Secondary Transition Fidelity Assessment: Assessing Fidelity of Implementation in Transition

Kyle Reardon, Marcus Poppen, Deanne Unruh, Dawn Rowe & Mary Morningstar

Presented at the 2019 Oregon Statewide Transition Conference

March 7, 2019

Eugene, OR
Agenda

• Need for a tool to evaluate secondary programs

• Guidance for using the STFA to evaluate fidelity of secondary programs

• Information related to results from pre-field testing the fidelity assessment (we are getting there)

• Next steps!
Implementation Fidelity in Secondary Transition

• Necessary component to ensure effective implementation of research-based secondary programs and practices within multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS)

• Important to understand research-based features and elements that should be prioritized as part of implementing programs and practices (Harn, Parisi, & Stoolmiller, 2013)

• Researchers in secondary transition have emphasized the importance of assessing implementation fidelity when delivering secondary transition EBP (e.g., Mazzotti, Rowe, Cameto, Test, & Morningstar, 2013)
Why do we even need this?

• Multi-tiered systems of support have come to high schools

• College and career ready skills should be for *all*

• Meant as a Tier 1 intervention

• *It’s about time...*
Purpose

To provide high school leadership teams, including, but not limited to teachers, guidance counselors, families, students, and administrators, with a self-assessment measure to examine their school’s use of secondary programs and practices demonstrated by research to lead to meaningful college and career outcomes for all students, including students at-risk for, or with disabilities, and students from diverse backgrounds.
Overall Process

Step 1: Identifying Team Members

Step 2: Establishing a Location and Meeting Time

Step 3: Preparing for the Meeting

Step 4: Convening the Meeting
Recommended Participants

• Administrators
  o District Secondary Program Coordinator
  o School Principal
  o Assistant Principal

• Special Education
  o District Director of Special Education
  o School Special Education Coordinator/Department Chair
  o Special Education Teacher(s)
  o Transition Specialist/Coordinator/Facilitator

• Secondary General Education
  o Curriculum and Instruction Program Coordinator
  o Career and Technical Education Program Coordinator/Teacher
  o General Education Teacher(s)

• Student Services
  o School Counselor/Psychologist
  o School Career and Guidance Counselor
  o School Social Worker

• Other
  o Student(s)
  o Parent(s)
  o Community Partners (business owners, institutions of higher education)
  o Coordinating Agencies (e.g., developmental disability services, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, department of human services, etc.)
Development Process

• DCDT Research Committee Sub-Committee convened in June (2016)
• Gained input from experts as we began the development process (i.e., PBIS Center, SWIFT Center)
• Face-to-Face meeting at DCDT 2016 – identified Critical Features, divided into groups....and we were off to the races 😊
• CEC (2017, 2018) & DCDT (2017, 2018) – gained input from the field (focus groups)
• Focus groups to gain input beyond SPED
  • NE PBIS Conference (May, 2018) – Elementary SPED, Gen ED
  • Arkansas (June, 2018) - School Counselors
  • The Learning Center Alternative High School (Kentucky, May, 2018) – Gen ED, SPED, Administrators
Structure

• Guided by **6 Critical Features:**
  1. Adolescent Engagement and Development
  2. Professional Capacity
  3. Family Engagement
  4. Community Engagement
  5. School Level Capacity
  6. District Level Capacity

• All items referenced to the literature

• Developed instructions, a scoring rubric, and an action planning support
Critical Feature: Adolescent Engagement and Development

- **Working Definition:** The collaboration between K-12 institutions and community stakeholders (e.g., employers, adult service providers, other community agencies) for the purpose of improving in-school and post-school outcomes for students.

- **Sample item:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Item Score</th>
<th>Possible Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5 Explore a broad range of postsecondary adult living options (e.g., visiting apartments, buying vs. renting, understanding legal contracts, paying bills)</td>
<td>0%–33% of students explore a broad range of postsecondary education options related to adult living</td>
<td>34%–66% of students explore a broad range of postsecondary education options related to adult living</td>
<td>67%–100% of students explore a broad range of postsecondary education options related to adult living</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>□ Results from adult living assessments □ Documentation of adult living activities and skills □ Other sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Feature: Adolescent Engagement and Development

1. Element: Educational Planning
   • 10 components

2. Element: College and Career Ready Skills
   • 14 Components
Critical Feature: Professional Capacity

- **Working Definition:** Professional development systems in place to ensure all secondary personnel have the capacity to effectively implement research-based secondary policies, programs, and practices to ensure all students are college, career, and community ready.

- **Sample item:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Item Score</th>
<th>Possible Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-level and district-level data are used quarterly/annually to identify gaps and areas of PD/TA need related secondary policies, programs, and practices</td>
<td>Data are analyzed but not used</td>
<td>Data analyzed and used at least annually to identify gaps and areas of PD/TA need related secondary policies, programs, and practices</td>
<td>Data are analyzed and used quarterly/annually to identify gaps and areas of PD/TA need related secondary policies, programs, and practices</td>
<td>/2</td>
<td>Dropout data, Graduation data, Post-school outcomes data (e.g., Indicator 14, SLDS)</td>
<td>Other sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Feature: Professional Capacity

1. Element: Capacity to provide quality technical assistance and professional development
   • Nine components

2. Element: Data-Driven Professional Development
   • Three components

3. Element: Quality Staff
   • Three components
Critical Feature: Family Engagement

- **Working Definition:** Interactive and persistent parent behaviors committed to supporting students’ learning and development and supportive of collaborative school efforts, including parental roles as agents and advocates on behalf of their children, capable of resisting barriers, imbalances, and exclusionary actions towards students and families from non-dominant communities.

- **Sample item:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Item Score</th>
<th>Possible Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop the transition knowledge and skills of stakeholders (e.g., school faculty, staff, related service providers) to engage with families.</td>
<td>No professional development (PD) planned for or provided to school staff on engaging with families in preparing youth for college and career readiness</td>
<td>PD on engaging with families in preparing youth for college and career readiness has been planned or has been provided to some school staff</td>
<td>PD on engaging with families in preparing youth for college and career readiness content has been provided to all school staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Agendas from PD □ PD completion certificates □ Pre/Post assessments of knowledge and skill □ Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Feature: Family Engagement

1. Element: Knowledge and Capacity of School Staff
   • Four components

2. Element: Support to Families
   • Seven components
Critical Feature: Community Engagement

- **Working Definition:** The collaboration between K-12 institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

- **Sample item:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Item Score</th>
<th>Possible Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools and community stakeholders, including parents and students, have a shared vision and common goals.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and community stakeholder s have not developed a shared vision or common goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and community stakeholders have developed a shared vision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Written vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and community stakeholders have developed a shared vision and established common goals.</td>
<td>/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Established goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Family and Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Self-Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Feature: Community Engagement

1. Element: School-Community Relationships
   • Five components

2. Element: School-Community Communication
   • Three components
Critical Feature: School Level Capacity

• **Working Definition:** The supports in place within a school that promote and enhance student-centered experiences and preparation for the transition to adult life for all students, which can include tiered systems of support in academics, behavior, and college and career readiness.

• **Sample item:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Item Score</th>
<th>Possible Data Source(s)/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school leadership supports inclusive, safe and positive schools.</td>
<td>(0) 0% to 33% of the leadership supports inclusive, safe, and positive schools</td>
<td>(1) 34% to 66% of the leadership supports inclusive, safe, and positive schools</td>
<td>(2) 67% to 100% of the leadership supports inclusive, safe, and positive schools</td>
<td>/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Feature: School-Level Capacity

1. Element: Leadership and collaboration among school systems
   • Six components
2. Element: Inclusive and Ambitious Instruction
   • 17 components
Critical Feature: District Level Capacity

• **Working Definition:** The underlying *district* infrastructure and policies needed to support schools in the quality coordination, implementation and sustainability of evidence-based transition programs and services that support post-school outcomes for all students.

• **Sample item:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Item Score</th>
<th>Possible Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District has established partnerships with institutions of higher education (i.e., four year colleges, community colleges, vocational schools, technical schools).</td>
<td>(0) District has not established partnerships with institutions of higher education, or has established partnerships with fewer than 25% of the total number of local institutions.</td>
<td>(1) District has established partnerships with between 25-74% of the total number of local institutes of higher education.</td>
<td>(2) District has established partnerships with 75% or more of the total number of local institutes of higher education.</td>
<td>/2</td>
<td>MOUs with postsecondary institutions</td>
<td>Dual-enrollment programs with postsecondary institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Feature: District-Level Capacity

1. Element: Knowledgeable and Engaged Educational Leadership
   • Three components

2. Element: Collaboration and Community Engagement
   • Three components

3. Element: Evaluation/Data-based Decision Making
   • Three components

4. Element: Inclusive Policy and Practices
   • One component
Practice Scoring Exercise

• Break into teams to practice scoring sample items from each rubric:
  1. Adolescent Engagement and Development
  2. Professional Capacity
  3. Family Engagement
  4. Community Engagement
  5. School Level Capacity
  6. District Level Capacity

• Think about what information you may need to score each item
• Group discussion/debrief
Phase 1: Field Testing Structure
(Fall 2016-Fall 2018)

• Setting: Midwestern High School

• Format:
  • 1 Group Meeting
  • 1 Individual Meeting

• Time: 1 Hour 30 Mins

• Participants completed the measure and provided qualitative feedback

• Participants:
  1. School Psychologist
  2. Special Education Teacher (Resource)
  3. School Counselor
  4. General Education Teacher
  5. Assistant Principal
  6. Transition Coordinator
Pre-Phase 1 STFA Results

### Summary of Critical Feature Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Feature</th>
<th>Observed score</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Score</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adolescent Engagement and Development</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Capacity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Engagement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community Engagement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. School Level Capacity</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. District Level Capacity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-Phase 1 Qualitative Information

• Participants provided feedback on:
  • Critical Features
    • Definitions
    • Missing Features / Repetitive Features
  • Wording of the Measure's Items
  • Response Options
  • Potential Data Sources
  • Name of the Measure
  • Potential Participants
Phase 2: Individual Item Analysis

- **Phase 2** (Spring 2019 – Fall 2019)
  - IRB approval
  - Funding
  - Quantitative Field Testing: Individual item analysis
  - Data Collection & Analysis
  - Final Revisions

- Phase (TBD)
  - Process field testing with school teams
Phase 2: Individual Item Analysis

• Recruit approximately 1500 participants in order to reach our desired minimal response of **900 participants** ages 18 and older to participate in the survey

• Administrators, special education personnel, secondary general education personnel, student services personnel, as well as other stakeholders the school deems necessary (parents, students ages 18 or older, community partners, coordinating agencies, etc.)

• Recruitment:
  • Emails to school leaders
  • Posts to social media (Twitter, etc.) with link to survey and informed consent
  • Listserv recruitment
Next Steps

• What will your involvement in Phase 2 be?
  
  • Take online survey (approx. 45 min)
  
  • Enter for a chance to win one of 25 prizes, including:
    • DCDT 2019 registration in Seattle, WA
    • An iPad
    • Apple Watch
    • Amazon Gift Cards
Next Steps

• Ticket-Out-the-Door

• Before you leave, please be sure to add your information to the sign-up sheet if you are willing to field-test the STFA and/or allow us to follow-up with you

• Thank you!!!
Contact

Kyle Reardon – kreardon@uoregon.edu
Marcus Poppen – marcus.poppen@wsu.edu
Mary Morningstar – mem28@pdx.edu
Deanne Unruh – dkunruh@uoregon.edu
Dawn Rowe – drowe3@uoregon.edu