.g., a team that plans activities to assist parents, students, educators, and community members with the successful transition of students receiving special education services to the next environment)?

Answer choices: yes, no

13. How familiar are you with the supports provided to transition-age youth (i.e., students thirteen years or older)?

Answer choices: not familiar, minimally familiar, moderately familiar, extremely familiar

14. Please rate your level or familiarity related to the following areas of transition service delivery:

Answer choices: not familiar, minimally familiar, moderately familiar, extremely familiar

- Transition laws and policies
- Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings
- Transition instruction, related activities, and curricular resources
- Evaluation of instruction and related activities pertaining to postsecondary goals
- Individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services
- Ways to promote active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process
- Strategies for collaborating with stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families

15. How familiar are you with evidence-based transition practices (e.g., teaching methods used to teach skills that have been shown to be effective based on high-quality research)?

Answer choices: not familiar, minimally familiar, moderately familiar, extremely familiar

16. How involved are you in transition programming for middle and/or high school students?

Answer choices: never, rarely, often, always

17. Please estimate the percentage of time you are involved in the following areas of transition programming for middle and/or high school students:

- Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings
- Instruction and related activities
- Evaluation of instruction and related activities
- Engagement in individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services
- Promotion of active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process
- Collaboration of stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families

18. Please estimate the percentage of time you devote to teaching life skills (e.g., communication, domestic, recreational, social-emotional, transportation, vocational/employment, etc.) to middle and/or high school students.

19. How involved are you in transition programming for elementary school students (i.e., functional skills focused on post-secondary outcomes, etc.)?

Answer choices: never, sometimes, often, almost always

20. Please estimate the percentage of time you are involved in the following activities related to transition programming for elementary school students:

- Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings
- Instruction and related activities
- Evaluation of instruction and related activities
- Engagement in individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services
- Promotion of active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process
- Collaboration of stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families

21. Please estimate the percentage of time you devote to teaching life skills (e.g., communication, domestic, recreational, social-emotional, transportation, vocational/employment, etc.) to elementary school students.

22. In your opinion, rate the level of importance of school psychologists' involvement in the following areas of transition programming:

Answer choices: not at all important, minimally important, moderately important, extremely important

- Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings
- Instruction and related activities
- Evaluation of instruction and related activities related to postsecondary goals
- Engagement in individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services
- Promotion of active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process
- Collaboration of stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families

23. Please rate how the following factors influence your involvement in transition programming.

Answer options: not a factor, a minimal factor, a moderate factor, an extremely important factor

- Size of caseload
- Current responsibilities
- Knowledge of transition programming
- Instruction provided by pre-services training program related to transition programming
- Professional development received related to transition programming
- Not part of job description
- Current setting

24. Please indicate how your pre-service training program in school psychology provided training related to transition programming. (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

Answer choices: class(es), practicum experience, internship, no training provided, other (please specify)

25. If your pre-service training program in school psychology addressed transition programming, please specify the extent the following areas were addressed:

Answer choices: not addressed, minimally addressed, moderately addressed, thoroughly addressed

- Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings
- Instruction, related activities, and curriculum resources
- Evaluation of instruction and related activities related to postsecondary goals
- Involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and

implementation process

- Collaboration of stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families

26. Based on the education you received during your pre-service training in school psychology, how prepared are you to address transition programming (e.g., assessment, interagency collaboration, transition planning as part of IEP development, implementation of instructional strategies, vocational education/integrated employment/continuing education, interviews/surveys/direct observations/questionnaires/transition-planning inventories, etc.)?

Answer choices: not prepared, minimally prepared, moderately prepared, extremely prepared

27. Please rate your level of satisfaction related to the education you received regarding transition programming during your pre-service training in school psychology.

Answer choices: not satisfied, minimally satisfied, moderately satisfied, extremely satisfied

28. Please use the space below to share any information related to how pre-service training programs in school psychology can improve education provided related to transition programming.

29. After completing graduate school for school psychology, how often in the last three years have you received professional development related to transition programming (e.g., assessment, interagency collaboration, transition planning as part of IEP development, implementation of instructional strategies, work experience, data collection, etc.)?

Answer choices: 0 times, 1-2 times, 3-4 times, 5 or more times

30. If you have received professional development related to transition programming, please specify the extent the following areas were addressed:

Answer choices: not addressed, minimally addressed, moderately addressed, thoroughly addressed

- Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to post school settings
- Instruction, related activities, and curricular resources
- Evaluation of instruction and related activities in relation to postsecondary goals
- Instruction in individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services
- Promotion of active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process

31. Please rate your satisfaction related to the professional development you have received related to transition programming.
Answer choices: not satisfied, minimally satisfied, moderately satisfied, extremely satisfied
32. Please use the space below to share any information regarding how professional development related to transition programming can be improved.
33. Please use the space below to share additional information related to transition programming not covered in the survey.

APPENDIX D

CONTACT 1: INITIAL EMAIL

Dear Fellow School Psychologist,

Research has indicated school psychologists feel they have more to offer than the services they currently provide. Results of minimal research conducted regarding school psychologists' involvement related to transition programming indicate school psychologists recognize and support the importance of transition programming and would like to be more involved in it.

Would you be willing to share your experiences related to transition programming by taking a brief survey? An understanding of the perceived training of school psychologists and their involvement in transition programming will help determine if school psychologists are being utilized to their fullest potential based on their roles, responsibilities, and capabilities.

The survey is short, only 33 items, and should take no more than 20 minutes to complete. You can access the survey through this web address: [link](#). Please complete this survey by _____.

Please note this survey is not meant as an evaluation of your current practice, but rather as a way to collect data about general practices and opinions of school psychologists in five states in the south east. This survey is anonymous and your participation is voluntary; therefore, there is no penalty for not participating. The results of this study will be presented as my dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Special Education at the University of South Carolina.

I will be happy to answer any questions about this study and can be contacted at (724) 747-7586 or by email at hallve@email.sc.edu.

Thank you for your consideration. I greatly appreciate your time and effort to help with this survey.

Sincerely,

Valerie E. Bell, EdS, NCSP
Doctoral Candidate
University of South Carolina

Faculty Advisor: Kathleen J. Marshall, PhD
kathleen@mailbox.sc.edu

APPENDIX E

CONTACT 2: REMINDER 1 EMAIL

Dear Fellow School Psychologist,

An email was recently sent to you requesting your input in a research study regarding school psychologists' training and involvement in transition programming. Thank you if you who have already responded. If you have not already done so, I would greatly appreciate your completion of the survey as soon as possible. Your participation will provide valuable data to school psychologists and other professionals. Please use the link to access the brief survey.

Please email me at hallve@email.sc.edu with any questions.

Thank you!

Valerie E. Bell, EdS, NCSP
Doctoral Candidate
University of South Carolina

link

APPENDIX F

CONTACT 3: REMINDER 2 EMAIL

Dear Fellow School Psychologist,

Two emails were recently sent to you requesting your input in a research study regarding school psychologists' training and involvement in transition programming. I am unable to see who has completed the survey because all responses are recorded anonymously. If you have already responded, thank you very much. I truly appreciate your input and help. If you have not already done so, I would greatly appreciate your completion of the survey as soon as possible. Your participation will provide valuable data to school psychologists and other professionals. Please use the link to access the brief survey.

Please email me at hallve@email.sc.edu with any questions.

Thank you!

Valerie E. Bell, EdS, NCSP
Doctoral Candidate
University of South Carolina

link

APPENDIX G

TABLES TO ACCOMPANY CHAPTER 4

Table G.1 *Demographic Information for Participating School Psychologists*

Attribute	Respondents (n)	Percentage (%)
Currently Employed as a School Psychologist		
Yes	376	90.60
No	39	9.40
Gender Identity		
Male	41	12.0
Female	299	87.68
Gender Variant/Non-conforming	1	0.29
Level of School Psychology Degree		
Specialist	269	79.35
Doctorate	57	16.81
Other	13	3.83
Years Employed as a School Psychologist		
First-year School Psychologist (<1)	12	3.51
1-5 years	59	17.25

6-10 years	68	19.88
11-15 years	62	18.13
16-20 years	49	14.33
21+ years	92	26.90
State Currently Working In		
Florida	28	8.21
Georgia	105	30.79
Kentucky	38	11.14
South Carolina	142	41.64
Virginia	13	3.81
Other	15	4.40
Location of Current Setting		
Urban	39	11.44
Suburban	166	48.68
Rural	121	35.48
Other	15	4.40
Current Setting		
Early Childhood	145	42.40
Elementary	276	80.41
Middle school	201	58.77
High school	173	50.58

Post-secondary	6	1.75
Private practice	21	6.14
Other	26	7.60
Estimate of Current Caseload		
Less than 1,000	98	28.65
Between 1,000 and 1,500	83	24.27
Between 1,501 and 2,000	70	20.47
Greater than 2,000	78	22.81
Other	13	3.80

Table G.2 *Extent Areas Were Addressed by Pre-service Program*

Transition Service Area	Not Addressed	Minimally Addressed	Moderately Addressed	Thoroughly Addressed
Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings	59.57%	29.57%	7.39%	3.48%
Instruction, related activities, and curriculum resources	66.96%	23.91%	7.83%	1.30%
Evaluation of instruction and related activities related to postsecondary goals	66.52%	24.78%	6.96%	1.74%
Involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process	68.56%	22.27%	6.55%	2.62%
Collaboration of stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families	63.91%	24.35%	8.26%	3.48%

Note. n = 230.

Table G.3 *Areas of Involvement in Transition for Elementary School Students*

Area	% (n)				
	0	1-25	26-50	50-75	76-100
Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings	74.50 (197)	19.78 (53)	3.36 (9)	0.00 (0)	2.24 (6)
Instruction and related activities	82.44 (216)	14.50 (38)	0.76 (2)	0.00 (0)	1.15 (3)
Evaluation of instruction and related activities related to postsecondary goals	82.64 (219)	14.34 (38)	0.75 (2)	0.00 (0)	1.13 (3)
Engagement in individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services	82.95 (219)	14.77 (39)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	1.15 (4)
Promotion of active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process	77.35 (205)	20.38 (54)	0.75 (2)	0.00 (0)	1.13 (3)
Collaboration of stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families	77.44 (206)	18.42 (49)	1.88 (5)	0.00 (0)	1.13 (3)

Note. n = 269.

Table G.4 *Areas of Involvement in Transition for Middle/High School Students*

Area

% (n)

	0	1-25	26-50	50-75	76-100
Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings	64.33 (184)	28.97 (84)	3.79 (11)	0.69 (2)	0.34 (1)
Instruction and related activities	81.97 (232)	14.13 (40)	1.41 (4)	0.35 (1)	0.35 (1)
Evaluation of instruction and related activities related to postsecondary goals	77.97 (223)	15.73 (45)	3.45 (10)	0.70 (2)	0.35 (1)
Engagement in individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services	72.37 (207)	24.13 (69)	1.05 (3)	0.70 (2)	0.35 (1)
Promotion of active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process	70.27 (201)	25.52 (73)	2.45 (7)	0.35 (1)	0.00 (0)
Collaboration of stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families	69.39 (197)	24.65 (70)	2.46 (7)	0.70 (2)	0.35 (1)

Note. n = 298

Table G.5 *Importance of Involved in Transition*

	Not at all Important	Minimally Important	Moderately Important	Extremely Important
Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings	3.70%	28.52%	48.52%	19.26%
Instruction and related activities	15.93%	49.26%	25.56%	9.26%
Evaluation of instruction and related activities related to postsecondary goals	10.70%	39.48%	35.79%	14.02%
Engagement in individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services	7.01%	28.04%	43.17%	21.77%
Promotion of active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process	5.54%	29.52%	39.85%	25.09%
Collaboration of stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports and outcomes for students and their families	4.81%	27.78%	42.22%	25.19%

Note. n = 271.

Table G.6 *Factor Influencing Involvement in Transition*

Factor	% (n)			
	Not a Factor	A Minimal Factor	A Moderate Factor	An Extremely Important Factor
Size of caseload	31.20% (83)	9.02% (24)	18.42% (49)	41.35% (110)
Current responsibilities	13.58% (36)	5.66% (15)	24.15% (64)	56.60% (150)
Knowledge of transition programming	19.63% (53)	23.70% (64)	33.33% (90)	23.33% (63)
Instruction provided by pre-services training program related to transition programming	26.12% (70)	23.88% (64)	30.97% (83)	19.03% (51)
Professional development received related to transition programming	19.70% (53)	24.16% (65)	32.34% (87)	23.97% (64)
Not part of job description	17.78% (48)	15.93% (43)	18.89% (51)	47.41% (128)
Current setting	19.70% (53)	12.27% (33)	20.45% (55)	47.58% (128)

Note. n = 270.

Table G.7 *Familiarity with Transition Service Delivery*

Area	% (n)			
	Not Familiar	Minimally Familiar	Moderately Familiar	Extremely Familiar
Transition laws and policies	27.08% (88)	46.46% (151)	22.77% (74)	3.69% (12)
Transition assessments and procedures used to identify students' strengths, preferences, and interests related to postschool settings	19.17% (65)	43.95% (149)	31.27% (106)	5.60% (19)
Transition instruction, related activities, and curricular resources	25.59% (87)	46.47% (158)	24.41% (83)	3.53% (12)
Evaluation of instruction and related activities pertaining to postsecondary goals	34.22% (116)	45.13% (153)	16.22% (55)	4.42% (15)
Individual student advocacy to obtain transition planning services	32.65% (111)	42.94% (146)	21.18% (72)	3.24% (11)
Ways to promote active involvement of families throughout the transition decision-making and implementation process	29.41% (100)	47.65% (162)	20.29% (69)	2.65% (9)
Strategies for collaborating with stakeholders to ensure and increase effective transition services, supports, and outcomes for students and their families	33.24% (113)	45.88% (156)	17.06% (58)	3.82% (13)

Note. n = 341.

Table G.8 *Ratings of Importance Correlated to Pre-service Training*

			Involvement		
Importance	Assessment	Instruction	Evaluation of Instruction	Involvement	Collaboration
Assessment	.236**				
Instruction		.269**			
Evaluation of Instruction			.193**		
Involvement				.309**	
Collaboration					.286**

**Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX H

HOW PRESERVICE TRAINING CAN IMPROVE TRANSITION EDUCATION

Table H.1 *How Preservice Training Can Improve Transition Education*

	n
Not applicable	5
Open-Ended Response	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not sure• We are not directly or specifically involved with transition for students.• Provide some training to introduce the topic.• Transition planning was not a factor in my training 40+ years ago. I feel that it is better left to individuals trained in vocational education as they have a more comprehensive background and training• Provide direct instruction and training• Training programs can start by simply mentioning transition programming.• It can be implemented so that school psychs are made aware. This isn't a component of the school psych role in my state.• Transition Programming can be learned on the job when needed. School Psychologists can apply the same level of standards researched based decision making that they learned in school when they are called upon to help with transition planning.	

- Transition programming was not part of the curriculum of my training program, but it is also not part of my job as a school psychologist. So, I would say I'm satisfied with my training program. It prepared me well for my daily responsibilities as a psychologist.
- I'm not sure this is something school psychologists would have time to do given the size of the testing case load.
- Including it in the instruction.
- I'm different. My doctorate is in both Educational Psychology and Industrial/Organizational Psychology. My internship was with the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Blindness and Low Vision. Which researched employment for individuals who are visually impaired. I also worked extensively with Vocational Rehabilitation. The VOC Rehab counselor for the county and I got along well. The problem is counties see school psychologists as only testers. Where the psychologist is also the special education director (I've been that too.), the perception changes. I recommend you work on making sure psychologists can also be certified as SPED Directors if you want to break the test only barrier.
- By integrating transition planning into at least one course or practicum experience.
- If school psychs need to be involved in transition services, which is not my experience, they need to receive training on skills involved with these services.
- Preservice training programs might improve by teaching more about IEP development related to transition planning, various assessments used for transition planning, and resources available to students who are transitioning to life after high school.

- If I worked at a high school and was included in transition programming, I would seek out resources and knowledge to be helpful. Therefore, I don't think that is a priority in school psych programs.
- It would be helpful to know even some basic transition assessments.
- I think this should be a collaborative effort with other professionals. This might be better suited for social workers, school counselors, and other educators. I'm not sure I feel that this should be a major role for school psychologists.
- There is a strong focus in training programs on evaluating elementary aged children with high incidence disabilities, which stands to reason because this is the bulk of what we do. It would be helpful if high school evaluation was included in the training with some exposure to transition measures and how school psychologists can be involved in that process. I think a barrier to the process is that it often involves coordination between multiple organizations that are different depending on where you are so I think it would be challenging to prepare scenarios. I do think the training programs could focus on developing advocacy skills to ensure that the IEP teams that do have knowledge of the resources available are asking the right questions and addressing the concerns that impact a smooth transition to post-secondary placements.
- Emphasize transition in coursework.
- School Psychologists are not mandated to evaluate High School students for post-secondary planning. It is a courtesy for us to do so. Also, we do not have enough School Psychologists employed to be able to re-evaluate HS students for post-secondary planning. When I have re-evaluated HS students, I have learned of post-

secondary planning to an extent. The Vocational Rehab Specialist and HS Special Ed Teachers are much more knowledgeable as this is in their job description. This school year, I am working at a new school district, so I am not as knowledgeable this year as I have been in the past school systems I have worked. Also, I think if you are a SP who does not serve HS students, you would not necessarily have to learn about post-secondary planning.

- More information on how to assist with transition, especially as it relates to post-secondary activities.
- I work in a private school setting and we do not have students on IEPs.
- Most of my pre-service transitioning knowledge has been obtained through experiences in IEP meetings for high school students. Nearly 30 years ago, there was not an emphasis on this in many training programs.
- I don't see the need for it.
- This is my 30th year. Transition planning was not part of my training at UGA, nor has it ever been a part of my job description in any of the school systems I have worked in around the State of GA.
- In my program we covered some tools that you may use to assess a student's interests. That may guide them a little in seeking a career and such. The actual transition processes were glazed over.
- I came into the field clueless. I wish my Ed.S. program had at least a portion of a class devoted to transition programming.

- My training was 25 years ago. I'm not sure what they do now. I don't know that it was as much a focus before. In my job, currently I am the only psychologist and I struggle to do what is on my job description, and cannot imagine doing transition. We have school personnel that do that.
- Transition was not part of training, nor law at the time. I gained work experience then developed a district-wide transition training manual prior to becoming law to be part of IEPs.
- I think it would help to understand the importance of these programs. It would also provide training on particular assessments to administer that could be used to assist those organizations (such as vocation rehab) that work with these students after high school.
- My pre-service training programs did not provide knowledge on transition programming at all. Therefore, actually discussing the topic would improve the education of school psychologists.
- Shadowing a class field trip to a vocational center or community outing would be helpful as a requirement; additionally, a review of assessments available in the field used to plan transition services
- None of our training is being used and implemented for student improvement academically, mentally, socially, or behaviorally. We are seen as "testers". We have a director supervising special education and school psychologists with no certifications, degrees, or formal training in either area.

- Covering it with depth, rather than in passing. The extent of my transition information came from being told students 8th grade/14 need to be invited to participate in their own meetings. All my current knowledge re: transition comes from working in the
- field and collaborating with one of our incredible educational consultants who helps coordinate transition services for SpEd students across the district.
- Most of my training has been on the job re: transition services. I think a focus on this would be beneficial for grad students. One possible avenue would be requiring a late high school (jr-sr) student as a case study and evaluation.
- It was not included at all in my pre-service training.
- Especially if a program can lead a student to resources specific to the state in which they will be working (in addition to federal requirements), the student should be able to self-educate to an adequate degree. There is no substitute for on-the-job involvement.
- Program can have relevant outside agencies come in to do presentations; overviews of what the state offers for transition planning, placements
- I really feel a basic run down of transition planning during training programs could familiarize you with services provided and help prepare you to be aware of assistance. Also, to give you an idea of what additional trainings you may need/want to attend.
- No pre-service training in clinic setting
- I think this can be addressed in pre-service training programs, but it is also something that we learn on the job. Each state treats this differently, so depending on where you study, where you work, and what setting you end up in, it is something you just have to learn on the job.

- Have it as part of training
- Make it a required part of practicum education
- Additional information and connections to community resources
- A course in transition issues including assessment, advocacy and programming would be helpful. These issues are typically addressed by the SPED teachers.
- Designate a couple of lectures for transition programming
- I completed my program over 30 years ago so it is a little difficult to recall specifically what components of the program addressed this issue. I'm sure I learned most about transition planning from the year-long internship.
- In our rural communities, teams are in place to provide these types of services; therefore, SPs can focus on academic, behavioral and process evaluation and strategies.
- Training programs have to balance the ideal NASP model with the realities of the extreme variability of settings/roles psychologist will ultimately serve in where there are routinely shortages of school psychologists. While translation related functions are extremely important aspects of education and psychologists are uniquely prepared to assist, we are not the only professionals in school systems capable of competently coordinating these services. I believe in an expanded role where psychologists are not relegated to psychoeducational assessment exclusively; however, my personal experiences across 3 states and collaboration with colleagues in 7+ areas where profound shortages persist, transition related consultation doesn't rise to the top of the priority list when so much of what we do cannot be shared with other campus roles.

- I'm satisfied with mine. However, services, supports, and funding vary from state-to-state. That is the issue, not my training.
- It depends on the assignment really as to what level of transition the psychologists are dealing with. Elementary to secondary does not need as extensive training as leaving high school does.
- None
- I believe school psychologists should be more involve in the transition process for high school ESE students into the real world. I also understand, due to time constraints and caseloads, that is not currently possible in many districts.
- Information on how school psychs can support transition programming.
- Other staff members generally perform that function in our district.
- My training in transition planning was based on trainings offered through the VDOE and TTAC long after my pre-service training. The VDOE uses the I'm Determined program which is excellent. In working with current practicum students, I do not feel transition planning is given the importance it should have in preservice training. I feel the training should be addressed by adding transition assessment tools to our regular evaluation skills. High school evaluations should include assessments for transition planning as a standard part of the evaluation battery. These assessments should take place in middle school as well but no later than 9th and 10th grade at the high school level. I would love to see preservice programs include electives to allow students to explore different aspects of school psychology (i.e., transition planning, emergency services, threat assessment, preschool services, collaboration with community partners). All of these areas are outside the typical school psychologist

training programs. I would give transition planning and collaboration with community partners a high priority in training.

- Address it at all. It was never mentioned in my training.
- I believe transition planning needs to be addressed through classes and practicum experience.
- My degree training was in the early 90's so the most important factor for transition training has been to do professional development throughout my career. Things change so much.
- An increased emphasis on measures/tools would be extremely helpful for consultative practitioners.
- Introducing the state laws on transitioning programming and providing opportunities to be involved in the process.
- Add it to the curriculum
- The law is reviewed in ethics classes, the assessments are reviewed in assessment courses but could be expanded, direct delivery is not a part of the Sch Psy role, thus not addressed in training. Advocacy and modeling of transition planning is provided in practica and internship. The state requires ongoing training in instruction for special education teachers as they deliver this support.
- It would greatly improve
- Provide awareness of transition supports such as Voc Rehab, ARC, what med waiver is, as well as other supports.
- No comment

- There was no training when I was in school and currently my caseload is far too high to assist with this.
- It depends on the state. In Florida, the Office of Vocational Rehab handles evaluations related to transition programming.
- Discussion of assessments related to transition planning
- This is relatively new
- We are not considered to be a major part of IEP services and curriculum so training in services and curriculum would help.
- There are career specialists and transition coaches who are trained to do this, so I don't feel that I need to do this. I am prepared to collaborate and be part of a team in making transition decisions. I have the education to learn this area and be competent at it, but don't feel I need to do so.
- This is not emphasized in current training programs, to my knowledge. Training would need to be linked it to a NASP domain of practice and a specific course.
- Honestly, school psychology programs have so much to cover and transition services are often placed to the side for other important things that are more school psychology related. Transition in a lot of places is managed by the special education teacher.
- Course work and practicum opportunities/requirements; perhaps an assigned project that involved transition programming would be helpful.
- If this was part of my graduate studies, it was very minimal; however, I have never seen this as a job responsibility of a School Psychologist in any district or

state I have worked in. For the middle school at my current district, these duties fall under the role of the career counselor and transition coordinator.

- There was no discussion of transition programming in my program; however, this is also something that is not required of school psychs in my current position/district. PD would be useful if this is an area where psychs can help students and families.
- My training was many years ago so I am certain the training has changed over the years.
- I absolutely love my graduate program, but I do not remember being introduced to transition programming information. If we were, and I just can't remember, it was probably minimal as we focused more on elementary students. From what I have learned in internship, you work more with transition information in middle and high school and I have not yet experienced those age groups.
- Perhaps provide information on transition assessment, psych involvement in the process, and ways to advocate for inclusion of psychs in transition services.
- Not sure
- Provide any information
- It would be good to have more background knowledge in this area to be a more integral part of the team.
- There can be more time devoted to individual assessments and the issues surrounding transition but much of the actual work of transition planning is very region dependent and each student will be working in different settings and locations. I learned much more “on the job” that was useful to me and my training program couldn’t have provided me with that.

- There was none - should be included
- Having a knowledge base related to transition programming would be important, especially in middle/high school setting, though our district has a team of folks that take the lead on transition and post-graduate options
- Class in area and/or better integration of transition in all classes
- Psychologists are key stakeholders in a child's future planning. Transition services are for all kids with disabilities and we should be taught what these activities look like and what our role is.
- It would be helpful if the pre-service training include instruction in the policies, procedures and assessments involved in the transition programming.
- I do feel that training programs should focus more on providing training and experience related to assessing for need and providing transition services.
- First, it is important to note that my training took place many, many years ago. I have practiced in 4 states and each assignment has been different. My doctorate was more educationally based so that was helpful in considering transition programming. I also worked at big districts as well as small districts and that has a bearing on services. When you follow a child K-12 it is a natural fit to be part of their services. In a position that has less stability or different responsibilities, the job changes. I am currently a retired part-time employee that focuses on trauma; however, last year working in a very small district with additional responsibilities, I did engage in transition activities. I completed a postdoc in neuropsychology and this too changes what is requested of my time.

- For those working at the secondary, level I can see the benefits of school psychologists being able to provide additional support and recommendations to assist in program planning. However, the current emphasis of psychologists being utilized primarily for evaluation and behavior intervention, the extent of being able to successfully incorporate skills in post-secondary and transition planning would be difficult unless there begins to be a culture shift in how school psychologists are perceived and utilized in the school setting.
- It was not a focus of my program.
- Describe role school psychologist can take to assist with transition programming beginning in elementary school
- I think we need more information on the requirements of the law and what exactly that should look like in schools. I don't think we should necessarily receive training in the actual transition instruction but we definitely need more high school level information such as programs available to all developmental levels of students.
- I think this depends on the extent to which transition is a part of your job description. In my county, it is the special education case manager and transition coordinator that manage the transition process. It would be nice to have been trained on transition programming in order to have a better idea of what is available and be more involved in talking about it through the reevaluation and evaluation process.
- Some training in transition programming would be helpful for exposure.
- Important for educational programming
- When I was assigned a high school one year, I attended a conference held by Transition Alliance - Lots of helpful information! <https://transitionalliancesc.org/>

- None at this time
- Transition was not a focus of my school psychology program. This role lies with the special education teachers.
- Pre-service training was minimal; however, in my current role, transition assessments/programming is primarily the responsibility of the case manager (sped. teacher).
- More attention to this area - most of the focus was on early elementary assessment and intervention and social-emotional health and well-being. Most of my vocational training was during my clinical psych master's program. Without that I would feel even less prepared.
- I work with 4k-5th graders, so I do not deal with transition programming at all. I am always thinking about the big picture for students and pushing IEP teams to make decisions that will set the student up for his/her best chance at a high school diploma and employment.
- Provide training in this area
- Being able to inform both student and parent of kinds of accommodations student may be able to get either in college or even the workplace itself.
- Address it more
- Preparing a child for further independency skills beyond high school graduation. This could also be a huge factor towards increasing a child's attendance rate, if clinically low.
- It would be very helpful to have speakers from other agencies share resources, process for assistance, and honesty of challenges.

- Given all that school psychologists must learn (i.e., assessment, collaboration, consultation, MTSS, etc.), I think transition planning just ended up being low on the list of importance. It is not part of my role as there is a team already assigned to this task.
- Related to other job responsibilities, transition planning is a very small, small part of my job. Other IEP team members (special ed teachers, administrators, program coordinators) spend significantly more time addressing transition planning/instruction than I do. My pre-service program did not include transition planning instruction/courses, but I gained experience during internship. On the job experience is more meaningful than coursework, in my opinion, as I attended a program in a different state than I currently work. My district has detailed transition procedures that we are required to adhere to/follow and those are very likely different from what is relevant in another state.
- It would provide a model for addressing transition in public schools.
- What a school psych's role in the process actually IS would be super helpful!
- I don't think we talked about transition planning in my grad program, but if we did it was minimal and not memorable.
- Through practicum experiences, direct instruction
- I really don't think my program focused on transition programming at all, other than to make us aware that the law exists. It is somewhat surprising to me that transition programming seems so separate from other things that are more integrated (academics, behavior, etc.). But I also have never worked in the middle school/high school setting, so perhaps it is more integrated that I think.

- Minimal training provided related to transition programming
- This will increase post school employability which is incredibly important for all students not just special education students.
- I don't think transition programming even existed when I was in graduate school 30 years ago

Note. n = 128.