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ABSTRACT

A “transition gap” is present when comparing the post-school outcomes for students with disabilities and their developmentally typical peers. However, federal legislation such as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandates equal opportunity for students with disabilities in the pursuit of school and post-school outcomes. Students with disabilities are provided Individual Education Plans (IEP) which document mandated services, individualized goals, accommodations, and assessment addendums. By the age of 16, qualifying students must receive an Individual Transition Plan (ITP) which contains a statement of necessary transition services and measurable transition goals. Adapted Physical Education (APE) teachers are responsible for the development of recreation/leisure goals and the monitoring of students’ gross motor skill goals for students who have APE services in their IEP.

Unfortunately, APE teachers have expressed a lack of knowledge and participation when it comes to the ITP process which raises concerns for students’ post-school outcomes. Given the concern expressed by current literature and APE teachers regarding the lack of knowledge and/or participation in the ITP process, this Master’s Project produced a white paper reporting the state of affairs in LAUSD. The white paper (i) evaluates LAUSD APE teacher involvement in the ITP process, (ii) identifies barriers that impede their inclusion in the ITP process, (iv) identifies opportunities that may promote their inclusion in the ITP process, and (vi) provides recommendations to APE teachers and administrators that optimize APE teacher involvement in the ITP process.

A 32-question survey was distributed to all APE teachers in LAUSD with an email accessible via LAUSD school websites (n=23). A response rate of 83% (n=19) was
achieved. Nineteen barriers were reported by respondents. These barriers have been
categorized as follows: Stakeholder Engagement, Budgetary Constraints, Teacher
Readiness, and Resource Scarcity. Ten opportunities were reported by respondents.
These opportunities were categorized as follows: Stakeholder Engagement, Teacher
Readiness, and Resource Availability. Grounded in research and the data presented in the
white paper, 12 actionable recommendations to mitigate the 19 reported barriers and
promote the 10 opportunities for APE teacher involvement in the ITP process are offered.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Adolescence (ages 10-19) is a period of significant change for both students with and without disabilities and with it comes unprecedented challenges (World Health Organization, 2023). Toward the end of adolescence, many students begin a transition to post-school life, which can include post-school employment, further education, or independent living. For students with disabilities, federal law requires that transitional planning services are provided by the school district to ensure the students’ “continue to receive the support needed, from the appropriate public and private agency/agencies” to “find or maintain the most independent level or employment possible” (Special Education Rights and Responsibilities [SERR], 2020, 10.1). Detailed in a student’s Individualized Education Program (IEP), these transitional planning services are informally known as an ‘individualized transition plan’ (ITP) (SERR, 2020, 10.4).

The transition services detailed in the ITP section are the coordinated set of activities designed to improve “the academic and functional achievement of the child with a disability” and to “facilitate the child’s movement from school to post-school activities” (IDEA, 2004, 34 U.S.C. § 1401). The ITP and the transition services it embodies are intended to serve as a bridge to support students in a successful transition out of high school into a post-school setting. The coordination of the transition process and the development of the ITP is the responsibility of a student’s IEP team who meets on an annual basis.

According to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004, 320 U.S.C. § 300), the IEP documents a student’s goals, objectives, test measurements, and
present levels of performance. The ITP is built into each student’s pre-existing IEP once they turn sixteen and remains in effect until they first graduate high school or reach the age of twenty-two (U.S. Department of Education, 2020; SERR, 2020). A core focus of the ITP section is the students’ movement towards post-graduation activities and/or post-secondary education or employment and it facilitates a calculated transition to life after high school (IDEA, 2004, 43 U.S.C. § 300). In the first IEP following a student’s sixteenth birthday, the IEP team must establish transition goals. The goals developed in the ITP focus on training, education, employment, and independent living skills, when deemed necessary by the IEP team (Feldman & Ramandi, 2011). The specific goals of the transition process depend on the student because each process should be molded to the student’s individual needs and interests (SERR, 2020)

However, even with the coordinated effort of the IEP team, students with disabilities do not experience similar success in their post-school transition as their developmentally typical peers. For example, reported unemployment rates of students with disabilities exceed 70%, which was more than double the unemployment rate of graduates from the general population (Figueroa, 2019). While the ‘gap’ in successful transition outcomes between students with and without disabilities, can be explained in part by wider societal ableist ideologies and discriminatory practices in the workplace (Snyder et al., 2009), it does raise a concern about the efficacy of the ITP and leads one to question whether there is a disconnect between the intended workings of the system and the actual practices of the ITP?

In light of this concern, this project was interested in the examination of the experiences of one specific member of the IEP Team, Adapted Physical Education (APE)
teachers, within the ITP development process. It sought to evaluate the quality of the APE teacher experiences in this process. Typically, IEP teams consist of the several service providers, including but not limited to, physical therapists, occupational therapists, classroom teachers, speech therapists, APE teachers, parent(s), special education teachers and, whenever appropriate, the child with a disability (IDEA, 2004, 321 U.S.C. § 300). Unfortunately, some APE teachers are unaware of their responsibilities in the ITP process and play a passive role in the coordinated effort that form the transition process (Krueger et al., 2000). While research attention has been given to the barriers that prevented students with disabilities from participating in the transition process, limited research has explored the experiences of APE teachers within this process (Krueger et al., 2000).

Of the few studies conducted in this area, the findings revealed worrisome trends. For example, in Wisconsin, 122 APE teachers participated in a study that examined their experiences in ITP development (Krueger et al., 2000). 64% of the participants (n=78) reported never being invited to take part in transition planning for their students, 41% (n=50) were not aware of what the APE teacher’s role in the ITP process was and 12% (n=15) indicated that they did not know what an ITP was (Krueger et al., 2000). In a similar study, Williams (2012) reported that 43% (n=55) of the surveyed APE teachers did not report including APE transition goals in their student’s ITP. According to Williams, one of the most influential barriers to APE transition programs was the lack of fiscal resources available to APE teachers. With minimal or non-existential resources being provided to APE teachers, production and delivery of transition services can be compromised. A result of this compromise can be low quality transition services. In
California, the majority of participants involved in a research study examining parental perceptions of the transition services provided by their student’s APE teachers, reported feeling unsatisfied with the minimal, or non-existent transition services being offered (Relf, 2014).

In addition to examining the quality of APE teacher involvement, this project also sought to identify potential barriers to APE involvement and explored possible best practices that facilitated APE teacher involvement. It built upon the research completed by Krueger et al (2000) and Williams (2012), and examined the experiences of APE teachers within a single school district in California.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this project was to explore APE teachers’ experiences in the development of ITPs and it examined the known and unknown barriers and opportunities that inhibited or promoted the active involvement of APE teachers in the transition process. While existing research has explored the experiences of APE teachers in the ITP process in Wisconsin and Texas (Dorow, 2010; Williams, 2012), no studies have examined this phenomenon in California. Thus, a need to conduct further research in this area was necessary. Better understanding Californian APE teachers’ experiences of the ITP process provided some explanation for the difficulties they experienced throughout the ITP process and provided a foundation for the development of best practices to promote APE teacher engagement.

This project was guided by three questions.

1. Are Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) APE teachers active participants in their students’ ITP processes?
2. What barriers are inhibiting LAUSD APE teachers’ active involvement in the ITP process?

3. What opportunities exist to promote LAUSD APE teachers’ active involvement in the ITP process?

Consequently, the purpose of this project was three-fold. Firstly, through the use of survey data it intended to evaluate LAUSD APE teachers’ involvement in the ITP process. Secondly, through use of surveys and interviews, it intended to reveal the barriers that inhibited active APE teachers’ involvement in the ITP process. Thirdly, drawing on the APE teachers’ interviews, it planned to identify opportunities for successful or effective APE teacher involvement in the ITP process and shared best practices with key stakeholders (e.g. LAUSD Administrators).

Project Outcome

This project produced a white paper that identified barriers and opportunities for increased APE teacher involvement in the ITP process. The white paper also provided specific recommendations to promote more active APE teacher involvement. These recommendations are to be shared with the LAUSD APE community (including but not limited to APE teachers, LAUSD administrators and APE teacher educators). The results of this project will be presented to the follow audiences:

i) LAUSD Administrators

ii) LAUSD APE Teachers

iii) CAHPERD conference attendees

iv) NAPEC conference attendees
Significance of Project

This project’s significance lies in its ability to assist APE teachers in becoming active participants in their students’ transition process and subsequently, the production of more adequate ITP goals, documentation and services. The aim of this project was to not only to identify the barriers that inhibited APE teacher involvement in the transition process but to also highlight and share the opportunities that promoted APE teachers’ success in the process.

The absence of the APE teacher in the ITP process can compromise the quality of transition goals specific to recreational/leisure activities. According to the California APE Guidelines, APE transition goals should include areas like lifelong fitness, and physical fitness skills needed for daily living activities and community participation (CDESED, 2012). Since APE teachers assist their students in developing their skills and knowledge necessary to participate in recreational activities, should the APE teacher be absent from the ITP process it is likely that these goals will be overlooked (Krueger et al., 2000). While IDEA does not specify who has to make the goals, it would be illogical to create recreational/leisure goals in an ITP without consultation from an APE teacher. After all, APE teachers monitor, record, assess, and develop motor goals for students with disabilities for the entirety of their APE services under IDEA.

According to Webbert and colleagues, the roles of an APE Teacher are to create achievement-based programs, provide a high-quality education, and to model leadership and advocacy for students (Webbert et al., 2020). Without an active presence in the ITP process, an APE teacher can’t fulfill their role as a member of the ITP team and it is
likely that no/limited attention will be paid to health-related goals and activities. The absence of such goals may have long-term health implications for these students. For example, a US-based study examined the health profiles of six hundred sixty-two students with disabilities from 49 states and revealed that obesity rates in students with disabilities (17.5%) was higher than that of students without disabilities (13%) (Rimmer et al., 2004). Without transition goals pertaining to their physical activity like recreation and leisure goals, student’s health risk factors like obesity can carry onto a student’s life after high school.

Project Limitations

As with all research related activities, this project contained inherent limitations. Below are the identified limitations that were present in this project:

1. The use of a purposive non-probability sampling technique inhibited the ability to generalize my findings to all APE teachers in LAUSD since the sample was not a representation of the population. This means that any recommendations by this project were grounded in the experiences in the non-representative sample of the population.

2. Since snowball sampling was utilized, this form of participant recruitment could have generated homogenous samples because of the social network used to create the sample (Gratton & Jones, 2011). Homogenous samples create a limitation due to their lack of representation of a population.

3. Due to limited resources (e.g. time and money) a small sample size (n=19) was obtained. Meaning, that any recommendations by this project are grounded in the experiences in the small sample of the population.
4. The survey instrument deployed in this project was not validated and therefore questions surrounding the internal validity of the survey items cannot be answered.

5. Only two interviews with participants were conducted. This restricted the depth of information provided. Consequently, the interview data was removed from the white paper analysis.

**Summary**

The challenges presented in, and after high school, are certainly daunting. None more so, than those present to students with disabilities as they begin to learn to navigate life without the structure of school. These difficulties can be mitigated with the assistance of a collaborative IEP team, who work towards ensuring a student’s future after high school through the ITP. The purpose of this project is to identify the barriers APE teachers face and the opportunities presented in the ITP process. Through the examination of the experiences of the APE teacher, future development of best practices can be implemented within ITP planning.

This project intends to explore three questions:

1. Are LAUSD APE teachers active participants in their students’ ITP processes?
2. What barriers are inhibiting LAUSD APE teachers’ active involvement in the ITP process?
3. What opportunities exist to promote LAUSD APE teachers’ active involvement in the ITP process?

In so doing, it evaluated LAUSD APE teachers’ involvement in the ITP process, explored the barriers inhibiting active APE teacher involvement in the ITP process and highlighted
opportunities to promoted their active involvement in the ITP process. Grounded in the APE and teachers’ experiences, the project provided a set of practical recommendations for best practices to key stakeholders in the ITP process.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>Adapted Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAHPERD</td>
<td>California Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDESED</td>
<td>California Department of Education Special Education Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individualized Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP</td>
<td>Individualized Transition Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD</td>
<td>Los Angeles County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACOE</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Office of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPEC</td>
<td>National Adapted Physical Education Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERR</td>
<td>Special Education Rights and Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

This chapter will begin by introducing readers to the federal and state laws pertinent to the transition process, most notably, IDEA (sections 300.39, 300.43 and 300.320) and the APE Guidelines in California Schools (key provisions 5.1 and 8.1). The IEP program will be explored with a specific focus on its role in the transition process. The contents of transition services and the eligibility criteria that students with disabilities need to meet in order to receive these services will then be summarized. Next, it will explore the literature surrounding the efficacy of transition services, the role an APE teacher in the transition process, and California APE teachers’ experiences in the transition process. The chapter will then end by looking at the experiences of special education teachers regarding the barriers they face and the suggestions they and other stakeholders provide in order to overcome those barriers. The purpose of this literature review is to reinforce the importance of this project and examine published literature related to APE teachers, special education teachers and the transition process.

Federal and State Regulations

Federal

IDEA represents the legal framework that supports the distribution of education and related services for applicable students with disabilities in the USA. Established in 1975, IDEA is significant because it reinforces free appropriate public education to students with disabilities and provides special education and related services to those children as well (IDEA, 2004, 101 U.S.C. § 300). According to IDEA special education is “specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a
child with a disability” (IDEA, 2004, 39 U.S.C. § 300), which includes instruction in physical education. IDEA defines PE as a development of motor skills, motor patterns, and skills in aquatics, recreational dance, and group and individual games. APE along with “special physical education, movement education, and motor development” (IDEA, 2004, 39 U.S.C. § 300) are also considered physical education. IDEA does not provide a direct definition for APE and is instead defined as special education under IDEA.

In regards to transition services, IDEA (2004, 320 U.S.C. § 300) determines that transition services must begin no later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child turns 16. Additionally, in IDEA (2004, 43 U.S.C. § 300) describes transition services as a coordinated set of activities that facilitate a child’s movement from school to post-school activities, and includes the importance of taking into account a students’ needs, strengths, preferences and interests. While IDEA provides a basic level of provision as mandated at a federal level, individual states have developed more specific regulations regarding transition services and APE services for students with disabilities. In the case of California, these state regulations extend the IDEA mandates and provide more detailed guidelines for the provision of APE-related services.

State

The APE Guidelines in California Schools extend and build on the laws and statutes put forth by IDEA. The APE Guidelines in California Schools provide more information in regards to APE, and transition services in its key provisions. These guidelines exist in order to “identify program guidelines that clarify adapted physical education services” (California Department of Education Special Education Division [CDESED], 2012, p. 5). As a result, the APE Guidelines in California Schools include
that APE is a physical education service delivery option that must be provided by a
credentialed APE teacher to students whose needs are not met through other physical
education programs (CDESED, 2012). In addition, key provision 5.1 of the guidelines
describe the wide array of knowledge that is expected of APE teachers like: “training in
anatomy, physiology, exercise physiology, human development, kinesiology, motor
control theory, motor development, cognitive development, learning theory, sport,
physical activity dance, behavior management, and have studied the etiology of
disabilities and their effects upon movement” (CDESED, 2012, page 54).

In regards to transition services, California APE guidelines build on the definition
provided by IDEA. Both include the necessity of the services being present no later than
the first IEP to be in effect when the student turns 16, but key provision 8.1 of the
California APE Guidelines include that the goals for physical education in transition
services “fall primarily within the areas of functional motor skills, lifelong activities and
physical fitness skills necessary to support vocational, health or daily living activities and
community participation” (CDESED, 2012, p. 72). The same key provision (8.1)
mentions that the service delivery models of APE for students with moderate to severe
disabilities (ages sixteen to twenty-one) are “lifelong activities and fitness activities that
are often conducted off campus” (CDESED, 2012, p. 73) which are transition services
under APE. These transition services are included in the student’s IEP and once included
are updated annually through the IEP team.
Individualized Education Program

According to IDEA the IEP is an annually reviewed document that is written for a students’ with disabilities that must include a students’ present level of performance, measurable annual goals, a description of how those goals will be measured, a declaration of a student’s special education and related services, a description of the extent to which the student cannot participate in the regular classroom, a statement of any accommodations necessary for the students to be assessed, and the beginning date of services and accommodations (IDEA, 2004, 324 U.S.C. § 300). Together all of these components make up the necessary document known as the IEP. In addition to the IEP, students are entitled to transition services that are created to meet the student’s learning needs and help them in preparing for further education, employment, and/or independent living, which are included in their IEP (IDEA, 2004, 43 U.S.C. § 300). This is one of many sections of the IEP and is informally known as the ITP. This section is designed to record and facilitate the services provided to students with disabilities in order to prepare them for this transition (IDEA, 2004, 43 U.S.C. § 300).

By a student’s 14th birthday their IEP may contain their need for instruction that will prepare them for transition (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). Furthermore, beginning at age 16 the IEP must include a statement of needed transition services. (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). The reasoning behind this law is to ensure all students with disabilities are successful in life after high school through preparation for further education, employment, and/or independent living. The IEP can be seen as a road map that contains benchmarks, goals, and objectives for students under IDEA.
In regards to the selection of transition services, IDEA requires that transition services be based on a student’s “needs, taking into account the child’s strengths, preferences, and interests” (IDEA, 2004, 43 U.S.C. § 300). In order to meet this requirement, the IEP team will create measurable transition goals that are based on assessments relating to education, training, employment, and, if necessary, independent living skills. The review and updating of the transition goals are done on an annual basis simultaneously with the IEP, and will take place in every IEP meeting succeeding the student’s sixteenth birthday.

*Individualized Transition Plan Process*

The team in charge of transition services will consist of the members of the IEP team and representatives of any agency that is going to provide transition services to the student. When establishing transition goals, the team should consider the student’s needs. Fortunately, transition assessments can provide guidance for the IEP team in developing transition goals that reflect a student’s needs and interests. The IEP team can then use the information derived from the transition assessments in order to develop “measurable postsecondary goals” for students (Szidon et al, 2014, p. 148). Transition goals will follow the same format as IEP goals meaning that they will include: who, what activity they will do, by when, under what conditions, indicated by what criteria, and how their progress will be measured. An example of a measurable transition goal that can be included in an IEP would be, “Given instruction in bus riding, Tonya will complete the steps necessary for her to arrive at five identified community destinations with 100% accuracy across five consecutive opportunities (in order to prepare her to independently
ride community transportation after she graduates high school)” (Szidon et al, 2014, p. 149).

Since transition services are embedded into the IEP, the planning and development of the services is part of the IEP process, and will typically take place during annual IEP meetings. However, the SERR state that it may be more beneficial for the student to discuss the ITP separately because it allows more time to focus on the student’s needs and interests (SERR, 2020).

**Effectiveness of ITPs**

ITP’s provide a foundation for quality post-secondary goals and may increase the success rate of high school graduates in employment, further education, and recreational activities. However, even with transition services being mandated through IDEA a recent investigation showed that ITP’s were not meeting the requirements put forth by IDEA (Greene, 2017). Examples of this in Greene’s study are the lack of quality that teachers demonstrated when presenting their transition assessment results and unfamiliarity teachers had with conducting transition assessments. (Greene, 2017)

More specifically, there is currently limited research that has examined the effectiveness of ITPs in achieving student’s APE goals. However, three notable studies suggest possible deficiencies with the current ITP process in relation to the presence of recreation/leisure goals (Steele et al., 2005), active student involvement in the ITP process (Dorow, 2010) and the quality of transition services (Relf, 2014).

A study conducted in central Texas evaluated the transition components of 28 high school graduates with disabilities, compared the projected-actual outcomes and, examined the students’ satisfaction with those outcomes (Steele et al., 2005). Out of
twenty-eight students only one reported having goals that focused on the component of recreation/leisure, none reported any goals relating to adult education in their ITP, and none demonstrated an exact match between their projected leisure goal and their reported leisure performance. Steele et al. (2005) findings suggest that recreation/leisure goals may often be completely overlooked in the ITP process and that failing to consider a student’s interests can manifest as a disparity between projected and reported outcomes.

Similarly, Dorow (2010) identified a disparity between the documented transition needs and what students’ felt was needed in their transition plan. Dorow’s study examined the ITPs of fifteen community college students from Central Texas. IDEA (2004, 43 U.S.C. § 300) mentions that students’ needs and interests must be taken into consideration when developing the goals for the ITP and that the recipient student must be invited to every IEP meeting. It is disappointing to discover that only forty percent (n=6) of Dorow’s participants played an active role in their ITP meetings (Dorow, 2010).

Relf (2014) gathered data from forty-four parents of youth with ASD using a questionnaire that assessed their child’s preparedness for adult life after leaving high school. The findings indicated that California Parents reported receiving no transition services or supports, being unsatisfied with their current transition services, and an absence of post-secondary transition communication during the students last IEP meeting (Relf, 2014). The collective findings of Steele et al (2005), Dorow (2010) and Relf (2014) raise the question as to whether or not teachers are fulfilling their due diligence in regards to transition services. However, in order to determine the accuracy of APE teachers’ service delivery it is necessary to first understand their roles and responsibilities in the transition process.
Role and Responsibilities of The APE Teacher in the Transition Process

In the transition guide created by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services and the United States Department of Education transition services require a “coordinated set of activities for a student with a disability within an outcome-oriented process” (CDESED, 2017, p. 62). In California, the IEP team oversees this coordination process and, if APE is the service delivery option for physical education, the APE teacher will be a member of IEP team (CDESED, 2012). As members of the IEP team, APE teachers have two roles/responsibilities in the transition process.

First, the role of the APE teacher in the transition process according to the transition guide is to “facilitate the individual’s use of community recreation and fitness resources” (CDESED, 2012, p. 73). Achieving this means that an APE teacher might conduct classes in the community rather than in the school in order to expose the student to community resources. As mentioned in the previous section, this is where a lot of APE teachers struggle because their transition goals are either non-existent or do not focus on community/leisure activities.

Additionally, it is the responsibility of the APE teacher to collaborate with the classroom transition teacher and/or community college APE/PE teachers (CDESED, 2012). Completion of this can be achieved by maintaining collaboration with both the classroom transition teacher and the community college APE/PE teacher and may result in a decrease in direct services by the APE teacher as a result of the transition (CDESED, 2012). Through following these roles and responsibilities APE teachers can participate effectively in the ITP process, promote a smooth transition out of high school, and become active members of IEP team.
Experiences of APE Teachers in the ITP process

Current research examining the experiences of APE teachers in the ITP process is very limited. Four notable studies have been conducted; two offer a broad overview of the experiences of APE teachers in the ITP process (Alnahdi, 2012; Williams, 2012) and two introduce the specific identified barriers APE teachers face in the ITP process (Dorow, 2010; Krueger et al., 2000). These four articles will be examined below.

Williams (2012) and Alnahdi (2012) suggest that APE teachers may not be as involved in the ITP process as intended. Less than one-third of the APE teachers involved in a Wisconsin study reported any responsibility in the transition planning process (Williams, 2012). A possible explanation for the lack of involvement of APE teachers in the transition process can be attributed to the lack of involvement opportunities provided to them and the significant barriers impeding their involvement in the transition process.

The significant barriers for APE teachers reported in Williams’ study were budget, geographical location, transportation, and social interaction (Williams, 2012). Budget and transportation were considered barriers because APE teachers felt that the budget cuts combined with small yearly allowances for APE related equipment and transportation services were insufficient to support the provision of quality services. Teachers reported social interaction as a barrier because some students had difficulty interacting with their peers and instructors making it difficult to create transition goals. The geographical barrier related to the lower amounts of community resources available in rural settings compared to the larger selection available in urban settings. Williams (2012) argues that APE teachers must engage in communication with special education directors and
become active members of the ITP team in order to promote physical fitness, kinesthetic expression, and lifelong fitness behaviors amongst their students.

Alnahdi (2012) suggests that there is a strong positive correlation between an APE teacher’s level of preparation and their frequency of providing transition services for students. Results indicated that many APE teachers have received poor transition training during their pre-service higher education training prior to working with students with disabilities (Alnahdi, 2012). Additionally, thirty percent (n=123) of the teachers included in the study believed that including transition planning in the IEP process would be a burden for the APE teachers.

In order to prevent future APE teachers from experiencing the same problems, it is important to comprehend the experiences of APE teachers navigation of the transition process. Two possible explanations for the lack of involvement reported by Dr. Williams were APE teachers being unfamiliar with the ITP process and a lack of collaboration between APE teachers and school personnel (Williams, 2012). Williams’ conclusions are supported by Krueger’s et al (2000) study, where they examined the most significant barriers APE teachers faced when developing ITP’s. These are now explored in more detail.

Existing Barriers faced by APE Teachers in the ITP Process

Two studies (Dorow, 2010; Krueger et al., 2000) examined the specific obstacles that prevented APE teachers from fully engaging in the transition process for their students, and as a result, limited the success students achieved after high school.

Dorow’s (2010) work highlighted three obstacles currently inhibiting active APE teacher involvement in the ITP process; a lack of knowledge available regarding the ITP...
process, an inability to take the students’ perspectives into account, and the discrepancy between teachers’ espoused theories and theories-in-use.

One of the main driving forces for Dorow’s (2010, p. 50) research is to “fill a gap” in the literature pertaining to the ITP process for students with disabilities that plan to pursue post-secondary education. This gap is present because of the lack of knowledge that some teachers display when attempting to take part in the ITP process. Dorow (2010) notes that some teachers are developing transition programs without clear understandings of the effectiveness and impact that they can play on students’ transition outcomes. Furthermore, teachers are implementing transition programs without developing methods of evaluation and improvement making difficult to track student progress and the effectiveness of the program (Dorow, 2010). With minimal information available to teachers regarding the ITP process, fulfilling their roles in the ITP process can become more challenging for themselves and their students.

Reported by Dorow (2010), a barrier for students with disabilities succeeding after high school in post-school employment or in college may be the transition process itself. Dorow (2010) stated that students with disabilities reported not feeling prepared for college. Additionally, students reported not having an active voice in the transition planning process. Using the students learning center as a recruitment area, Dorow interviewed a total of 15 students with disabilities and 4 staff members of the educational support services. Of those 15 students, 60% (n=9) expressed that they played a passive role during the ITP process. Dorow concluded that there appeared to be “significant discrepancy” between what ITP developers determined as necessary for students to transition out of high school and what the students and staff claimed as necessary for a
successful transition (Dorow, 2010, p 113). Meaning that participants in their study were not developing accurate transition goals and as a result were not fulfilling at least one of their roles according to the APE Guidelines.

In order to address the discrepancy between teachers espoused theories and their theories-in-use Dorow (2010) recommends teachers reflect on inconsistencies between them. For the sake of Dorow’s study, the ITPs developed by the IEP team represented the espoused theories and the data reported by students and college staff represented the theories-in-use. An examination of espoused theories using the model of transition based on Argyris and Schon’s Model II may result in increased positive outcomes in transition for students. The Argyris and Schon’s Model II includes using what is known as “double-loop learning” (Dorow, 2010, p. 52), which involves a teacher evaluating a current transition program and making changes as needed. The purpose of this is to have teachers self-evaluate any inconsistencies between their espoused theories and their theories-in-use. Dorow goes on to mention the importance of educating teachers on how to effectively create ITP’s and to play an active role in the transition process.

Similar to this project, Dr. Krueger et al conducted a study where APE teachers in Wisconsin identified and rated the obstacles they felt were the primary reasons why they never wrote, or had difficulty writing an ITP. Of the 122 APE teachers who participated in the study, 64% of them (n=78) reported never being invited to take part in transition planning for their students, 41% (n=50) were not aware of what the APE teacher’s role in the ITP process was and 12% (n=15) indicated that they did not know what an ITP was (Krueger et al., 2000). These results show a worrying level of unfamiliarity with the ITP process. For the 36% (n=44) of APE teachers who had taken part in transition planning
for their students, several barriers to their active involvement were reported. The 19
reported barriers and their descriptions could be seen in the table below (Table 1).

**Table 1**

*Categorization of Barriers with Description*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Factors</td>
<td>Budget Restrictions</td>
<td>School is unable to afford equipment, specialist’s support/ service time, or transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE Teacher Factors</td>
<td>Lacks knowledge of role</td>
<td>APE teacher is unaware of their position in the ITP process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of experience in ITP</td>
<td>Teacher has minimal to no experience in ITP’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient knowledge of resources</td>
<td>APE teacher has little-to-no knowledge of the community resources available to a student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Factors</td>
<td>Lack of exposure to activities</td>
<td>Students’ Functional skills necessary to experience success in activity are lacking. Lacks previous transition activity experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Transportation is not available for student during off-school hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Collaboration</td>
<td>Collaboration between school and community resource personnel is non-existent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student communication skills</td>
<td>Students lacks communication skills (Verbal, sign language, facilitated communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Isolation</td>
<td>Lacks companions to recreate with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inability to individualize activity</td>
<td>Individualized instruction is not available because of student’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of functional skills</td>
<td>Functional skills necessary to experience success in activity are lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Factors</td>
<td>Negative attitudes Activity Fee</td>
<td>Community resource personnel have negative attitudes towards ITP’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Resists inclusion</td>
<td>Agencies/Programs resist inclusion of population of individuals with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too few recreational Choices</td>
<td>Minimal community recreation opportunities that do allow for choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of caregiver/parent support</td>
<td>Parent/ caregiver is not involved in the ITP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sufficient time in community</td>
<td>Students is not given sufficient time to allow for successful transition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accessibility</td>
<td>Communities lack ADA compliant environments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adapted equipment</td>
<td>Community programs/agencies lack adaptive equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Fee</td>
<td>Parent/caregivers are unwilling to pay activity fee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Replication of this study in Southern California would provide information regarding the barriers faced by APE teachers in LAUSD. Southern California, being more densely populated and culturally diverse than Wisconsin may produce different results than those reported in Dr. Krueger et al. study. In order to produce meaningful recommendations to the LAUSD it is important to determine LAUSD APE teachers’ perspectives regarding the ITP process. By gathering data at the local level, recommendations can be tailored to the specific dynamics reported by the APE Teachers recruited for this project.

**Best Practices for increasing APE Teacher involvement in the ITP Process**

While the barriers faced by APE teachers may appear insurmountable, Krueger et al (2000) and Williams (2012) offer several best practices in an effort to improve APE teacher involvement in the ITP process. This section will cover four recommendations provided by these researchers. Williams’s (2012) recommendations include increasing communication and being more organized while Krueger et al (2000) include APE teachers’ promoting their role and working more effectively.

When facing issues brought forth by low budget, geographical location, and social integration, Williams (2012) recommends APE teachers improve and increase their communication with the special education director beyond just annual meetings. This should help an APE teacher become a more informed, vocal and active member of the
IEP team. Williams (2012) also recommends that APE teachers create a more systematic and organized approach in order to improve post-secondary outcomes, and integrate those services.

Similar to Williams (2012), Krueger et al (2000) proposed that APE teachers promote their roles as special educators in order to become more powerful advocates for their students. However, Krueger et al (2000) recognize that APE teachers must gain more knowledge of important special education legislation in order to do so. Also, in addition to IEP team Krueger et al (2000) recommends APE teachers work closely with families, community representatives, and administrators because it is extremely beneficial in the development of ITP’s. The reason being that it will increase the student’s support system outside of school and family. By advocating for students and themselves, APE teachers can play a more active role in the IEP team. Recognizing the role of an APE teacher as a special educator opens the possibility of APE teachers to learn from the experiences of special education teachers in the ITP process and potentially apply best practices developed in the broader field to the unique circumstances of APE.

*Special Education Teacher’s Experiences in the Transition Process*

Special education is any instruction that is “specially designed for students, at no cost to the parents, that meets their unique needs” (IDEA, 2004, 39 U.S.C. § 300). Discussed in this section are the perceived barriers special education teachers face in the transition process and the strategies proposed to overcome them. Better understanding the experiences of special education teachers and the recommended best practices utilized in this field can offer potential solutions to transfer to the APE setting.
Barriers to the Transition process

Similar to Krueger et al (2000) findings, the most prominent barriers to positive transition outcomes reported by special education teachers were lack of resources, low quality teacher training, and minimal parental involvement (Meade, 2017). Lack of resources was the number one barrier reported by special education teachers (Lubbers et al., 2008). Special education teachers indicated that transition planning was not a priority in their school and/or district. Furthermore, schools were either providing teachers with large caseloads, minimal funding, or they did not feel supported. Lack of training was reported as a barrier because teachers exhibited a lack of information about their responsibilities in the transition process. Furthermore, a “broad lack of knowledge” relating to transition practices indicated the need for teacher training (Lubbers et al., 2008, p. 288).

Finally, minimal parental involvement was identified as a very crucial barrier for special education teachers (Rodriguez et al., 2014). Low parental involvement resulted in parents being unaware of their role in the process and/or feeling constrained in their ability to contribute to their child’s education with their current knowledge. This can inhibit parents from taking part in the transition process because they may not feel as if they have a voice or their voice is not significant. APE teachers in Krueger et al (2000) study also reported parental involvement as a barrier to the transition process.

Suggestions to Overcome Barriers to Transition

In order to mitigate the barriers reported by special education teachers, researchers have asked teachers and stakeholders for suggestions on how overcome them.
Researchers have identified six primary recommendations for special education teachers to overcome the previously reported barriers (Lubbers et al., 2008).

Suggestions to combat the lack of priority in a school and/or district are scheduling regular interagency meetings and including transition skills in existing school curriculum (Lubbers et al., 2008). Regular meetings can promote relationships between agencies and teachers, schools, and districts. Additionally, the incorporation of transition skills in a school’s curriculum would make knowledge on transition absolutely necessary for teachers to learn.

Multiple suggestions for addressing the lack of knowledge exhibited by some special educators include: developing manuals consisting of information regarding agency contact information, work-related transition activities, and the available programs and services for students, the offering of workshops and conferences on transition, and the provision of tours of local college campuses and vocational technical institutes (Lubbers, 2008). All of which are geared towards educating teachers and stakeholders on the transition process.

Lack of parental involvement in the transition process was contributed to parents’ lack of knowledge about the subject. Providing parents with resources can fill the gap of knowledge so they can better assist their child through the transition process (Meade, 2017).
Table 2

*Categorization of Barriers, Best Practices, and their Description*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Factors</td>
<td>Budget Restrictions</td>
<td>Scheduling regular interagency meetings</td>
<td>Meetings between teachers and community agencies strengthen bonds between schools and agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Including transition skills in existing school curriculum</td>
<td>Transition skills become mandatory for all educators to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APE Teacher Factors</td>
<td>Lacks knowledge of role</td>
<td>Developing manuals consisting of important information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manuals consisting of necessary information regarding the APE teachers’ role in the transition process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of experience in ITP</td>
<td>Offering of workshops and conferences on transition</td>
<td>Engaging workshops that give APE teachers more hands-on experience in developing transition goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient knowledge of resources</td>
<td>Provision of tours of local college campuses and vocational technical institutes</td>
<td>Tours of nearby resources provide more information on nearby resources available for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Factors</td>
<td>Lack of exposure to activities</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Collaboration</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student communication skills</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Isolation</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inability to individualize activity</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of functional skills</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Factors</td>
<td>Negative attitudes</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity Fee</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Resists inclusion</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IEP team does not consist of a single professional but rather a collection of professionals that includes both APE teachers, and the special education teachers. Together through collaboration, special education teachers and APE teachers can benefit from the knowledge available regarding the barriers and the suggested opportunities to navigate through the transition process.

Summary

This project seeks to build on existing literature examining the barriers that inhibit APE teacher involvement in the ITP process. Research reported limited involvement of APE teachers in the development of their students’ ITP’s and as a result, recreation goals were absent from the plan. While researchers Dorow (2010) and Krueger et al (2000) provide high-quality insights into their participants’ experiences, it is not a given that APE teachers in California are experiencing the same barriers. Therefore, there is a need to evaluate APE teacher involvement in the ITP process in LAUSD by identifying opportunities for effective APE teacher involvement in the ITP process, and identifying

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too few recreational Choices</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of caregiver/parent support</td>
<td>Providing parents with resources</td>
<td>Teachers provide parents with important documents containing beneficial information on how they can be more active in the transition process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sufficient time in community</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accessibility</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adapted equipment</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Fee</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
barriers inhibiting this outcome. Conducting this project in the state of California will provide exploratory data about the barriers and opportunities that APE teachers experience in this specific state. This can imbue APE teachers with the beneficial knowledge that can help them be more confident in the transition process and to discover the opportunities that promote APE teacher involvement in the transition process. With that, this project will record the opportunities that promote APE teacher involvement and provide them to APE teachers and LAUSD Administrators.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The chapter describes the research population, the project sample, participant recruitment, project design, the instrumentation, the procedures, and the ethical concerns and strategies. The purpose of this chapter is to develop an understanding for the chosen research population, justify the chosen project design, and to represent the instruments that were used for data collection in this project.

Project Population of Interest

Given the focus of this project, the inclusion criteria used to identify the project population of interest were as follows. APE teachers that:

i) Were currently employed within Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD),

ii) Held a valid APE added authorization,

iii) Currently teach APE in a LAUSD middle or high school.

It was important to ensure participants held an APE added authorization because you cannot teach APE in the Californian Public School system without one. Only APE teachers currently employed within LAUSD were recruited to participate in this project to ensure the data collected reflected the current opportunities and barriers faced by APE teachers.

According to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) website, there are 80 school districts in the Los Angeles County area containing over 246 High Schools and 1.4 million students, 169,718 of which have disabilities. LAUSD is the largest of these 80 school districts, both in terms of geographical area and number of
students served. Although the exact number of APE teachers employed within LAUSD is not public record, LAUSD schools employ 73,737 teachers, which include APE teachers (LACOE, 2021).

**Project Sample & Participant Recruitment**

The primary sampling method for this project was a purposive, non-probability approach. While convenient, a noted weakness of the purposive sampling method was the data couldn’t be generalized because the sample was not representative of the population (Atkinson, 2012).

Potential participants that met the inclusion criteria described above were identified through their professional emails displayed on school and district websites. They were emailed a recruitment flyer containing a summary of the project, basic information, and my contact information. The flyer also contained a QR code and a link to be followed by possible participants in the project.

**Project Design**

This project employed a cross-sectional design which consisted of 2 data collection methods, a survey and a semi-structured interview. The cross-sectional design was selected because it was convenient when faced with the limited resources (Gratton & Jones, 2010). An additional benefit of the cross-sectional project design included lower attrition rates than other project designs because data would be collected using a small-time commitment (Gratton & Jones, 2011). This feature was particularly important because of APE teachers’ limited availability and impacted workload. In California, APE teachers are typically itinerate, meaning they travel to multiple schools a day throughout
the district in order to teach the students on their caseload. Consequently, the time commitment of participation was minimized in hopes of increased response rates.

*Instrumentation*

Two data collection methods were employed to collect data from the participants. These two data collection methods were a survey and a semi-structured interview. The survey provided quantitative data while the interview provided qualitative data, which dove deeper into the teachers’ experiences and gave them the opportunity to expand beyond the survey content.

*Survey*

Surveys were selected as the initial data collection method because they enabled the collection of quantitative data from a large, geographically disparate population (Gratton & Jones, 2011). Furthermore, surveys permitted the collection of data, which was compared to existing studies. The online nature of the surveys reduced the cost of distribution, maximized time efficiency and promoted anonymity among participants (Gratton & Jones, 2011). Participants who completed the surveys reported their demographic profile and identify the presence and frequency of barriers that inhibited their involvement in the ITP process and reported the degree of importance attached to each one.

Noted weaknesses of surveys included: low response rates, incomplete data (e.g. unanswered or partially answered questions) and limited opportunity to probe participants for more information (Gratton and Jones, 2011). Weaknesses were minimized with two follow-up emails sent to participants before the cut-off date. The first email was sent seven days after the surveys were emailed to participants and the final follow-up email
was sent at 12 days. Additionally, because there was a chance of uncompleted data from participants any incomplete data was removed from the sample which prevented a skew of data.

Surveys are also subjected to a weakness in validity if the survey items are not validated. Rather than create new survey items, this project utilized a pre-existing survey designed by Dr. Deborah Krueger et al (2000). Dr. Krueger et al. 1997 study explored the obstacles APE teachers in Wisconsin faced when developing transition plans through a 3-part survey. Part 1 of the survey gathered demographic information on participants, part 2 identified the barriers to the ITP process, and part 3 consisted of a list of the top 5 most negative barriers according to participants. Using part 2 of Krueger et al. survey as its foundation, the survey developed for this project will consisted of 19-pre-identified barriers that may have prevented APE teachers from taking part in the transition plan (see Appendix A). Participants indicated if they have experienced the barrier and reported the perceived severity of the barrier using a pre-determined Likert-scale.

After the 19 listed barriers an open-ended barrier was provided where participants identified a barrier not listed previously and similarly rated it. The open-ended question provided the APE teacher an opportunity to report an unidentified barrier. The final question of the survey asked participants if they were willing to participate in a semi-structured interview to further discuss their experiences. If they were willing, they would be asked to provide their contact details.

*Semi-structured Interviews*

The second phase of data collection built upon the survey results. The semi-structured interviews offered gathered rich, detailed descriptions of the APE Teachers’
experiences. Conducting the interviews allowed APE teachers to expand on their answers to the questionnaire and provided insight on their experiences during the ITP process. It is for this reason that semi-structured interviews and the surveys were both chosen as data collection tools for this project.

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as the interview style for this project because they allowed interviewers to have participants elaborate on answers which provided rich qualitative data (Atkinson, 2012). Weaknesses of interviews as a data collection method included: respondents reacting to the person asking the questions rather than the questions themselves, answers could be imperfect memories created by the interviewee in order to look good for the interviewer, and the interview quality was heavily dependent on the communication flow (Atkinson, 2012).

Replication of the interviews will be easy to achieve due to the interviewer having access to an interview guide (see Appendix B). The interview guide was informed by the existing literature and addressed the themes discussed in Chapter 2. In addition, the guide was modified after the collection of the survey data, which enable the researcher to use the survey data as a guide for discussion. Being semi-structured, the interviews consisted of open-ended questions that allowed the interviewer to probe participants (Adams, 2015). The interviewer gained additional knowledge from participants regarding the questions on the surveys using probing. Benefits of probing include: collecting rich detail from few questions and clarifying misunderstandings or unclear points (Gratton & Jones, 2011). Consequently, semi-structured interviews are time consuming, labor intensive, and require interviewer sophistication (Adams, 2015).
Procedures

The following administrative procedures were used.

Surveys

The e-survey platform Qualtrics was used to house and gather the survey data. Participants were emailed a link to the e-survey and had 2-weeks to complete the survey. One week after the distribution, participants were emailed a reminder to complete their surveys. A final email was sent to participants 2 days before the 2-week cut-off date which expressed urgency and requested their completion of the survey. This first question in the survey was the informed consent form which provided all of the necessary ethical information to potential participants before they commenced the survey itself. The last question in the survey asked the respondents if they were willing to take part in a follow-up interview and asked for their contact details if they were.

Interviews

The contact details for the survey respondents willing to participate in an interview was collected in an Excel file. A minimum sample size of 15 participants was sought. This desired sample size was selected due to the time available to the researcher to conduct, transcribe and code the interview data. After the survey deadline passed, the interview participant pool was evaluated. Only 2 of the 19 survey respondents agreed to participate in a follow-up interview.

Because a sample of 15 participants was not reached through the survey request, a snowball sampling method was incorporated. From there, APE teachers who agreed to participate in the project were asked if they knew any colleagues who met the inclusion criteria. The researcher requested an introduction, directly approached the potential
participants, and requested their inclusion in the project. The implications of snowball sampling are that it provides high-quality data from a small sample, and it promotes greater trust between researcher and participants leading to improved quality in data (Atkinson, 2012). A noted pitfall of snowball sampling is that generates samples are typically homogenous because of the social network used to create the sample (Gratton & Jones, 2011). However, the snowball sampling method did not yield any additional participants. Consequently, the interview data was not reported in the white paper.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and associated social-distancing practices, the interviews took place through ZOOM. The timing of interview appointments differed because they depended on the participant’s schedule and availability. Interviews lasted between 30-60 minutes which depended on the depth of the participants’ responses. A semi-structured interview schedule was used to guide the discussion (see Appendix B). The interviews were audio-recorded through Zoom which assisted with transcription.

Analysis

The data generated through the surveys and interviews was analyzed in the following ways.

Surveys

Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the survey data and report the demographic profile of the sample. Responses to the 19-Likert scale questions and the 1-open ended question were recorded and ranked in order of frequency which established the most influential barriers that impeded involvement in the ITP process for APE teachers. Data was presented tables that showed the reported number or responses for
each barrier. The gathered data was used to show the most and least prominent barriers that were identified by the participants.

**Interviews**

The interviews were transcribed verbatim and a 4-stage thematic analysis coding process was applied. The 4-stage coding process used in this project consisted of highlighted important information (developing raw codes), categorized raw codes, established links between the categories, and then codes connected back to the literature review (Gratton & Jones, 2011). I worked on each stage until the point of saturation was reached and moved onto the following stage. The first stage included highlighting everything that related to the questions asked by the interviewer. Then, the highlighted data was split into themes which helped organize the immense amount of highlighted material. From there, I looked for possible links/similarities between the identified categories. Once stages 1-3 were complete, I used my literature review to explain the data. As noted, due to the small number of interviews conducted the interview data was not reported in the white paper.

**Ethical Concerns & Strategies**

Since this project included human subjects, there were ethical concerns and strategies were taken into consideration to protect the participants’ and the researchers’ safety. Ethical concerns for this study included voluntary participation, and disclosure of subject/participation information. Since the study included humans there was an ethical concern to whether or not their participation in this project was voluntary or involuntary. Additionally, participants disclosed some personal information as well as sensitive information about their school district. The disclosure of such information created an
ethical concern, however safeguards such as pseudonyms were deployed to minimize the likelihood of harm.

Providing information as sensitive as laws and whether or not they were being broken in a school district could have led to social and psychological harm in the participants’ lives. Social harm could have been present if a participant’s information was publicized without their consent (Atkinson 2012). Participant’s disclosure of personal information could have made them uncomfortable (emotional harm), it could have altered their salary, and could have placed them in judicial harm if the information provided by the participants was not protected by the use of ethical strategies.

Strategies taken to reduce the ethical concerns presented were as follows: CITI training, IRB approval, separate informed consent forms for the survey and interview, pseudonyms, and post-data collection withdrawal option. In order to become aware of the ethical concerns in this study I completed CITI training and attained IRB approval before data was collected. Completion of the CITI training ensured competence of the ethical concerns that may have arose in the human research and the strategies could have been taken to avoid these concerns. Additionally, IRB approval was achieved in order to confirm the rights of the human participants were protected in this project.

An informed consent form was the first question in the survey which ensured their participation was voluntary (see Appendix A). This informed consent described the nature of the study and how the data was used before it was collected (Gratton & Jones 2011). An additional informed consent was issued prior to the interview. This informed consent form mentioned: each participant was given a pseudonym, they had the right of member checks, and the right to withdraw from the project post-data collection if they
chose to do so. Participant information such as identity was hidden with pseudonyms, which ensured the participants could not be identified or tracked. Member checks provided the audience the opportunity to be consulted about the data gathered in the project as well as its ensured an accurate capture of the respondent’s answers (Atkinson, 2012). Furthermore, participants had the right to post-data collection withdrawal, which allowed them to leave the project even after the data has been collected with no explanation necessary.

Summary

The project gathered data from APE teachers regarding their experiences of the ITP process through the use of surveys and semi-structured interviews. In order to do this, a target population that consisted of APE teachers holding valid APE added authorizations and valid California teaching credentials and who teach in a LAUSD middle school or high school. I distributed a recruitment flyer via the direct emails provided by district websites. The recruitment flyer contained links to the initial survey and informed consent documents.

Participants had a total of 2-weeks to complete the survey and indicate their willingness to participate in a follow-up interview. The follow-up interview was conducted via ZOOM and was audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. A 4-stage coding process was applied which analyzed the major themes in the qualitative data. A minimum sample size of 15 participants in both the survey and interview was sought but not achieved. Nineteen APE teachers completed the survey. However, only 2 APE teachers participated in the interviews. Therefore, the interview data was not used to
inform the practice recommendations provided in this project. The quantitative trends evident in the survey provided the foundation for the white paper recommendations.
CHAPTER 4

Project Artifact

This chapter presents the project artifact, a white paper entitled “Adapted Physical Educators in the Transition Plan Process: The barriers they face and how to mitigate them.” The audience for this white paper is LAUSD APE teachers and LAUSD administrators. The goal of this white paper is to provide recommendations to APE teachers and LAUSD administrators on how to mitigate significant barriers inhibiting APE teacher involvement in the Transition Plan process and promote success amongst APE teachers.
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Executive Summary

A “transition gap” is present when comparing the post-school outcomes for students with disabilities and their developmentally typical peers. However, federal legislation such as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandates equal opportunity for students with disabilities in the pursuit of school and post-school outcomes. Students with disabilities are provided Individual Education Plans (IEP) which document mandated services, individualized goals, accommodations, and assessment addendums. By the age of 16, qualifying students must receive an Individual Transition Plan (ITP) which contains a statement of necessary transition services and measurable transition goals.

Adapted Physical Education (APE) teachers are responsible for the development of recreation/leisure goals and the monitoring of students’ gross motor skill goals for students who have APE services in their IEP.

Unfortunately, APE teachers have expressed a lack of knowledge and participation when it comes to the ITP process which raises concerns for students’ post-school outcomes. Given the concern expressed by current literature and APE teachers regarding the lack of knowledge and/or participation in the ITP process,
this white paper reports the state of affairs in LAUSD. This white paper (i.) evaluates LAUSD APE teacher involvement in the ITP process, (ii) identifies barriers that impede their inclusion in the ITP process, (iv) identifies opportunities that may promote their inclusion in the ITP process, and (vi) provides recommendations to APE teachers and administrators that optimize APE teacher involvement in the ITP process.

A 32-question survey was distributed to all APE teachers in LAUSD with an email accessible via LAUSD school websites (n=23). A response rate of 83% (n=19) was achieved. Nineteen barriers were reported by respondents. These barriers have been categorized as follows: Stakeholder Engagement, Budgetary Constraints, Teacher Readiness, and Resource Scarcity. Ten opportunities were reported by respondents. These opportunities were categorized as follows: Stakeholder Engagement, Teacher Readiness, and Resource Availability. Grounded in research and the data presented in this white paper, 12 actionable recommendations to mitigate the 19 reported barriers and promote the 10 opportunities for APE teacher involvement in the ITP process are offered.
Background

Students with disabilities in the United States are facing what is known as a ‘transition gap’, a disparity among post-school outcomes when compared to their developmentally typical peers (Dorow, 2010). The transition gap is evidenced in the lower percentages of students with disabilities achieving high school graduation (66%) and obtaining gainful employment (34.8%) when compared to their developmentally typical peers (83% and 74.4% respectively) (Figueroa, 2019). A similar trend is observed in post-school health outcomes. When compared, the overall health outcomes between individuals with disabilities and those without them show a clear difference. For example, obesity rates in adolescents (ages 12-18) with disabilities (17.5%) are higher than their developmentally typical peers (13%) (Rimmer et al., 2004). In addition, individuals with disabilities report lower rates of physical activity and their chance of having cardiovascular disease is 3 to 4 times higher than their developmentally typical peers (Pan et al., 2015).

Several systematic processes and federal laws have been enacted to ensure students with disabilities receive the necessary services to facilitate their success in school and post-school outcomes. Most notable of these is the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA, 2004, 34 U.S.C. § 1414), which stipulates that students with qualifying disabilities are entitled to an Individualized Education Program (IEP). The IEP is designed to ensure qualified students receive specialized instruction and support services. The IEP organizes these services in a single document reviewed annually by the IEP team. A typical IEP team consists of service providers, including but not limited to, physical therapists, occupational therapists,
classroom teachers, speech therapists, APE teachers, parent(s), special education teachers and, whenever appropriate, the child with a disability (IDEA, 2004, 321 U.S.C. § 300). The IEP documents the student’s present level of performance, measurable annual goals, a description of how those goals will be assessed, a declaration of the student’s special education and related services, a description of the extent to which the student can’t participate in the regular classroom, a statement of any accommodations necessary for the students to be assessed, and the beginning date of services and accommodations (IDEA, 2004, 324 U.S.C. § 300).

During adolescence (ages 12-18) a section focusing on transition goals becomes integrated into the IEP. This section is informally known as the Individualized Transition Plan (ITP). The ITP documents post-secondary goals for students in special education. While the IEP can be seen as a road map for a student throughout their time in primary and secondary school, when paired with transition goals, an IEP can also facilitate success for a student in post-secondary life. The ITP and the post-secondary goals focus on the transition requirements of the student which include “the need for assistive or rehabilitation technology, orientation and mobility services or travel training, and career exploration through vocational assessments or work experience opportunities” (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). The effective implementation of an IEP and its associated ITP can improve the chances of students with disabilities succeeding in school and post-secondary life (U.S. Department of Education, 2020).

The success of an IEP is directly correlated with the IEP team’s comprehension and application of the document (Krueger et al., 2000). APE services are necessary when a student’s needs cannot be met in general or specially designed physical education
(CDESED, 2012). In these circumstances, APE teachers are charged with undertaking comprehensive motor assessments, making specific program recommendations, and delivering APE services to qualifying students.

In relation to the ITP, the APE teacher is tasked with developing physical activity goals that focus on a student’s functional motor skills, lifelong physical activities, and physical fitness skills necessary to support vocational, health or daily living activities and community participation (CDESED, 2012). The APE teacher should be facilitating the student’s use of community fitness and recreational resources and collaborating with classroom teachers or community college APE/PE teachers to ensure these goals are met (CDESED, 2012).

However, existing literature reveals a common trend amongst APE teachers’ experiences in the ITP process, whereby APE teachers have expressed a lack of knowledge and participation in the ITP process (Krueger et al., 2000; Alnahdi, 2012; Williams, 2012). Possible explanations for this trend include APE teachers receiving poor or no transition training during their pre-service higher education (Alnahdi, 2012) and reported obstacles faced by APE teachers including but not limited to a lack of equipment, budget restrictions, few recreational opportunities, lack of experience, and a lack of caregiver support (Krueger et al., 2000). In one study, more than 60% of APE teachers reported never being invited to take part in an ITP, 41% were not aware of their role in the ITP process, and 12% had no idea what an ITP was (Krueger et al., 2000). This data is concerning because a reduced involvement of APE teachers in the ITP process can compromise the quality of the IEP and ITP and diminish a student’s success in post-school life.
Purpose of White Paper

The possible consequences of low APE teacher involvement to a student’s health, and educational performance cannot be taken lightly. The state of California is home to the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), the 2nd largest school district in the United States. LAUSD serves over six hundred thousand K-12 students at over one-thousand schools. Therefore, it is imperative to learn more about the experiences of LAUSD’s APE teachers in the ITP process to assess whether the trends observed in existing literature are present here. The goals of this white paper analysis are four-fold. It seeks to:

i) evaluate LAUSD APE teacher involvement in the ITP process,

ii) identify barriers experienced by LAUSD APE teachers that inhibit their involvement in the ITP process

iii) identify opportunities to promote LAUSD APE teacher involvement in the ITP process and,

iv) provide recommendations to optimize LAUSD APE teacher involvement in the ITP process.

Methodology

To meet the goals of this white paper, a two-phased data collection strategy was implemented. First, a 32-question survey concerning APE teachers’ experiences of the ITP process, their current practices when developing ITPs, and any barriers they encounter in this process was distributed via email to all APE teachers listed on LAUSD school websites. To identify all potential respondents a systematic analysis of the LAUSD directory was completed. A sweep of all LAUSD middle and high school
(n=467) websites located the direct contact information for 24 APE teachers. Direct contact was made via email to request their participation in the research. In addition, emails were sent to each general PE teacher (n=145) listed on the website requesting assistance in reaching any APE teachers who met the inclusion criteria (currently employed within the Los Angeles County School District (LAUSD), hold a valid APE added authorization, currently teach APE in a LAUSD middle or high school).

Secondly, survey participants were also asked if they were willing to participate in a follow-up semi-structured interview. Two participants consented to their involvement. Interviews were held via Zoom due to the ongoing COVID pandemic and associated social distancing mandates. The interviews lasted approximately 45-minutes and included questions that pertained to the teacher’s general APE experience, their experience of the ITP process, and if they had any recommendations for other practitioners in the field. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using a 4-stage thematic analysis which consisted of raw codes being developed, raw codes being categorized, links between categories being established, and codes being connected to existing literature. However, due to the low response rate for the interview phase, this data is reported sparsely in this white paper.
Respondents

Twenty-one APE teachers completed the survey, of which, 19 met the inclusion criteria. Of the 19 respondents, 53% identified as male (n=10), 47% as female (n=9) and none preferred not to disclose their gender identity. More than half of the respondents were between the ages of 31-50 years old (n=11), 3 were younger than 30 years old, 5 were between the ages of 51-60 years old and only 1 participant was past the age of 60.

The depth of teaching experience was diverse within the sample (see Figure 1). All levels of teaching experience were represented in the sample but the majority of respondents were either veterans (> 20 years) in the field or new APE teachers (<5 years).

Figure 1

Years of Teaching Experience
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1 N= 2 were removed as they did not hold a valid added authorization in California
74% (n=14) of respondents received their Teaching Credential from institutions either within, or in close proximity to, LAUSD (see Figure 2). The institutions considered to be in close proximity to LAUSD included: California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA), California State University, Long Beach (CSULB), California State University, Northridge (CSUN), California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH), California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (CPP), University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), and Azusa Pacific University (APU). The “other” category included: California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt, California State University, Sonoma, National University, and California State University, Chico. Similarly, 78% (n=15) of respondents earned their APE added authorization from institutions in within or in close proximity to LAUSD (see Figure 2).

Figure 2

*Earned Teaching Credential and APE Added Authorization*
It is difficult to determine if the survey respondents are representative of all APE teachers operating within LAUSD for two reasons. Firstly, the LAUSD website may not provide an accurate reflection of all the APE teachers currently employed within the district, thus making it difficult to ascertain population characteristics. The strategy used to generate the sample successfully recruited 19 respondents, although it is unclear if these were accessed via the direct or indirect emails. Secondly, district-wide demographic data places APE teachers within an aggregated ‘other’ category\(^2\), making it difficult to disaggregate the demographic profile of APE teachers specifically (LAUSD, 2019). Table 1 compares the survey participants demographic profile with that of the LAUSD ‘other’ personnel category.

**Table 1**

*LAUSD ‘other’ vs. Sample Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>LAUSD ‘other’</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary/3(^{rd}) gender</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) The “other” category consists of Human Resources certified control pool, special education multiple (SPED), SPED speech/language itinerant, SPED infant/preschool, deaf elementary, inclusion programs, APE teachers, PE teacher itinerants, and reassigned employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Not Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inability of this white paper to determine the representativeness of the sample limits the generalizability of the findings.

**Findings**

Three themes of interest to LAUSD administrators and other key stakeholders in the development of ITP emerged from the survey data. They were:

1. The limited involvement of APE teachers in the ITP process,
2. Notable barriers that inhibited APE teacher involvement in this process, and
3. Practices that promoted APE teacher involvement.

Each will be addressed in turn.

**APE Teacher involvement in ITP Process**

Firstly, data shows APE teachers are not as involved in the transition process as they should be. APE teachers reported a lack of experience in writing ITPs, measured by less than 4 ITPs in the past 4 years (56% of survey respondents) and a lack of knowledge of what their role should be in the transition planning process (19%). Interview data supported this lack of involvement and offered ‘isolation’ as a possible explanation. One interviewee, a former special education teacher, felt like “they valued your opinion when it came to the transitioning process “but felt like as an APE teacher” they just don’t

---

3 Reported percentages are a combination of strongly agree/agree responses.
include you at all”. When it came to APE teachers’ involvement in the transition process, they suggested that “there’s no input at all”.

Although limited in scope, these data suggest limited APE teacher involvement in the ITP process. Whether it’s because of how APE teachers approached the ITP process (shown by reported survey data) or how their colleagues perceived them (shown in reported interview responses), APE teachers’ involvement in the ITP process in an area of concern. An examination of the barriers faced by APE teachers offered greater insight into their limited involvement in the ITP process.

**Barriers Inhibiting APE Teacher Involvement in ITP process**

The survey responses identified barriers that may be inhibiting LAUSD APE teacher involvement in the ITP process. Eighteen factors were offered as potential barriers in the survey (see Appendix A). Since each of these was reported by at least 19% of the respondents, all factors were considered barriers present in LAUSD, although varied in their prominence. For analysis purposes, the reported barriers have been organized in the following 4 categories: Stakeholder Engagement, Budgetary Constraints, Teacher Readiness, and Resource Scarcity. Each will be summarized and examined in turn.

**Stakeholder Engagement**

Stakeholder engagement refers to factors that impact the strength and quality of IEP team members’ engagement within the ITP process. The stakeholders include, but are not limited to, speech pathologists, occupational therapists, community resource personnel, parents, APE teachers, and classroom teachers. Four specific areas of concern related to Stakeholder Engagement were identified as barriers by LAUSD APE teachers.
These barriers are presented in Table 2. Each barrier will be discussed in order of prominence.

**Table 2**

**Reported Stakeholder Engagement Barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parent/caregiver support and involvement in the plan.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community agencies/programs that resist inclusion of students with disabilities.</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student is not allotted sufficient time in the community setting to allow for successful transition.</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration between school and community resource personnel.</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitudes/anxiety of community resource personnel.</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>33.34%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the category of ‘stakeholder engagement’, the most reported barrier was the lack of parent/caregiver support and involvement in the transition plan. It is well
documented that low parental support in the ITP process can lead to continued dependence, lack of adult-to-adult cooperation, lack of reality-based self-awareness, and a detrimental transition experience (Smith et al., 2002). In contrast, implementation of parental support interventions in the ITP process has been shown to increase the successful outcomes in students with disabilities (Pleet, 2000). These consequences negatively impact APE teachers’ involvement in the ITP process because parents are crucial resources for information pertaining to the student interests and needs in APE.

The second most prominent barrier within this category is community agencies/programs that resist inclusion of students with disabilities. Meaning, community agencies/programs did not support participation of students with disabilities. If community agencies/programs do not support the inclusion of students with disabilities, the number of opportunities available for students to continue engaging in physical activity diminishes. Legislation like The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), IDEA, and section 504 mandate public entities to provide equal opportunity for individuals with disabilities to participate in and benefit from services, programs, or any other activity hosted by any public entity. With that, all programs, services, and activities hosted by any public entity must be readily accessible to individuals with disabilities (ADA, 2008, Title II U.S.C. § 35.150).

The third most prominent barrier was students not being allotted sufficient time in the community setting to allow for successful transition. If students are not being given the same amount of time as their developmentally typical peers to participate in a community setting, progress in transition goals pertaining to community settings can be impacted. A systematic of over 100 studies reported students with disabilities having less
variability in their community recreation opportunities and spending more time in sedentary activities than their developmentally typical peers (Shields et al., 2012).

The fourth most prominent barrier was a lack of collaboration between school and community resource personnel. Lack of collaboration amongst school and community resource personnel can result in a poor or non-existent relationship between school staff, and community resource staff. A poor relationship with community resource staff weakens the bridge of transfer over to post-school outcomes which includes APE transition outcomes. Such relationships are essential and reinforced by IDEA (2004, 43 U.S.C. § 300) to ensure a successful transition out of high school for all students who have an ITP embedded in their IEP.

The least prominent barrier of this category is negative attitudes/anxiety of community resource personnel. This barrier can exist due to excessive pressure being put on limited community resource personnel (Krueger et al., 2000). Excessive pressure placed on community resource personnel can deter and damage already existing relationships between them and schools. According to Krueger et al (2000) putting too much pressure on community resources can risk the availability of community activities and the relationships between teachers, administration, and community resource personnel.

**Budgetary Constraints**

Budgetary Constraints refers to factors concerned with the financial support of APE-related activities. Two specific areas of concern related to Budgetary Constraints were identified as barriers by the LAUSD APE teachers. These are presented in Table 3. Each barrier will be discussed in order of prominence.
The most prominent barrier in this category was budget restrictions. Budget restrictions meant APE teachers did not have what they perceive to be an adequate budget to provide their students with the necessary equipment, environment, and/or transportation to and from community resources. No quantitative research has been conducted to report the average equipment budget for APE teachers in LAUSD. In a 2019 report titled *Equipment Additionally*, California teachers reported spending an average of $664 annually out-of-pocket to fund their classroom needs (Walker, 2019).

The second most prominent barrier within budgetary constraints was an activity fee that parents/caregivers are not willing to pay. If parents are unwilling to pay the activity fee, it prevents students from accessing those community/recreation programs. Findings from William’s (2012) study compliments the presence of budgetary constraints due to lack of fiscal resources reported by teachers. Furthermore, high activity fees may be a product of an increase in the number of participants attending adapted sports and
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**Table 3**

**Reported Budgetary Constraints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Restrictions (Equipment, specialist’s support/service time, transportation).</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An activity fee that parents/caregiver aren’t willing to pay.</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recreational programs (Moberg-Wolff et al., 2008) which may place a higher demand for them.

*Teacher Readiness*

Teacher Readiness relates to the degree APE Teachers are informed, trained and prepared to undertake their responsibilities in the ITP process. Four specific areas of concern related to Teacher Readiness were identified as barriers by the APE teachers. These are presented in Table 4. Each barrier will be discussed in order of prominence.

**Table 4**

*Factors Affecting Teacher Readiness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experience in writing Individualized Transition Plans (Less than 4 ITP’s in the past 4 years).</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My insufficient knowledge of community resources.</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>41.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to provide individualized instruction based of needs of student. All activities become group activities.</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>68.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most prominent barrier in this category is the lack of experience in ITPs. The APE teachers who reported this barrier had taken part in ≤1 ITP annually over 4 years. Inexperience in the ITP process limits the amount of knowledge an APE teacher can reference when presented with the transition process. With transition planning beginning as early as age 14, survey respondents may have had only one student in their entire caseload with transition services, had no ITPs to attend, or were not aware of a student’s ITP taking place.

The second most prominent barrier in this category is the reported lack of knowledge APE teachers have regarding local community resources. An APE teacher being unaware of the community resources and the service/programs they provide for students with disabilities impacts students’ exposure to these programs. According to Figueroa (2019) a lack of knowledge and/or involvement in community resources can be viewed as a consequence of the barriers faced by APE teachers.

The third most prominent barrier in this category relates to a teacher’s inability to provide one-on-one instructional setting where students’ needs are met. As a result, APE activities may become group activities which do not always cater to students’ individual needs due to class sizes, varying skill levels, and varying experience. Although sometimes challenging, it is the responsibility of the APE teacher and other members of the IEP team to advocate for their students, and create activities they may enjoy (Krueger
et al., 2000). Research conducted at California State University, Long Beach indicated an increased implementation of opportunities for peer engagement in the APE classroom for students with disabilities following brief in-services from preservice teachers (Daughrity et al., 2020).

The fourth most prominent barrier in this category is a lack of knowledge of what an APE teacher’s role is in the transition plan, which is the least reported barrier in this study. Not having knowledge of your role in any given task places you at an extreme disadvantage compared to others who do. As an APE teacher, not having knowledge of your role in the transition plan impacts the presence of student’s transition goals and opportunities targeting physical fitness post-school.

**Resource Scarcity**

Resource scarcity relates to a lack of the resources needed to promote involvement for students with disabilities in an educational and/or a community setting excluding finances. Three specific areas of concern related to resource scarcity were identified as barriers by the APE teachers. These are presented in Table 5. Each barrier will be discussed in order of prominence.
Table 5

**Barriers Resulting from Resource Scarcity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transportation available to students during off-school hours.</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too few community recreation opportunities to allow for choice.</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accessibility (ramps, elevators in community environments).</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most prominent barrier in this category is a lack of transportation to community resources (i.e., recreational centers). Lack of transportation to community resources inhibits students’ ability to engage in after-school activities by limiting their access to these activities. This is a documented barrier across the country. In a study conducted at the University of Illinois, Chicago researchers organized four focus groups to discuss the barriers and facilitators of participation in physical fitness and recreation programs among individuals with disabilities (Rimmer et al., 2004). Among these barriers, lack of transportation was frequently cited as a resource barrier that prevented individuals with disabilities from participating in recreation programs (Rimmer et al., 2004).
The second most prominent barrier in this category is having too few community resource opportunities to allow for choice. A homogeneity of community recreation opportunities does not allow students to choose based off of their interests. Rather, students will choose what is convenient and available to them which contradicts the importance placed by the Transition Guide to Postsecondary Education and Employment on a transition plan being the product of collaboration driven by the student’s needs, desires, and abilities (U.S. Department of Education, 2020).

The third most prominent barrier in this category is lack of accessibility. The lack of accessibility structures and/or mechanisms in community resources such as, ramps, automatic doors, pool lift chairs, or wheelchair seating prevents access from students with disabilities. However, resource restrictions are still present in our society. Williams (2012) reported APE teachers perceived both transportation and community resources as two of the top four barriers to APE transition programs. Additionally, lack of accessible wheelchair routes, handrails, and elevators are still being reported by community representatives despite these being required by Federal legislation (Shields et al., 2012).

**Opportunities that Promote APE Teacher Involvement in the ITP Process**

While the survey data identified the notable barriers present for LAUSD APE teachers discussed above, the responses also helped to identify the most common best practices implemented in the field. These best practices will be known as “opportunities” because they promote involvement in the ITP process. Ten best practices were identified as opportunities in the survey. Aligned with the barriers’ analysis, these opportunities can be organized in the following 3 categories: Stakeholder Engagement, Teacher Readiness, and Resource Availability. Each will be summarized and examined in turn.


**Stakeholder Engagement**

Stakeholder engagement refers to factors that impact the strength and quality of IEP team members’ engagement within the ITP process. The stakeholders include but are not limited to the speech pathologist, occupational therapist, community resource personnel, parents, APE teacher, and the classroom teacher. Four specific best practices related to Stakeholder Engagement were identified as opportunities by the APE teachers.

**Table 6**

**Reported Stakeholder Engagement Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain regular communication with the special</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education director.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work closely with families, community representatives, and administrators.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide transition resources to parents.</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule regular inter-agency meetings.</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within this category the most reported opportunity was APE teachers maintaining regular communication with the special education director. Practicing this opportunity
means an APE teacher is frequently communicating, whether that is via email, messenger, virtually, or in person, with their special education director. Under IDEA, special education encompasses instruction in physical education which includes adapted physical education. (IDEA, 2004, 20 U.S.C. § 1401). With special education directors being directly responsible for creating and implementing cohesive and comprehensive transition plans, maintaining regular communication (Meade, 2017) with them allows for a valuable resource and ally for an APE teacher.

The second most prominent opportunity was APE teachers working closely with families, community representatives, and administrators. An APE teacher who practices this opportunity puts in an effort to maintain frequent communication with these stakeholders. An APE teacher practicing effective communication amongst families, and community representatives may lead to higher levels of agreement on levels of satisfaction in the APE components of an ITP (Williams, 2012). Examples of ways to communicate with these stakeholders include: group chats, virtual meetings, and phone calls.

The third most prominent opportunity was APE teachers providing transition resources to parents. APE teachers who practice this opportunity provide parents with transition resources which can include a manual containing locations, activity fees, contact information, program descriptions, and any other relevant information pertaining to local, state and national community-based programs that are accessible to individuals with disabilities. With 43% of APE teachers reporting a lack of collaboration between school and community resource personnel, providing parents with a manual of transition
resources may help lessen the gap present due to possible lack of parental, administrative, and community resource personnel involvement.

The least prominent stakeholder engagement opportunity was scheduling regular interagency meetings. Practicing this opportunity means collaborating with community resource personnel regularly to discuss transition related topics. The reported percentage of APE teachers who do not practice this opportunity is equal (43%) to the percentage of teachers who reported lack of collaboration between school and community resource personnel as a barrier to the transition process (see Table 2).

**Teacher Readiness**

Teacher Readiness relates to the degree APE Teachers are informed, trained and prepared to undertake their responsibilities in the ITP process. Four specific best practices related to Teacher Readiness were identified as opportunities by the APE teachers. These are presented in Table 7. Each opportunity will be discussed in order of prominence.
Table 7

Reported Teacher Readiness Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement a systematic organized approach.</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote my role as a special educator.</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain knowledge of important special education legislation.</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend workshops and conferences on transition.</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within this category the most prominent opportunity was implementing a systematic organized approach. Practicing this opportunity means following or establishing a step-by-step process that addresses the individual needs of the student. This can be achieved by APE teachers’ listing the most important components of their APE transition programs and reported how satisfied they are with each component in their current settings (Williams, 2012). Almost all APE teachers in this study reported implementing in organized approach at some point in their teaching.
The second most prominent Teacher Readiness opportunity was APE teachers promoting their role as a special educator. Practicing this opportunity means an APE teacher has to be aware and have sufficient knowledge of their role as a special educator. The majority of LAUSD APE teachers (87%) reported practicing this opportunity. This data point may speak to quality training LAUSD APE teachers may be receiving through their teacher preparation program and subsequent professional development supported by the district.

The third most prominent opportunity was gaining knowledge of important special education legislation. Practicing this opportunity means an APE teacher is familiar with special education legislation, such as IDEA, and the Assistive Technology Act. All of which, ensure equal access to the school curriculum for students with disabilities. Legislation like IDEA defines transition services and provides a systematic breakdown of the different components necessary to make it functional. Again, this data point may speak to quality training LAUSD APE teachers may be receiving through their teacher preparation program and subsequent professional development supported by the district.

The least prominent teacher readiness opportunity was attending workshops and conferences on transition. Practicing this opportunity means an APE teacher is actively attending in-service workshops, and/or national or statewide conferences where workshops and/or presentations on the transition process are presented. According to Table 7, half of APE teachers reported not attending workshops or conferences on transition. Typically, school districts will pay for a fixed number of APE teachers to
attend these conferences leaving those not selected to pay out-of-pocket if they wish to attend.

**Resource Availability**

Resource availability relates to the quantity and quality of the resources needed to promote involvement for students with disabilities in an educational and/or a community setting. Two best practices related to resource availability were identified an opportunity by APE teachers. This is presented in Table 8 The opportunities will be discussed in order of prominence.

**Table 8**

*Reported Resource Availability Practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include transition skills in existing school curriculum.</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>13.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of tours of local college campuses and vocational technical institutes.</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most prominent barrier in the resource availability category was including transition skills in existing school curriculum. Practicing this opportunity means APE teachers are actively incorporating and teaching transition skills within their curriculums.
According to IDEA, transition services facilitate a student’s movement from a school to post-school environment (IDEA, 2004, 43 U.S.C. § 300). Transition services differ for every student because they are dependent on the students’ communicating their strengths, interests, and needs to the IEP team (IDEA, 2004, 43 U.S.C. § 300). Eighty percent (n=20) respondents indicated that they currently embed these transition skills into their curriculums. While this number is high it should be 100% in order to fulfill federal requirements (IDEA).

The least prominent resource availability barrier was the provision of tours of local college campuses and vocational technical institutes. Practice of this opportunity means an APE teacher organizes or is involved in the organization of a field trip to local college campuses and/or trade schools. The low percentage of APE teachers who reported practicing this opportunity may be attributed to the budgetary constraints listed in Table 3.

**Summary of Findings**

All barriers were present to some degree in LAUSD schools according reports by APE teachers. In the case of Stakeholder Engagement, the most prominent opportunity was lack of parent/caregiver support and involvement in the plan (56.25%) and the least prominent barrier was Negative attitudes/anxiety of community resource personnel (33.34%). For budgetary constraints, the most prominent barrier was Budget restrictions (62.50%) and the least prominent barrier was an activity fee that parents/caregivers aren’t willing to pay (20%). In factors affective teacher readiness, the most prominent barrier was Lack of experience in writing Individualized Transition Plans (56.25%) and the least prominent was the lack of knowledge of what my role should be in the transition plan.
(18.75%). In the case of resource scarcity, lack of transportation (68.75%) was the most prominent barrier and lack of accessibility (25%) was the least prominent barrier. Overall, barriers affecting stakeholder engagement and teacher readiness make up a majority of reported barriers by LAUSD APE teachers.

In the case of opportunities, every opportunity was reported at least once by participants. For stakeholder engagement opportunities, the most prominent opportunity was maintaining regular communication with the special education director (81.25%) and the least prominent was Scheduling regular inter-agency meetings (31.25%). The most prominent teacher readiness practice reported was Implement a systematic organized approach to the ITP process (93.75%) and attending workshops and conferences was the least prominent (37.50%). In the case of resource availability, the most prominent category was including transition skills in existing school curriculum (80%) and Provision of tours of local college campuses and vocational technical institutes (18.75%). Overall, stakeholder engagement and teacher readiness opportunities encompass the majority of opportunities practiced by APE teacher in LAUSD.

**Recommendations**

To mitigate the barriers and amplify the best practices reported in this study, this white paper offers the following 12 recommendations. These recommendations are organized around the four themes identified in the above findings and are presented in turn:

1. Stakeholder Engagement
2. Budgetary Constraints
3. Teacher Readiness
4. Resource Scarcity

**Stakeholder Engagement**

A disparity in stakeholder engagement which includes lack of collaboration amongst IEP members (including the student), a debilitated relationship with resource personnel, and/or resistance of inclusion of students with disabilities in community programs may impact the foundational structure of the transition process for students. Research suggests educating community resource personnel and administration to become more disability-aware and knowledgeable of modified activities may help facilitate a stronger sense of engagement in the transition process (Shields et al., 2012).

According to Table 6, 43% of LAUSD APE teachers do not schedule regular interagency meetings and 18% do not work closely with families, community representatives, and administrators.

Thus, this white paper recommends the following to increase stakeholder engagement:

1. LAUSD to develop PD/in-service workshops to educate all members of the IEP team about the value and importance of physical activity goals in the transition plan. APE teachers could develop and deliver these workshops to help build collaborative relationships between IEP team members grounded on mutual respect.

2. LAUSD develop PD/in-service workshops APE teachers’ advocacy, negation, and communication skills to ensure that APE teachers possess the necessary skills to articulate the needs of students within the transition plan process.
3. LAUSD to establish a collaborative platform, plan, and/or expectations to facilitate regular communication amongst IEP team members, families, community representatives, and administrators.

**Budgetary Constraints**

Barriers presented due to budgetary constraints, such as a restrictive budget and an unwillingness to pay activity fees directly impact a student’s attendance at community recreational centers, and impactful transition skill building opportunities. Research suggests seeking the perspectives of stakeholders involved in the APE transition process including the APE teacher, community resource personnel, parent(s), and the student (Williams, 2012) can help in the development of a systematic organized approach to improve post-secondary outcomes. According to table 3, more than 60% of LAUSD APE teachers identify budget restrictions as a barrier to the ITP process.

Thus, this white paper recommends the following to reduce budgetary constraints:

1. LAUSD to commission a needs assessment regarding the current funding of APE programs and associated physical activity opportunities.

2. LAUSD to redistribute funding in line with the findings of the needs assessment and when possible, identify alternative sources of funding to help support

**Teacher Readiness**

Poor teacher readiness includes APE teachers lacking experience of their own roles in the ITP, having difficulty implementing instruction to meet the needs of their students, and/or not being cognizant of community resources for their students. Research suggests schools educating their teachers in the implementation of self-determination skills and student-centered transition planning may improve student’s experiences in the
ITP (Meade, 2017). According to table 7, only 31% of LAUSD APE teachers reported knowledge of special education legislation and 50% reported never attending workshops and/or conferences on transition.

Thus, this white paper recommends the following to improve teacher readiness:

1. LAUSD partner with local institutions who grant APE added authorizations to provide feedback about teacher readiness and program requirements.
2. LAUSD to partner local institutions who grant added authorizations to lobby legislative bodies (e.g. the CTC) to revisit program standards, to address gaps in teacher readiness related to ITP knowledge.
3. LAUSD to offer continuing education on the ITP process (consisting of a complete breakdown of the ITP, a look into community resources, and examples of appropriate ITP’s) for all stakeholders.
4. LAUSD to increase funding to support APE teacher engagement in professional development, workshops, and conferences.

**Resource Scarcity**

A scarcity of resources includes the lack of transportation to community resources, minimal community recreation opportunities, and difficulties accessing community environment which adversely impact the ability for students and/or stakeholder to access them. Research suggests schools placing an emphasis on providing supports for the transition process by developing stronger bonds with community stakeholders in order to maximize recreational opportunities for students with disabilities (Meade, 2017). According to table 7, more 60% of LAUSD APE teachers reported lack of transportation and more than 50% reported too few community/ recreational
opportunities available for students as a barrier to the ITP process. Thus, this white paper recommends the following to improve resource scarcity:

1. LAUSD to commission a needs assessment regarding community recreation opportunities for APE programs.
2. LAUSD to partner with local community recreation providers to create a platform to share information about community recreation opportunities (e.g. website, manuals)
3. LAUSD to host regular inter-agency meetings with community representatives allowing for the opportunity to discuss topics like transportation, events, and access to facilities.

**White Paper Summary**

A “transition gap” is present when comparing the post-school outcomes for students with disabilities and their developmentally typical peers. However, federal legislation such as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandates equal opportunity for students with disabilities in the pursuit of school and post-school outcomes. Students with disabilities are provided Individual Education Plans (IEP) which document mandated services, individualized goals, accommodations, and assessment addendums. By the age of 16, qualifying students must receive an Individual Transition Plan (ITP) which contains a statement of necessary transition services and measurable transition goals. Adapted Physical Education (APE) teachers are responsible for the development of recreation/leisure goals and the monitoring of students’ gross motor skill goals for students who have APE services in their IEP.
Unfortunately, APE teachers have expressed a lack of knowledge and participation when it comes to the ITP process which raises concerns for students’ post-school outcomes. Given the concern expressed by current literature and APE teachers regarding the lack of knowledge and/or participation in the ITP process, this white paper reports the state of affairs in LAUSD. This white paper (i.) evaluates LAUSD APE teacher involvement in the ITP process, (ii) identifies the barriers that impede their inclusion in the ITP process, (iv) identifies the opportunities that may promote their inclusion in the ITP process, and (vi) provides recommendations to APE teachers and administrators that optimize APE teacher involvement in the ITP process.

A 32- question survey was distributed to all APE teachers in LAUSD with an email accessible via LAUSD school websites (n=23). A response rate of 83% (n=19) was achieved. Nineteen barriers were reported by respondents. These barriers have been categorized as follows: Stakeholder Engagement, Budgetary Constraints, Teacher Readiness, and Resource Scarcity. Ten opportunities were reported by respondents. These opportunities were categorized as follows: Stakeholder Engagement, Teacher Readiness, and Resource Availability. Grounded in research and the data presented in this white paper, 12 actionable recommendations to mitigate the 19 reported barriers and promote the 10 opportunities for APE teacher involvement in the ITP process are offered.
CHAPTER 5

Project Reflection

In this chapter I will reflect on my project experiences. This will be structured into the reflection on project antecedent, the creation of the project, and the overall project experience.

Reflection on Antecedent of Project

The inspiration for this project came from the same driving force that created the curiosity that attracted me to Adapted Physical Education. In 8th grade I lost my best friend due to heart complications. In elementary school I would occasionally go to my friend’s alternative PE class (not knowing that it was called APE) and I remember us having the time of our lives pushing each other on scooter boards, playing with instruments, and engaging in activities that I never did in my General Physical Education (GPE) class. As a kid, I never thought of my friend as different, I never questioned why he looked different, why he had a huge scar in the middle of his chest, why he would miss school for annual hospital visits, and why he wouldn’t participate in GPE with everyone else. One thing was for sure, his APE class was fantastic and he always had a great time in it. In 8th grade at age 13, my best friend was airlifted to the hospital due to heart complications in an attempt to get him the immediate medical treatment he needed. Unfortunately, his body succumbed to this heart’s complications on the flight and he did not make it to the hospital. Through this painful and traumatizing event came a curiosity into the life that my best friend wasn’t able to reach. Since my best friend passed away at the age of 13, transition skills were not a part of his IEP because, in California, the earliest age that transition skills can be integrated into an IEP is age 14. Once introduced
to the field of Adapted Physical Education in Cal Poly Pomona I knew that it was the field meant for me. Through this I could give other students the same great experiences my friend and I had when we were pushing each other on scooter boards in his APE class.

The inspiration for this project comes from the life of Alex because he didn’t reach the minimum age to start a transition plan in his IEP. My curiosity in the transition process ignited from investigating what he had left in his educational journey. Sure enough, as I begun to delve deeper into the transition process, I was presented with numerous articles mentioning the difficulties teachers had in it. Among these articles was Dr. Krueger’s Masters’ thesis titled “Obstacles Adapted Physical Education Specialists Encounter When Developing Transition Plans.” Ultimately, this article would become the foundation of my current Master’s Project. This journey lead me on a hunt to discover whether or not the obstacles and opportunities listed in Dr. Krueger’s study still applied APE teachers in LAUSD over 20 years later.

My curiosity was certainly fulfilled as I became far more familiar with the transition process than ever before. After immersing myself over the span of several months in dozens of peer reviewed papers regarding the transition process I learned how often teachers and admin overlook it, the lack of preparation APE teachers felt when facing it, and what can be done to mitigate barriers APE teachers face in it. Overall, my curiosity led me down a road of deep concern for APE teachers but it also presented a moment of opportunity.
Reflection on Creation of the Project

This project started with a very different path in mind. With the help of my project committee chair I was able to decide on a final path for my Masters’ project. The original path and changes made to this project will be discussed in the following order.

1. Focus on students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)
2. Have Chp.4 be a Report of Only Barriers
3. Use CAHPERD and NAPEC conference to distribute surveys
4. Contact only APE teachers
5. To be completed by Fall of 2021

Focus on students with ASD

Originally, I started this project with ambitions to focus on the barriers APE teachers face when developing transition plans for students with ASD. The reasoning for this was because, from my personal experience, ASD was the most common disability category I encountered among students who qualified for APE services. From my personal experience I thought it’d be a great idea to focus my efforts on students with ASD. Fortunately, with further research and input from my committee I discovered that ASD was not the most common disability category present in schools. Additionally, it was concluded that the reach of this project would be far greater if it applied to APE teachers of all students with disabilities who receive IEP and ITP services.

Initially, the broadening of my focus from students with ASD to students with disabilities was daunting because of the far greater reach. However, as my project progressed, I became aware that this is not a challenge faced solely by APE teachers who teach students with ASD. In fact, I came to realize that focusing my project on APE
teachers who teach students with ASD would not be truly representative because students that fall under any one of the 13 disability categories will qualify for IEP services. Additionally, APE teachers are not confined to teach only students with ASD. As a result, my impression and the focus of my project shifted.

**Have Chapter 4 be a Report of Only Barriers**

Currently, my Chapter 4 is a white paper analysis focused on discussing the barriers and opportunities reported by LAUSD APE teachers. Originally, instead of using the format of a white paper analysis, my Chapter 4 was going to simply report the findings of my surveys and once I defended my project I would present my findings at a conference. After discussing it with my committee, it was decided that the white paper analysis would carry more depth than a simple presentation of findings. Additionally, rather than only presenting at a conference the white paper analysis would be distributed to LAUSD and/or neighboring school districts in order to spread the findings and the recommendations to mitigate the barriers and promote the opportunities. I felt that this change of direction would benefit this project greatly because it provided more meaning, more data, and solutions instead of only highlighting the issues.

**Use NAPEC and CAHPERD conference to distribute surveys**

The 2020 CAHPERD and NAPEC conferences presented an optimal setting to recruit APE teachers into taking the survey and to spread the links and QR codes. The plan was to post flyers containing a QR code and URL that would direct the participants straight to the survey. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic made this impossible because both NAPEC 2020 and CAHPERD 2021 were in digital format in adherence of social distancing protocols. After brainstorming, the alternative method to distribute the
surveys was to compile a master list of all junior high and high schools in LAUSD and a list of all LAUSD APE teachers with their contact information. From there, I would email every LAUSD PE teacher the same link and QR code that would have been posted on the flyers at NAPEC and CAHPERD with the hopes of them responding.

This method resulted in 21 APE teachers completing in the surveys of which 19 met the inclusion criteria. Although I had hoped for a larger sample size, given LAUSD’s massive size, the distribution of surveys via school email would prove effective as this method would yield a sample size of 19 which is near the sample size of 20 school employees recruited by Dr. Krueger in her 1998 study.

Contact only APE teachers

In total, LAUSD consists of 463 schools that are either junior high or high schools. Of those 463 schools 24 provided a method of communication with an APE teacher via their websites. This presented a problem because it was highly unlikely that all 24 emailed APE teachers would respond to the initial email sent. After discussions with my committee, it was decided that 145 PE teachers (PE teachers whose contact information was found on their school website) would be emailed message to be forwarded to the APE teacher who serviced students at their school. The email provided to the PE teacher would contain a QR code and a URL that would be forwarded to the APE teacher of that school with the hopes of increasing the sample size. Ultimately, the extra effort resulted in a sample size of 21 survey respondents of which 19 met the inclusion criteria.
Reflection of Overall Project Experience

Moving onto the reflection of my overall experience in this project, I was excited to start this project, find my sources, gather my data, review my data, present my results, and defend my project as quickly as possible. Although it looked great on paper, the process did not go as smoothly as planned. My initial project committee chair had to take time off due to personal reasons which placed a brief pause in the genesis of my project. Not long after, I was given a new temporary project committee chair (who would later become my permanent project committee chair) and we hit the ground running. As time progressed and the revisions continued, I began to realize that the timeline I had established was not realistic. I began to realize that this project was going to take longer than I anticipated.

The realization that this project was going to take longer than expected was daunting to me. This led me to experience anxiety, occasional panic attacks, self-doubt, and lack of motivation. During the bulk of this project (Chapters 2, 3, and 4) I would spend more time trying to relax myself than I would in working on my project. Something needed to change. The focus of this project quickly shifted from focusing on APE teachers’ barriers in the transition process to overcoming my own personal barriers. With the help of my committee, I was able to progress consistently at a slower pace via a systematic approach. With this systematic approach, I was allotted significant time to complete each section of the project which allowed me time to compose myself. Suddenly, I was back on track.

Consistent revisions and feedback from the committee established a clear path for the project. Originally geared towards reporting solely on the barriers APE face in the
transition process, the project would now present the opportunities (best practices) and provide recommendations on how APE teachers can mitigate the reported barriers, and promote the reported opportunities. This added greater meaning to my project and consequentially rid me of my fear of predetermined timeline transcending it into determination and ambition of creating a quality product. My project was finally coming together and I had the motivation that I needed to continue pushing forward. Overall, the greatest obstacle throughout this project has been myself. This project led me to educate myself substantially on information regarding ITP’s, IEP’s, and legislature regarding students with disabilities (section 504, ADA, IDEA, and SERR). Although it was initially overwhelming, as the project came to a close the laws and regulations, the articles regarding IEPs and ITPs, and the analysis of survey data have become tools in my role as a special educator. Now, as a full-time APE teacher, I conclude that the information I have learned and the personal growth I have experienced throughout this process is extremely invaluable.

**Professional Growth**

I began this project as a student at Cal Poly Pomona (CPP) in 2020 with a fresh provisional teaching credential and APE added authorization granted to me. Now, at the conclusion of my project I am a district employed full-time APE teacher who has just completed their first year of teaching.

At the beginning, my teaching philosophy in APE was grounded in the coursework I had completed and the experiences I had volunteering at CPP. I understood the importance of the IEP and what I had to do as an APE teacher to fulfill APE services for students who qualify for them. My teaching philosophy as a result, revolved around
teaching the fundamentals of skills, applying them in competitive settings when appropriate, and having students engage with their peers as much as possible. Reflective of the curriculum, I wanted to make sure students learned the components of motor skills and were able to apply it in a real-world sport setting.

After completing this project in 2023, my teaching philosophy maintains its beliefs in fundamentals, competitiveness, and socializing among peers. However, my project led me to immerse myself in the literature relating to APE teacher involvement in the ITP process. As a result, I extended my philosophy to include students participating in activities that would prepare them for a real world setting outside of school. This encompasses activities practiced in the general physical education setting, engaging with their developmentally typical peers, and learning to advocate for themselves. Overall, this project fueled my passion for teaching and reminded me the importance of preparing students for post-school outcomes which include but are not limited to, community recreation, vocational institutes, colleges or universities, and employment.

**Future Lines of Inquiry**

In this section, I will address how I would like to progress my research as well as opportunities for others to expand on it. First of all, after successfully defending my project, I would like to present my findings at a conference in my field (e.g., NAPEC). During my presentation I would like attendees to spend the first couple of minutes filling out the same survey included in my study. The purpose of this would be to compare and contrast the survey results of conference attendees to those of my project. Additionally, this would be a prime opportunity for a collaborative brainstorm with attendees via brainstorming apps (e.g., Popplet) to propose their recommendations for overcoming
barriers or promoting opportunities in the ITP process. This will expand the pool of APE teachers from only LAUSD to the whole nation.

In regards to opportunities for other researchers, seldom did I find research pertaining to the attitudes and experiences reported by community representatives that provide services to students with disabilities. Also, there is an opportunity to compare survey results from other school districts and/or other member of the IEP/ITP team both in and out of California since my project focused on the barriers and opportunities reported by APE teachers in one school district.
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Purpose of the Project: In my graduate program at Cal Poly Pomona, I (Alejandro Chavez) am conducting a project to examine APE teacher’s experiences in the transition process for students with ASD. My hope is to identify current barriers that are inhibiting APE teacher involvement in the ITP process and identify opportunities that are enhancing APE teacher involvement in the ITP process. At the completion of my project I intend to develop a set of recommendations and/or best practices to promote increased APE teacher involvement in the ITP process.

Voluntary Status: You have met the requirements for enrollment as a volunteer in the project described above and conducted by the researchers listed above. You are now being invited to participate in this project. Before you can make your decision, you will need to know what the project is about, the possible risks and benefits of being in this project, and what you will have to do in this project. The research team are providing this information in the following consent form. You may also decide to discuss it with your family and/or friends. Some of the language may be difficult to understand and if this is the case, please contact the researcher for an explanation via email at alejandrochavez@cpp.edu. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to indicate your consent at the bottom of this form. Your participation is voluntary. You may withdraw any time without penalty and there will be no loss of any benefits to which you are entitled.

Project Procedures: If you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to complete a short survey about your experiences as an APE. Teacher in the transition process for students with ASD. We expect the survey to take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete. No identifying information will be collected. Your survey responses will be completely anonymous. At the competition of the survey you will be asked if you are
willing to participate in a follow-up interview. If you agree to do so, you will be asked to provide your email address to allow the researcher to contact you. A new consent form will be provided to you for the interview portion of the project.

**Commitment and Compensation**: Your total participation in the survey will take approximately 5-10 minutes. You will not receive financial compensation for participation in the project.

**Possible Risks and Benefits**: It is expected that participation in this project will provide you with no more than minimal risk or discomfort, which means that you should not experience any more difficulty than what would occur in your normal daily life. However, there is always the chance of an unexpected risk. If you feel uncomfortable or distressed, please tell the researcher and he will ask you whether you wish to continue. You can withdraw from the project at any time without penalty by emailing the researcher at alejandroc@cpp.edu. You will not receive any direct benefits from participating in this project. However, your participation is intended to add to the knowledge about APE teachers’ experiences in the transition process for students with ASD. It may benefit other people with similar concerns.

**Confidentiality and Consent**: The investigator and staff involved with the study will not reveal the personal information, which they collect about you. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study -- and that can be identified with you -- will remain private and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Your identity will be kept strictly confidential by removing your name and all identifiers. Once the project is completed, all survey materials will be destroyed. Do be aware, that the results, in either an anonymous or a summarized format, will likely be published or presented at conferences.

**New Information**: During the course of this study, the investigators may discover information that could be important to you. They will notify you as soon as possible when such information becomes available.

**Consent**: Please indicate whether you consent to being a participant in this project by selecting the appropriate option below.

- I consent to participate in the project. I understand that my participation in this project is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the project at any time without penalty. (1)

- I do not consent to participate in this project (2)
Q1 I hold a valid APE Added Authorization that is valid in California.

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If I hold a valid APE Added Authorization that is valid in California. = No

Q2 I am currently employed as an APE Teacher in a Middle or High school in LA Country School District

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If I am currently employed as an APE Teacher in a Middle or High school in LA Country School District = No

Q3 I currently have at least one student with Autism Spectrum Disorder in my caseload

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If I currently have at least one student with Autism Spectrum Disorder in my caseload = No

End of Block: Eligibility Criteria

Start of Block: Demographic Information
Q4 I earned my Teaching Credential while studying at _______ (please select one).

- California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA) (1)
- California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) (2)
- California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) (3)
- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (CPP) (4)
- Azusa Pacific University (ASU) (5)
- Other (6) ________________________________________________

Q5 I earned my APE Added Authorization while studying at _______ (please select one).

- California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA) (1)
- California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) (2)
- California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) (3)
- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (CPP) (4)
- Azusa Pacific University (ASU) (5)
- Other (6) ________________________________________________

Q6 I identify as....

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Non-binary / third gender (3)
- Prefer not to say (4)
Q7 I am...

- 21-30 years old (1)
- 31-40 years old (2)
- 41-50 years old (3)
- 51-60 years old (4)
- over 61 years old (5)

Q8 I have _____ years of teaching experience

- 0-5 years (1)
- 6-10 years (2)
- 11-15 years (3)
- 16-20 years (4)
- over 20 years (5)

End of Block: Demographic Information

Start of Block: Your Experiences of the ITP Process

Q9 When developing ITP’s, I have found the following to be serious barriers:

Click the bubble on the scale that best represents your answer to the statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (2)</th>
<th>No Opinion (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of transportation available to students during off-school hours (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adapted equipment in the community sector (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Activity fee that parents/caregivers are unwilling to pay (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My insufficient knowledge of community resource. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration between school and community resource personnel. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge of what my role should be in the transition plan. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experience in writing Individualized transition plans (&lt; 4 ITP's in the past 4 years) (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inability to provide individualized instruction based of needs of student. All activities become group activities. (8)

Student is not allotted sufficient time in the community setting to allow for successful transition. (9)

Negative attitudes/anxiety of community resource personnel. (10)

Community agencies/programs that resist inclusion of students with disabilities. (11)

Too few community recreation opportunities to allow for choice (12)

Lack of accessibility (ramps, elevators in community environments) (13)
Social Isolation of student from peers (No companions to recreate with) (14)

Student's lack of prior exposure to transition activities (15)

Students lack of functional skills necessary to experience success in activity. (16)

Student's lack of communication skills (verbal, sign language, facilitated communication) to express interests and choices) (17)

Lack of parent/caregiver support and involvement in the plan. (18)

Budget restrictions (equipment, specialist's support/service time, transportation) (19)

Other: (20)
Q10 I would be interested and willing to participate in a follow-up interview about my experiences in the ITP Process

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q11 Please provide your name and email address to allow me to contact you to arrange the follow-up interview. This information will remain confidential.
APPENDIX B

Informed Consent (Interview) and Interview Guide

You are being invited to participate in a research project, which the Cal Poly Pomona Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed and approved for conduct by Alejandro Chavez. This form is designed to provide you - as a human participant - with information about this project. This consent form describes this project to you and you are entitled to a copy of this form. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, complaints about the informed consent process of this research project, or experience an adverse event (something goes wrong), please contact the Research Compliance Office within Cal Poly Pomona’s Office of Research at 909.869.4215. More information is available at the IRB website, http://www.cpp.edu/~research/irb/index.shtml

**Project Title:** An Examination of Adapted Physical Education Teacher’s Experiences in the Development of Individual Transition Plan’s for Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)  
**Primary Investigator:** Alejandro Chavez  
**Secondary Investigator:** Dr. Lara Killick

**Purpose of the Project:** In my graduate program at Cal Poly Pomona, I (Alejandro Chavez) am conducting a project to examine APE teacher’s experiences in the transition process for students with ASD. My hope is to identify current barriers that are inhibiting APE teacher involvement in the ITP process and identify opportunities that are enhancing APE teacher involvement in the ITP process. I am doing so by collecting data via an online survey and semi-structured interviews. At the completion of my project I intend to develop a set of recommendations and/or best practices to promote increased APE teacher involvement in the ITP process.

**Voluntary Status:** You have met the requirements for enrollment as a volunteer in an interview conducted by the researchers listed above. You are now being invited to participate in the interview phase of the project. Before you can make your decision, you will need to know what the interview is about, the possible risks and benefits of being in this interview, and what you will have to do in this interview. The research team are providing this information in the following consent form. You may also decide to discuss it with your family and/or friends. Some of the language may be difficult to understand and if this is the case, please contact the researcher for an explanation via email at alejandroc@cpp.edu. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form. Your participation is voluntary. You may withdraw any time without penalty and there will be no loss of any benefits to which you are entitled.

**Procedures:** If you agree to take part in this interview, you will be asked several questions regarding your experience in the ITP process, to what degree did you feel prepared, what barriers did you face, and what opportunities were present when engaging in the ITP process. We expect the interview to range from 30 minutes to 1-hour. After the raw data have been collected, all names and identifying information will be removed. Your name and any identifiers (e.g. school names) will be assigned a code number/pseudonym. Only the code number/pseudonym will be left as identifiers.

**Commitment and Compensation:** Your total participation in the interview will take 1-session, which will last up to one-hour. You will not receive financial compensation for participation in the interview.

**Possible Risks and Benefits:** It is expected that participation in this interview may provide you with some risk or discomfort, which means that you will experience slightly more difficulty than what would occur in your normal daily life. This is due to the discussion of sensitive and confidential information regarding schools and school districts. Additionally, there is always the
chance of an unexpected risk. The foreseeable risks in this interview include voluntary participation and disclosure of your provided information. This informed consent form describes the nature of the interview and how the data will be used before it is collected. As a safeguard I will pseudonymize your names in order to protect your identities and I have attained IRB approval before gathering any data. If you feel uncomfortable or distressed, please tell the researcher and he will ask you whether you wish to continue. You can withdraw from the project at any time without penalty by emailing the researcher at alejandroc@cpp.edu. You will not receive any direct benefits from participating in this project. However, your participation is intended to add to the knowledge about APE teachers’ experiences in the transition process for students with ASD. It may benefit other people with similar concerns.

Confidentiality and Consent: The investigator and staff involved with the interview will not reveal the personal information, which they collect about you. Any information that is obtained in connection with this interview -- and that can be identified with you -- will remain private and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Your identity will be kept strictly confidential by removing your name and all identifiers. Once the project is completed, all interview materials will be destroyed. Do be aware, that the results, in either an anonymous or a summarized format, will likely be published or presented at conferences.

New Information: During the course of this interview, the investigators may discover information that could be important to you. They will notify you as soon as possible when such information becomes available.

Consent: I consent to participate in the interview. I understand that my participation in this interview is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the interview at any time without penalty. I have received a copy of this consent form for my records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of participant</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of primary investigator</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Goals of Semi-Structured Interview:

- Build trust with interviewee
- Gain a sense of the overall experience educators have involving the transition planning process.
- Identify barriers that inhibit successful participation in the transition planning process.
- Identify opportunities that promote APE teacher participation in the ITP process.

Theme: Rapport-building/background information

1. I can see from your survey that you have been teaching for X years, what motivated you to become an APE Teacher?

2. What do you enjoy most about your job?

3. What elements of your job do you enjoy the least?

Theme: Experience of involvement in ITP process

- I’m going to switch gears a little now... as you know, I am interested in exploring your experiences of the ITP process.

4. Can you tell me a little bit about your experience in the ITP process been since you began teaching APE?
   a. How many ITP’s have you been part of?
   b. Did you feel prepared for your role on the ITP team?
   c. Did you have the support of your colleagues? If so, how did they support you?
      a. If no, how might you account for or explain this lack of support?

Theme: Preparedness for involvement in the ITP process

5. Do feel confident in your role on an ITP team?
6. Do you feel like you received the appropriate preparation for your role/responsibilities in transition planning?
7. Where did you receive this ‘preparation’ and what did that consist of?

Theme: Barriers to involvement in the ITP process

- I know you provided some insight into the barriers you have experienced in the survey you completed for me, I’d like to explore these in a little more detail now, if that’s ok with you...

8. Are there any barriers that you have experienced in the field that has made it difficult for you to take part in the ITP process? If so, what are they?
   a. What was the most significant barrier for you?
   b. How did you react to this barrier?

9. <Return to their survey and bounce off of the responses provided there>

Theme: Opportunities for involvement in the ITP process

10. Is there anything that you have found or have you adopted any strategies or techniques that have promoted involvement in the ITP process?
    a. If so, what are they?
    b. How did you discover these techniques or strategies?

Theme: Recommendations for best practices

- That’s got me thinking about how we might better prepare future APE teachers for their involvement in the ITP process…

11. What recommendations, if any, do you have for any current or aspiring APE teachers that are having difficulty comprehending or taking part in the ITP process?

Theme: Closure

12. Thank you so much for your time today, is there anything we didn’t talk about in relation to your experiences of the ITP process that you think would be important for me to know as I move forward with my project?

13. Are there any questions you have for me?
APPENDIX C

Sample IEP

Student ID: [redacted]
WA SSID: [redacted]
Date of Birth: [redacted]

Review Individualized Education Program (IEP) Invitation

To: [redacted] Date Sent to Participants: 01/12/2012

PURPOSE: This invitation requests your attendance at a meeting concerning the educational program/needs of your child. You have the opportunity to participate in any meeting regarding the identification, evaluation, educational placement, and the provision of a free appropriate public education for your child.

This is to notify you that an IEP meeting has been scheduled for the above student. Your participation and attendance at this meeting are very important. This Review meeting must be scheduled at a mutually agreed upon time and place. The purpose of this meeting is to (check all that apply):

- Develop an Initial IEP
- Review Current IEP
- Discuss Transition Services
- Discuss Annual Goal Progress
- Consider Termination of Services
- Develop ESY
- Manifestation Determination
- Behavioral Intervention Plan
- Discuss Attendance Issues
- Determine Placement
- Review Instructional Needs
- Discuss Graduation
- Other:

This meeting has been scheduled for: Date 01/17/2012 Time 8:30 AM

Location: [redacted]

The following are invited to attend and participate in the Review meeting:

- Family Therapist
- General Education Teacher
- Parent
- Psychologist
- Special Education Teacher

The parent/adult student or school may invite individuals who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student, including related services personnel, to participate. The determination of the knowledge or special expertise shall be made by the person/party extending the invitation. If you, the parent or adult student, are bringing other individuals to the meeting, please let us know. This will ensure that the meeting space will accommodate all team members.

If you have any questions or would like additional information or assistance to help you prepare for this IEP meeting, please contact [redacted] at [redacted] e-mail [redacted]

Notice of Procedural Safeguards for Special Education Students and Their Families has been provided to parents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Contact Date</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>01/12/2012</td>
<td>01/12/2012</td>
<td>Can Attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>01/11/2012</td>
<td>01/11/2012</td>
<td>Can Attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Individualized Education Program (IEP) Cover Page

**Student's Name:***

**Grade:** 09  **Age:** 15  **Disability (if identified):** Emotional Behavioral Disability

**Parent/Guardian/Adult Student:**

**Parent interpreter needed?**  Yes  No  **Surrogate parent:**  Yes  No

**Home Address:**

**Phone # (H):**

**Phone # (W):**

**Attending School:**

**Is this student's neighborhood school?**  Yes  ☑ No

**Most recent evaluation date:** 01/11/2012  **Plan start date:** 01/17/2012

**Next re-evaluation must occur before this date:** 01/11/2013  **Plan end date:** 01/17/2013

**Date of Plan meeting:** 01/17/2012  **Date student notified of Plan meeting (if transition will be discussed):**

**Primary Staff Contact:**  SC Structured Learning Teacher

**Phone Number:**

---

The list below indicates that the individual participated in the development of this Plan and the placement decision; it does not authorize consent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excused</th>
<th>Name of Participant</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* The student must be informed at least one year prior to turning 18 that the IDEA procedural safeguards (rights) transfer to him/her at age 18 and be provided with an explanation of those procedural safeguards.

**Date informed:** 01/17/2012  **Projected Graduation/Exit Date:** 06/20/2015

**Comments:**

If the parent did not attend, what method was used to ensure their participation:
Team Considerations

Meeting Date: 01/17/2012

PURPOSE: During the IEP meeting, the following factors must be considered by the IEP team. Best practice suggests that the IEP team document that the factors were considered and any decision made relative to each. The factors are addressed in other sections of the IEP if not documented on this page. (For example: see Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance)

- The strengths of the student and the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their child. When motivated, works hard and does quality work. is creative and has a good sense of humor. Communicated she wants the school, home, and family therapist to have good communication to support in school.

- The results of the student's performance on any general state or district-wide assessments. will be taking the HSPE exam this sophomore year.

- The communication needs of the student. In the case of a student who is deaf or hard of hearing, consider the student's language and communication needs, opportunities for direct communications with peers and professional personnel in the student's language and communication mode, academic level, and full range of needs, including opportunities for direct instruction in the student's language and communication mode.

None at this time.

- The student's assistive technology devices and services needs.

None at this time.

- In the case of a student whose behavior impedes his or her learning or that of others, consider, when appropriate, strategies, including positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports to address that behavior. The Structured Learning team develops interventions to address behavioral deficits.

None at this time.

- In the case of a student with limited English proficiency, consider the language needs of the child as such needs relate to the child's IEP.

None at this time.

- In the case of a student who is blind or has a visual impairment, provide for instruction in Braille and the use of Braille unless the IEP team determines, after an evaluation of the student's reading and writing skills, needs, and appropriate reading and writing media (including an evaluation of the student's future needs for instruction in Braille or the use of Braille), that instruction in Braille or the use of Braille is not appropriate for the student.

has a prescription for reading glasses. At this time, does not wear reading glasses in school.
Student ID: [redacted]
WA SSID: [redacted]
Student ID: [redacted]
Date of Birth: [redacted]

Present Level of Educational Performance

Meeting Date: 01/17/2012

PURPOSE: The Present Level of Educational Performance describes the effects of the student's disability upon the student's involvement and progress in the general curriculum and area(s) of need. This includes the student's performance in academic achievement (reading, math, communications, etc.) and functional performance (behavior, social skills, daily life activities, mobility, extra-curricular activities, etc.) in objective terms. Test scores, if appropriate, should be self-explanatory or an explanation should be included. For preschool students, this section should include how the student's disability affects the student's participation in appropriate activities. There should be a direct relationship between the present level of educational performance and the other components of the IEP.

Social/Emotional

[redacted] continues to struggle with following staff requests or directions. [redacted] will almost always say "no" or shake his head to communicate that he does not want or will not do what staff is asking. After [redacted]'s initial refusal to comply, he complies with staff 5/10 opportunities.

[redacted] has been doing a good job of handling frustration and conflict without aggression. [redacted] comes to staff and asks for help when he is having a conflict with a peer. On two occasions this school year, [redacted] has pushed a chair over in frustration. On both occasions, [redacted] eventually picked the chair up and apologized for his behavior. [redacted] is currently resolving conflict without aggression 9/10 opportunities.

[redacted] has been very reluctant to participate in group academic activities. He prefers working independently with staff support. At this time, [redacted] participates in group classroom activities 3/10 opportunities.

Academic

Math

[redacted] is completing a 6.0 grade math curriculum this year. He has demonstrated he can use a calculator to solve 6.0 calculation problems accurately 8/10 opportunities. Fluency has not been an issue and the IEP team recommends dropping this measurable skill.

[redacted] has been independently completing 6.0 grade level word problems accurately 5/10 opportunities. [redacted] lacks some confidence and often asks for help when he could have solved problems independently. With minimal help, [redacted] is often able to ask questions to confirm his thinking, and then goes on to accurately solve the problem.

Reading

[redacted] has been very reluctant to read silently or aloud this school year. For a time, [redacted] was reading 1:1 with staff in an alternative location. This intervention worked well for 2 months. Then, [redacted] demanded staff do most of the reading aloud while he listened. At this time, [redacted] needs support in whole group reading, but he refuses to read aloud and rarely follows along reading the book while others read aloud. [redacted] is currently reading 60 WCPM at the 6.0 grade level. [redacted] is able to answer comprehension questions at the 6.0 grade level 75% of the time.

Writing

When completing daily reading logs, [redacted] is able to write sentences using correct punctuation and capitalization 80% of the time. When asked to write a paragraph response for his scrapbook or other English assignments, [redacted] most often refuses to complete the assignment. [redacted] does best with 1:1 support, but often tries to get the staff to do all the work. At this time, [redacted] writes correct sentences to complete a paragraph with proper content and pragmatics 50% of the time.

Work Habits/Study Skills

[redacted] continues to struggle with completing assignments. When [redacted] is willing to complete an assignment, he always works hard and does a good job. The IEP team has observed that he is very concerned about making mistakes on assignments. He may be refusing to complete some assignments because he is feeling anxious about making a mistake. At this time, [redacted] independently completes assignments 3/10 opportunities.
Present Level of Educational Performance

Meeting Date: 01/17/2012
Secondary Transition

Meeting Date: 01/17/2012

PURPOSE: The purpose of transition planning is to develop a coordinated set of activities designed within a results-oriented process that is focused on improving the academic achievement and functional performance of the student in order to facilitate the student's movements from school to post-school activities, including postsecondary education, training, employment, and if appropriate, independent living skills.

Projected Graduation / Exit Date: 06/20/2015
Comments:

I. Post Secondary Goals/Outcomes

Define and project the desired post-secondary goal as identified by the student, parent, and IEP team in the available content areas. Transition Services may be special education, if provided as specifically designed instruction or related services. These services would be included in the Service Matrix section of the IEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area: Education/Training</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is interested in going to college to complete a degree that would help him achieve his career goal of working in law enforcement.</td>
<td>Transition Services</td>
<td>Staff/Agency Responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area: Employment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is interested in law enforcement and possibly working for the FBI.</td>
<td>Transition Services</td>
<td>Staff/Agency Responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Course of study

A multi-year description of coursework to achieve the student's desired post secondary goals, from the student's current year to anticipated exit year.

is completing a comprehensive course of study to meet graduation requirements.

III. Agency Linkage

The IEP Team recommends the post-school support agencies available for the student listed below. Representatives of any agencies that are likely to be responsible for providing or paying transition services to the student must be invited to the IEP meeting with parent and adult student consent.

** Not appropriate at this time **
Measurable Annual Goals

Meeting Date: 01/17/2012

PURPOSE: IEPs must include a statement of measurable annual goals, including academic and functional goals, designed to meet each of the student's educational needs that result from the student's disability to enable the student to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum. In order to be measurable, the goal should include a baseline ("from"), a target ("to"), and a unit of measure.

Annual Goal: Math

Supports the student's post secondary goals: Yes [X] No [ ]
By 01/11/2013, when given 7.0 grade level word problems, will calculate problems using a calculator improving accuracy from 80% at the 6.0 grade level to 80% at the 7.0 grade level as measured by classroom assessments.

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)
[ ] Written Progress Report
How often will progress be reported? ☑ Monthly [ ] Quarterly [ ] Trimester [ ] Semester [ ] Other:

Annual Goal: Math

Supports the student's post secondary goals: Yes [X] No [ ]
By 01/11/2013, when given 7.0 grade level word problems, will independently solve the problem improving accuracy from 50% at the 6.0 grade level to 80% at the 7.0 grade level as measured by classroom assessments.

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)
[ ] Written Progress Report
How often will progress be reported? ☑ Monthly [ ] Quarterly [ ] Trimester [ ] Semester [ ] Other:

Annual Goal: Reading

Supports the student's post secondary goals: Yes [X] No [ ]
By 01/11/2013, when given 6.0 grade level text, will read aloud or silently improving fluency from 60 correct words per minute to 100 correct words per minute as measured by classroom assessments.

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)
[ ] Written Progress Report
How often will progress be reported? ☑ Monthly [ ] Quarterly [ ] Trimester [ ] Semester [ ] Other:

Annual Goal: Reading

Supports the student's post secondary goals: Yes [X] No [ ]
By 01/11/2013, when given 7.0 grade level text, will answer comprehension questions improving accuracy from 75% at the 6.0 grade level to 80% at the 7.0 grade level as measured by classroom assessments.

Measurable Annual Goals
Measurable Annual Goals

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)
☐ Written Progress Report

How often will progress be reported? ☐ Monthly ☑ Quarterly ☐ Trimester ☐ Semester ☐ Other:

Annual Goal: Social/Emotional/Behavioral

Supports the student’s post secondary goals: ☑ Yes ☐ No
By 01/11/2013, when given a direction from staff, ☐ will comply improving success from 50% to 80% of the time as measured by classroom data.

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)
☐ Written Progress Report

How often will progress be reported? ☐ Monthly ☑ Quarterly ☐ Trimester ☐ Semester ☐ Other:

Annual Goal: Social/Emotional/Behavioral

Supports the student’s post secondary goals: ☑ Yes ☐ No
By 01/11/2013, when given a situation that is frustrating, ☐ will resolve his feelings without aggression improving success from 90% to 100% of the time. as measured by classroom data.

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)
☐ Written Progress Report

How often will progress be reported? ☐ Monthly ☑ Quarterly ☐ Trimester ☐ Semester ☐ Other:

Annual Goal: Social/Emotional/Behavioral

Supports the student’s post secondary goals: ☑ Yes ☐ No
By 01/11/2013, when given an opportunity to participate in group academic activities, ☐ will appropriately work with staff and peers improving success from 30% to 80% of the time as measured by classroom data.

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)
☐ Written Progress Report

How often will progress be reported? ☐ Monthly ☑ Quarterly ☐ Trimester ☐ Semester ☐ Other:

Annual Goal: Work Habits/Study Skills

Supports the student’s post secondary goals: ☑ Yes ☐ No
By 01/11/2013, when given an academic assignment, ☐ will complete the assignment improving success from 30% to
Measurable Annual Goals

80% of the time as measured by classroom data.

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)

☐ Written Progress Report

How often will progress be reported? ☐ Monthly ☒ Quarterly ☐ Trimester ☐ Semester ☐ Other:

Annual Goal: Writing

Supports the student’s post secondary goals: ☒ Yes ☐ No

By 01/11/2013, when given a writing prompt, will write a paragraph with sentences that have correct content and pragmatics improving accuracy from 50% to 80% of the time as measured by classroom assessments.

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)

☐ Written Progress Report

How often will progress be reported? ☐ Monthly ☒ Quarterly ☐ Trimester ☐ Semester ☐ Other:

Annual Goal: Writing

Supports the student’s post secondary goals: ☒ Yes ☐ No

By 01/11/2013, when given a reading log to complete, will write sentences using correct punctuation and capitalization improving accuracy from 80% to 95% of the time as measured by classroom assessments.

How will progress toward this goal be reported? (check all that apply)

☐ Written Progress Report

How often will progress be reported? ☐ Monthly ☒ Quarterly ☐ Trimester ☐ Semester ☐ Other:
Program Accommodations/Modifications and Support for School Personnel

Meeting Date: 01/17/2012

PURPOSE: The purpose of this page is to document the modifications and/or accommodations that the student requires, based on the student’s assessed needs, in order to advance appropriately toward attaining the identified annual goals, to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum, and to be educated with non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate. Accommodations may be in, but not limited to, the areas of presentation, timing/scheduling, setting, aids, and format. The impact of any modifications listed should be discussed. This includes the earning of credits for graduation.

This student will be provided access to the general education, special education, other school services and activities including non-academic activities and extracurricular activities, and education related settings:

- with no accommodations/modifications
- with the following accommodations/modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation(s)/Modification(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration m/d/y to m/d/y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviorally Related: alternative schedule</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>All settings</td>
<td>01/17/2012 to 01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviorally Related: breaks available when frustration level escalates</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>All settings</td>
<td>01/17/2012 to 01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviorally Related: Alternative location to resolve anger/frustration</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>All settings</td>
<td>01/17/2012 to 01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area: Alternative location to complete assignments/texts</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>All settings</td>
<td>01/17/2012 to 01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Modifications: alter weight of class/course tests/exams</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>All settings</td>
<td>01/17/2012 to 01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Modifications: modified assignments for length and/or content</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>All settings</td>
<td>01/17/2012 to 01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Modifications: Extended time to complete assignments/tests/projects without penalty if working appropriately</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>All settings</td>
<td>01/17/2012 to 01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Response: For Writing: Students may use a print or electronic dictionary or thesaurus, spell check and word prediction software with topic specific dictionaries disabled.</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>All settings</td>
<td>01/17/2012 to 01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Response: Mathematics manipulatives and calculator</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>All settings</td>
<td>01/17/2012 to 01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supports for School Personnel (training, professional, development etc):

Program Accommodations/Modifications and Support for School Personnel
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State or Districtwide Assessments of Student Achievement

Purpose: The IEP team makes the determination of what type of assessment the student will take and what administrative modification and individual accommodations are necessary. Accommodations provided on state and districtwide assessments should be those that are provided as part of the regular instructional program.

For Measurement of Student Progress (MSP), High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE), or Washington Alternate Assessment (WAAS) see Guidelines for Inclusion and Accommodations for Special Populations on State-Level Assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Accommodations Modifications</th>
<th>IF YES, List Accommodation(s) and/or Modification(s) by Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State High School Proficiency Exams (HSPE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Prof. Lt. 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mathematics manipulatives and calculator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Prof. Lt. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Prof. Lt. 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>For Writing: Students may use a print or electronic dictionary or thesaurus, spell check and word prediction software with topic specific dictionaries disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Prof. Lt. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Prof. Lt. 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>For Writing: Students may use a print or electronic dictionary or thesaurus, spell check and word prediction software with topic specific dictionaries disabled, Mathematics manipulatives and calculator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Prof. Lt. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Prof. Lt. 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>For Writing: Students may use a print or electronic dictionary or thesaurus, spell check and word prediction software with topic specific dictionaries disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Prof. Lt. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAS Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally-Determined Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Special Education and Related Services**

Meeting Date: 01/17/2012

**PURPOSE:** The information on this page is a summary of the student's program/services, including when services will begin, where they will be provided, who will be responsible for providing them, and when they will end.

**Services 01/17/2012 - 01/11/2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>Service(s)</th>
<th>Service Provider for Delivering Service</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Location (setting)</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>SLC Tchr/Paraprofessor</td>
<td>Structured Learning Tchr</td>
<td>40 Minutes / 1 Times Daily</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>01/17/2012</td>
<td>01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>SLC Tchr/Paraprofessor</td>
<td>Structured Learning Tchr</td>
<td>40 Minutes / 1 Times Daily</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>01/17/2012</td>
<td>01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>SLC Tchr/Paraprofessor</td>
<td>Structured Learning Tchr</td>
<td>40 Minutes / 1 Times Daily</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>01/17/2012</td>
<td>01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Social/Emotional Behavioral</td>
<td>SLC Tchr/Paraprofessor</td>
<td>Structured Learning Tchr</td>
<td>15 Minutes / 3 Times Daily</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>01/17/2012</td>
<td>01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Study Skills</td>
<td>SLC Tchr/Paraprofessor</td>
<td>Structured Learning Tchr</td>
<td>5 Minutes / 3 Times Daily</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>01/17/2012</td>
<td>01/11/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total minutes per week student spends in school:**

- 1000 minutes per week

**Total minutes per week student is served in a special education setting:**

- 900 minutes per week

**Percent of time in general education setting:**

- 10% in General Education Setting
Special Education and Related Services

PURPOSE: The purpose of this page is to document the extent to which the student will be involved and progress in the general curriculum, participate in extracurricular and nonacademic activities and be educated and participate with other special education students and non-disabled students. Other education-related factors that may impact the student should also be considered.

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE):
The student is educated with children without disabilities.
- Special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of the student from the regular educational environment occurs only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.
- The student's placement should be as close as possible to the child's home and unless the IEP of the student with a disability requires some other arrangement, the student is educated in the school that he or she would attend if he or she did not have a disability.
- In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the student or on the quality of services that he/she needs.
- The student with a disability is not removed from education in age-appropriate regular classrooms solely because of needed modifications in the general curriculum.

Placement Options:
Setting 1: 01/17/2012 – 01/11/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Options for LRE</th>
<th>SELECTION</th>
<th>OR REASONS REJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considered</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>(only 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-100% in Regular Class</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%-79% in Regular Class</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-39% in Regular Class</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/private separate day school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Placement by Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student will not participate with nondisabled students in the general education class, and in nonacademic and extracurricular activities, including a description of any adaptations needed for participation in physical education:

The IEP team recommends placement in Structured Learning with integration into the general education setting.

Neighborhood School Explanation:
Placement in a specialized program.

Other Considerations:
1. Transportation: [X] Regular [ ] Special
2. Extended School Year: [ ] Yes [X] No If Yes, must complete ESY form.
3. General PE: [X] Yes [ ] No
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Prior Written Notice

To: [Redacted]  
Re: Student's Name: [Redacted]  
Date: 01/17/2012  

**PURPOSE:** As a parent/guardian of a special education child suspected of needing special education services, the school district is required to provide you with a prior written notice whenever it proposes or refuses to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, educational placement, or provision of a free appropriate public education to your child. This notice should be given to you after a district makes a decision and before action is taken on the decision. The notice should be given to you in a reasonable amount of time before the district takes action.

The purpose of this prior written notice is to inform you that we are:

1. **[X]** proposing [ ] refusing to  
   (mark one of the above)
2. **[X]** initiate [ ] change [ ] continue [ ] discontinue a/an  
   (mark one of the above)

Mark all items below that apply:

3. [ ] Referral  
   [ ] Educational Placement  
   [ ] Disciplinary action that is a change of placement
4. **[X]** Initial Evaluation  
   **[X]** IEP  
   **[X]** 504 Plan
5. [ ] Eligibility Category  
   [ ] Reevaluation  
   [ ] Other:

Description of the proposed or refused action:

Review of the annual Individualized Education Plan.

The reason we are proposing or refusing to take action is:

Required by law.

Description of any other options considered and rejected:

None at this time.

The reasons we rejected those options were:

N/A.

A description of each procedure, test, record, or report we used or plan to use as the basis for taking this action is as follows:

Review of academic and behavioral history.

Any other factors that are relevant to the action:

At this time the student is on a half-day schedule. He has struggled behaviorally when trying to complete a full-day schedule. The IEP team will continue to assess him to determine if he is able to successfully complete a longer school day. The IEP team recommends a gradual increase in his school day as he demonstrates he can be successful.

The action will be initiated on: [Redacted]

Your child has procedural protections under IDEA. These protections are explained in the Notice of Procedural Safeguards for Special Education Students and Their Families. If this prior written notice is given to you (1) as part of your child's initial referral for evaluation, (2) as part of a request for reevaluation or (3) notice to you regarding disciplinary action that constitutes a change of placement the procedural safeguards accompanies this notice. If a copy of the Notice of Procedural Safeguards for Special Education Students and Their Families is not enclosed and you would like a copy or you would like help in understanding the content, please contact: [Redacted] at [Redacted]

Notice of Procedural Safeguards for Special Education Students and Their Families has been provided to parents/guardians.
Prior Written Notice

To: [Redacted]  
Re: [Redacted]  

Date: 01/17/2012  

PURPOSE: As a parent/guardian of a special education child suspected of needing special education services, the school district is required to provide you with prior written notice whenever it proposes or refuses to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, educational placement, or provision of a free appropriate public education to your child. This notice should be given to you after a district makes a decision and before action is taken on the decision. The notice should be given to you in a reasonable amount of time before the district takes action.

The purpose of this prior written notice is to inform you that we are:

1. [Redacted] to [Redacted]
2. [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted]

Mark all items below that apply:

3. [Redacted]
   Initial Evaluation
   IEP
   504 Plan
   Eligibility Category
   Reevaluation
   Other:

Description of the proposed or refused action:

Review of the annual Individualized Education Plan.

The reason we are proposing or refusing to take action is:

Required by law.

Description of any other options considered and rejected:

None at this time.

The reasons we rejected those options were:

N/A.

A description of each procedure, test, record, or report we used or plan to use as the basis for taking this action is as follows:

Review of academic and behavioral history.

Any other factors that are relevant to the action:

At this time [Redacted] is on a half-day schedule. [Redacted] has struggled behaviorally when trying to complete a full-day schedule. The IEP team will continue to assess [Redacted] ability to successfully complete a longer school day. The IEP team recommends a gradual increase in school day as he demonstrates he can be successful.

The action will be initiated on:

Your child has procedural protections under IDEA. These protections are explained in the Notice of Procedural Safeguards for Special Education Students and Their Families. If this prior written notice is given to you (1) as part of your child’s initial referral for evaluation, (2) as part of a request for reevaluation or (3) notice to you regarding disciplinary action that constitutes a change of placement the procedural safeguards accompanies this notice. If a copy of the Notice of Procedural Safeguards for Special Education Students and Their Families is not enclosed and you would like a copy or you would like help in understanding the content, please contact:

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

Notice of Procedural Safeguards for Special Education Students and Their Families has been provided to parents/guardians.