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Where Did Secondary School Reform Come From?

- **Before 1995**: (Standards-based reform, school to work reform, comprehensive school reform….)
- **2000**(ish): Bill & Melinda Gates College-Ready for All
- **2002** Partnership for 21st Century Skills (P21)
- **2004**(ish) Response to Intervention/ Multi-Tiered Systems of Support
- **2005**: National Governor’s Association P-16 Cradle to College Systems
- **2006**: National High School Center launched
- **2010**: National Governors’ Association (NGA) & Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) College and Career Readiness Standards (CCSS)
- **2010**: National Assoc. of State Boards of Ed High School Redesign

College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS)

- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and National Governors Association (NGA) Common Core State Standards (CCSS)
- Career Standards
  - SCANS Skills (1990)
  - Are They Ready to Work? (2006)
  - Career Clusters (2002)
  - 21st Century skills
  - P-16 Councils
  - Next Generation Learners (2009)
  - CCSS (2010)
  - Common Career Technical Core(2012)

Post-school Engagement of Young Adults Out of High School up to 8 years

- Employment Only, 48%
- Employment and Postsecondary education, 9%
- Employment and Job Training, 2%
- Not engaged, 35%
- Other, 1%
- Postsecondary education only, 5%

Common Core State Standards

• “The Common Core State Standards provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn, so teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them. The standards are designed to be robust and relevant to the real world, reflecting the knowledge and skills that our young people need for success in college and careers.” [www.corestandards.org](http://www.corestandards.org)

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support

• School-wide multi-level approach for improving student academic and behavioral performance
• A three-tiered model of support
  • Tier 1: research-based interventions provided to students school-wide
  • Tier 2: research-based interventions selected for students not responding in Tier 1
  • Tier 3: students receive specialized and individualized instruction using research-based interventions
• RTI is embedded within MTSS (this is a recent conversation with SWIFT schools about how RTI is distinct for MTSS)

What’s YOUR Definition of a Multi-Tiered Model?

Common Features of Multi-Tiered (Prevention) Models

• Tiered system of matching interventions to meet academic and behavioral needs
• Systematic screening of young children using scientifically acceptable measures
• Interventions are evidence-based & aligned with standards
• Progress monitoring of students to make informed decisions and track progress
• Data-based decision making concerning levels of support (tiers)
• Shared ownership among school staff in assessment and instruction
• Parent engagement
Multi-Tiered Models of School Reform

- Tier 1: Core Instructional Interventions
  - Transition-Focused Systems & Interventions
    - College and Career Readiness

- Tier 2: Targeted Group Intervention
  - Integrated resources
  - Progress monitoring systems
  - Greater levels of intensity
  - Interventions ensure student engagement

- Tier 3: Intensive & Individualized Intervention

Features of Transition-focused MTSS model

- Developmentally different learners
- Student engagement in learning
- Youth literacy
- Demands of curriculum and environment
- Curricular demands
- Structure and culture of schools
- Teacher roles
- High stakes for graduation
- Post-school outcomes for youth

What’s Different about Secondary Schools?
- Curriculum focused on Postsecondary Outcomes
- Instruction promotes Independence & Engagement
- Family Engagement
- Assessment for Student-focused Planning
- Collaboration within school and community
- Broad-based Collaboration with Adult Agencies, Families, Employers, & Community Resources
- Interagency Collaboration
- Support for Individualized Planning

Assessment for Student-focused Planning

- Screening
- Diagnostic
- Progress Monitoring
- Outcomes

Assessment for Student-focused Planning

Tier 1: All Students = Universal

- Early & ongoing assessment for developing career & graduation plans with high expectations for postsecondary education and employment and necessary supports for success
- “Emphasize rigor, relevance & engagement

Focused on student engagement and student-directed planning

Planning for college and career readiness

Examples
- Early Career Assessments
- Student-directed Progress Monitoring
- Personal Plans of Study
- State Assessments + SAT/ACT tests
- College Planning (including documentation needs)
- “Advisories” throughout HS w/ same educator
- Aligning HS to postsecondary education
- Postschool tracking systems for all students – longitudinal
- Early Warning System

Curriculum Focused on Postsecondary Outcomes

Tier 2: Curriculum to Supplement Transition

Supplemental Curriculum for Student Engagement:
- Transition
- Academic
- Behavior

- Dropout Prevention (student-specific: Check &Connect)
- Wilson Reading
- Algebra ½
- Elective Careers course
- Online courses in summer maintain credit hrs.
- Self-determination interventions
- Study skills (learning strategies) course
- WIA Summer Youth Programs

Instruction that Promotes Independence & Engagement
**Tier 3: Intensive & Individualized Instruction**

- Instructional modifications
- Assistive technology for communication
- Generalization of skills to multiple settings
- Small group instruction or 1:1
- Dedicated support from trained personnel
- Customized Interventions

**Family Involvement Supporting Postschool Outcomes**

**Tier 1: Parent involvement in secondary academic & career planning**

- PTA Standards for Family School Partnerships
- The Family Involvement Network of Educators (FINE)
- Communication with parents (newsletters, online grades)
- School events (e.g., job fairs, college fairs) involve parents
- Parents collaborate to develop graduation plans
- Parent advocate models

**Collaboration within the School and Community**

- Broad-based Collaboration with Adult Agencies, Families, Employers, & Community Resources
- Collaboration within school and community targeted for groups
- Inter and intra-agency Collaboration for transition
- Few

Tier 2: Collaboration In School

In-school collaboration among diverse staff providing services

- Screening Teams
- Social Worker/Guidance Counseling
- Community Transition Team Model for At Risk Youth
- Participation of school staff in community organizations
- Community Resource Mapping
- Wrap Workers
- Co-funded staff for At-risk Students (e.g., VR or MH + District $)

What’s Missing for Transition?

A reliable, valid measurement system

- PBIS has student level data (SWIS) and program level (School-wide Evaluation Tool, Team Implementation Tool, Benchmarks of Quality, Implementation Blueprint and Self-Assessment )
- RTI has Screening and Progress Monitoring tools (AIMSweb, DIBELS, mClass, STAR)
- Inclusive Education has SWIFT Fit (Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation, new, being piloted)

Transition-focused MTSS could use current PBIS and RTI assessments and add Early Warning Tools and SWIFT Fit BUT still lacks a simple, cohesive, overall assessment of quality transition services and student progress monitoring tools

What Might We use?

1. Could NSTTAC’s Predictor Self-Assessment work as a secondary transition data system?

NSTTAC Predictors

- Career Awareness
- Occupational Courses
- Paid Employment
- Vocational Education
- Work Study
- Community Experiences
- High School Diploma Status
- Inclusion in General Education
- Program of Study
- Self-Determination Skills
- Self-Care Skills
- Social Skills
- Interagency Collaboration
- Parent Expectations
- Parent Involvement
- Student Support
- Transition Program
**Predictor Implementation School/District Self-Assessment**

The checklist below is intended to guide schools, districts, or other stakeholders in secondary transition with a framework for determining the degree to which their programs are implementing practices which are expected to lead to better outcomes for students with disabilities. The predictor categories listed have been adapted from high-quality correlation research conducted with students with disabilities. See http://www.nsttac.org/PredictorSelfAssessment for more information on the process by which these predictors were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Implementation Scale</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 = Not implemented</td>
<td>1 = No evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Implemented sporadically</td>
<td>2 = Limited evidence (e.g., copies of curricula, copies of training materials, in some cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Implemented by many or all districts</td>
<td>3 = Some evidence (e.g., reference in school or district document, or program delivered and includes students with disabilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Implemented consistently</td>
<td>4 = Consistent evidence of implementation and impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Predictor Category**
- Specific career awareness strategy provided to students with disabilities while in high school
- Specific career awareness strategy was part of program delivery and included students with disabilities

**Possible Examples**
- Students in the School to Work Transition Program who exited school with high job search skills were more likely to be engaged in post-school employment (Benz et al., 1997)
- Students in the School to Work Transition Program who exited school with high career awareness skills were more likely to be engaged in post-school employment or education (Benz et al., 1997)

---

**What Might We use?**

1. Could NSTTAC’s **Predictor Self-Assessment** work as a secondary transition data system?

2. Could the Transition Coalition’s **Quality Indicators of Transition Programs** work here?

---

**Quality Indicators of Transition**

- Transition Planning
- IEP requirements
- Methods of planning
- Transition Assessment
- Methods of assessing & linking to MPG’s as well as SOP
- Family Involvement
- Participation in planning
- Information/training to families
- Supports for families
- Student Involvement
- Decision-making, goal setting skills
- Opportunities for making choices
- Leading transition planning

* Based on Halpern’s early work + Transition Taxonomy + EBP’s and Predictors in latest revision (2013)
Pros/Cons…

- They might be used at the program level
  - Both are designed to be used by states, districts, and/or schools to assess current status of the quality of transition services
  - But both rely on general rating scales (completely achieved, not implemented)
  - Can they become direct (student level) measures? For example, could data be gathered on:
    - Number or percent of students who access predictors/indicators?
    - School self-assessment scores by predictor/indicator?
    - Could both be tracked over time/per year?

How about a Student-level EBP & Predictors Measure?

Using the Predictors might look like this…
Using the Quality Indicators might look like this...

Pulling it all together, Questions to Consider....

1. Is the current implementation of MTSS in secondary schools effective in engaging students and promoting post-school outcomes?
2. What happens if we only focus on academic and behavioral interventions to the exclusion of those that address outcomes (careers, college, independent living)?
3. How do we merge academic and behavioral systems in a transition-focused approach that includes adolescent engagement (student-focused planning, IEPs, ILPs)?
4. How do we develop a system to track all students into post-school outcomes?
5. How do we ensure treatment fidelity with transition practices?

Your Thoughts on What’s Next?

- Screening at student level (all relevant data in one place – EWS, A, B, CCR)
- Screening at program/school level
- Training of secondary staff (all) on transition/sec school reform
- Must be tied to accountability – at school, district level and state level (e.g., PBIS in IN)
- Assessment must target Elen/MS not just HS – targeting academic and behavior readiness for postschool (VA)
- Pay attention to CCS and the assessments to come – how it integrate “transition” into core content (e.g., literacy + career w/ technology - Envision it, OH)
- How do you “roll up” (and roll down) data (student to teacher to school to district) that is easy to collect and functional to interpret and shared across stakeholders (Chicago + VA)
- Creation of Data Teams – progress monitoring (e.g., data walls) every Weds. All in district look at data + identify interventions for all students in building (SC)
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