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RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: POLICY AND FUNDING
That there must be long-term Government commitment to policy development and funding of Transition Support Programs as a priority.

RECOMMENDATION 2: PLANNING AND COORDINATION
Collaboration between the Education Department of Western Australia, the Independent Schools sector, and the Catholic Education Commission be continued and fostered in order to ensure coherent planning and resourcing of the Program and co-ordination between external agencies and schools.

RECOMMENDATION 3: ROLE OF THE TRANSITION SUPPORT OFFICERS
The role of Transition Support Officers should be clarified with clear job description and responsibility statements.

RECOMMENDATION 4: MODEL OF IMPLEMENTATION
That Model 1, involving the employment of Transition Support Officers be continued and further developed. In particular the issue of whether or not it is necessary to have full-time Transition Support Officers in a coordinating role across schools be further investigated.

RECOMMENDATION 5: FURTHER MODEL DEVELOPMENT
That Model 3, involving a Coordinator and specialist agencies, be further developed and evaluated in order to ascertain the suitability of this model.

RECOMMENDATION 6: ROLE OF JOB COACHES
That job coaches be employed to provide on-the-job and work experience support for students with disabilities as a necessary component of Transition Support Programs. The roles and responsibilities of such personnel should be clarified and included in job statements.
RECOMMENDATION 7: INDIVIDUAL TRANSITION PLAN
That the Individual Transition Plan be retained as a central part of future Transition Support Programs.

RECOMMENDATION 8: PARENT/FAMILY INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION PLANNING
That parents and families continue to be included as full participating members of individual transition planning meetings and that strategies and practices be put in place to encourage this.

RECOMMENDATION 9: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
That the Education Sectors should support professional development in the knowledge and skills required for teachers to assist transition from school to community settings of students with disabilities.

RECOMMENDATION 10: FUTURE EVALUATIONS
That future evaluations of Transition Support Programs apply a sampling approach over an extended period of time, including direct data collection within the program and long-term program outcome effects.
1 INTRODUCTION

The "Transition Support Program" described in this report is the Western Australian Transition Support Program for students with disabilities, a pilot program funded by the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) under the Transition Support Component of the National Equity Program for Schools.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Major changes are evident in the expectations for and aspirations of students with disabilities, particularly as they move from school attendance to community options. This has resulted in an increasing focus on the need for policy and program development to support students as they make the transition from school into adult life.

Acknowledgement of the unique needs of students with disabilities when they leave school was noted in 1990 in Western Australia by an inter-departmental working party (Blakeman, Francis, Cain, and Deavins, 1990). They concluded that the prospect that future school leavers would secure community recreational or vocational placement was remote given the waiting lists for these services at that time. The Working Party noted that individual planning is the primary mechanism for linking the students' school program from year to year and to Post School Options regardless of personnel involved.

As part of the initiative to develop a framework incorporating curriculum programs and individual program planning, Dr Barbara Wilcox, a US noted scholar in the area of school-to-work transition, was invited to Western Australia to present a series of workshops and seminars to teachers, parents and others in the field in May 1990. The Education Department of Western Australia
committed resources to develop a curriculum framework in the areas of leisure and recreation, independent living, and career education (Holmes, 1993) and to advance the implementation of programs to cater for the individual needs and priorities for transition to adulthood of students with disabilities.

In 1994, the Education Department of Western Australia, in conjunction with the Non-Government Schools Sector, was funded by DEET to carry out a pilot Transition Support Program designed to improve school to post-school transition processes for students with disabilities. Part of this funding was allocated to evaluate the program as it was being implemented.

The goal of the Transition Support Program was stated as:
...to develop, implement and evaluate a range of strategies to improve the school to post school transition process for students with disabilities attending mainstream schools in a geographical cluster of government and non-government schools.

The objectives of the Program were:
- to provide information regarding possible post school options to parents, students and schools;
- to facilitate the development and implementation of Individual Transition Plans;
- to establish links with work experience employers, service providers, relevant tertiary education institutions and the community;
- to assist schools in locating suitable work experience placements for students;
- to assist students with disabilities to access community programs.

This report describes the evaluation of the processes involved in the Transition Support Program, including stakeholder feedback of the four models of transition that were implemented in the pilot program.
1.2 THE EVALUATION

1.2.1 Purposes of the evaluation

The brief for this evaluation, provided by the Steering Committee, described the purposes of the evaluation as follows:

to evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the program to achieve the set goals and to provide the Transition Support program Steering Committee with a:

1. Descriptive analysis of the program processes and outcomes of the three implementation models, and
2. A comparative analysis of the relative advantages and disadvantages of the models.

The evaluation team met with the Steering Committee and presented a proposed outline for the evaluation based on the following components:

Evaluation purposes to be accomplished across the program models adopted by a descriptive and comparative analysis of:
* the major assumptions and policy frameworks of the program
* the major program stakeholders
* the full range of program methods and processes
* the program outcomes including service utilisation data and qualitative feedback from stakeholders

This evaluation was essentially a process evaluation and was concerned with what actually happens in practice. Owen (1993) noted three major approaches to process evaluation:
1. *Studies of program implementation*: This approach is used when stakeholders need to know about the actual delivery of an existing program.

2. *Guidance for refinement of developing programs*: This approach is used when a program is in the process of formation. Evaluative information is needed to refine the specifications before making the program available for widespread use.

3. *Responsiveness to the needs of practitioners*. This approach is used when practitioners have a professional concern about the quality of program provision at the individual site level. (Owen, 1993, p. 129).

This evaluation was based on the first of these approaches, namely the study of program implementation.

### 1.3 METHODOLOGY

Five evaluation components were identified, with a sixth to take place if considered necessary and if additional resources were provided.

1. Individual Student Activities Record (Appendix A)
2. Individual Transition Support Program Survey (Appendix B)
3. Professional Development Days
4. Literature Review
5. Questionnaires for the Key Stakeholder Groups (Appendix C)
6. Interviews with selected stakeholders.
2 CONSULTATION PROCESSES

Throughout the evaluation, the Evaluation Team met at intervals with the Steering Committee, Teachers involved in the pilot program though professional development days, and regularly with two School Transition Officers.

2.1 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS
An oral presentation of the proposed research methodology was presented to the Steering Committee on July 18 1994 and subsequently accepted by the committee.

A teleconference was also held on September 5 1994 to discuss the program.

One or more members of the Evaluation Team attended the Steering Committee meetings on two further occasions during the last two terms of the 1994 school year. On 7 October 1994 an Interim Evaluation report was presented to this committee. A draft of this final report was discussed at a meeting on April 3 1995 and again on May 22 1995.

2.2 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
The Evaluation Team attended the first of two professional development events on 29 July 1994. On this occasion, the Evaluation Team discussed with Teachers and the Transition Support officers plans for the evaluation and received feedback on the initial survey instrument and activities record keeping procedures.

On September 22 1994, the team attended a further Professional Development session to answer any questions relating to the data collection procedures.
2.3  **MEETINGS WITH TRANSITION SUPPORT OFFICERS**
Throughout the program, regular meetings were arranged between members of
the Evaluation Team and the two transition Support officers to coordinate the
data collection procedures.
3 LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 INTRODUCTION
The transition from school and adolescence to adult life may be difficult for any young person, but for young people with disabilities the transition can be even more problematic. The practical and social limitations of a disability can block the paths commonly followed by non disabled young people: for example, completing one's school education and continuing adult education; finding and holding a job; forming adult relationships; and moving away from home. Many young people with a disability, although they overwhelmingly desire to achieve these dimensions of adult life, are presently not able to succeed in all or many of these areas.

A considerable volume of research focuses on the issue of transition (eg. Hirst, 1983; Disabled Persons' Community Resources, 1991; Ward et al., 1991). The Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI), a branch of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), has issued at least six publications specifically addressing the transition problem for young people with a disability (see for example 1986; 1991). The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) model also attracted a good deal of interest in the early 1980s (Will, 1984a; 1984b). While each research group has a different criteria list for successful transition, all the reports come to the same general conclusion: the transition from education to adulthood, for young people with disabilities, is fraught with difficulties.

The concept of "transition" as we now use it, emerged from the 1960s when a model called Cooperative Work/Study Programs was introduced in the USA. The general goal of these programs was to create an integrated, academic, social and vocational curriculum accompanied by appropriate work experience that was
designed to prepare students with disabilities for eventual community adjustment (Halpern, 1973; 1974; Kolstoe and Frey, 1965).

In the 1970s the career education movement emerged. This was much more general in its implementation. In fact the initial impetus for career education did not even mention people with disabilities. According to Halpern (1992), writing in the US context, "the work/study movement died as an inadvertent consequence of Federal Legislation and regulation and the career education movement was intentionally disowned as a federal initiative. These predecessors left a legacy for the emergence of the transition movement of the 1980s" (p.205).

A major piece of legislation enacted in the US during the early 1990s - the 1990 amendments the Education of the Handicapped Act (PL 101-476) - included a number of provisions that gave additional impetus to transition services for people with a mild disability.

In the development of transition services, the following models have been the most influential.

3.2 OECD/CERI MODEL

The OECD/CERI is a linear model which makes a distinction between the process and phase aspects of transition: The Centre for Educational Research and Innovation describes "The 'process' aspect as referring to the psychosociological development of the individual whereas the 'phase' aspect refers to the pattern of services provided for the individuals during transition" (1986, p.15). Both the processes and phases of transition are sites of problem setting and debate in the transition literature.

The Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI, 1991: 9) divided transition into three stages:
(a) the final years of schooling;
(b) further education and vocational preparation;
(c) entry into work and adult life.

These three transitional stages imply a sequential progression of transition. The practical activities associated with the stages are justified for psycho-social reasons (valuing employment as a vehicle for identity construction, for example). While these stages are not required steps of transition, they are stages that most young people travel through and which help the young people, not only technically to achieve adult status, but psychologically to become an adult.

The Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (1991) proceeded with a list of processes within their three stages. These 'milestones' included both practical goals (eg. productive activity) and more psycho-social goals (such as personal autonomy). The 1991 CERI report summarised them as:

(a) personal autonomy, independence and adult status;
(b) productive activity;
(c) social interaction, community participation, recreational and leisure activities;
(d) roles within the family (p. 137).

In the phase aspect of the model, paid employment is postponed indefinitely as young people are placed time and time again into various work training programs. According to the CERI model, the prolonged work training masked limited employment opportunities. CERI’s solutions therefore required expanded employment opportunities for young people with disabilities; indeed its 1983 report used case studies to explore various options.

3.3 **OSERS TRANSITION MODEL**
The OSERS model acknowledged that the needs of adolescents and adults with disabilities are very complex, with an equally complex service system to respond
to these needs. To quote Halpern (1985) "The OSERS transition model faced this complexity without flinching and then attempts to reduce it to dimensions that are somehow manageable" (p.479). However, Halpern maintained that the authors of this policy seem to be suggesting that the non-vocational dimensions of adult adjustment are significant and important only in so far as they contribute to the ultimate goal of employment. He challenged this position, and offered a revision of the transition model which is reproduced in Figure 1 below.

FIGURE 1
Revised Transition Model


The revised model incorporated three major "pillars": employment, residential environment, and social and interpersonal network. Halpern's argument was that successful living in one's community should be the primary target of transition services. The dimensions of community adjustment included the quality of a person's residential environment and the adequacy of his or her social and interpersonal network, which are considered to be no less important than employment. Halpern argued that the three dimensional portrayal of
community adjustment was intentional. "It is meant to imply that if any of the three pillars are inadequate and do not carry their own weight, then the entire structure is in danger of collapse, and a person's ability to live in the community is threatened" (p. 480).

These two models were particularly influential in the Australian context and became the impetus for transition in the 1980s.

### 3.4 TRANSITION IN THE AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT

Andrews (1991) reported that in 1979 only one third of schools paid heed to vocational education for students with disabilities. However, since the early 1980s transition has become a major area of concern for students approaching the completion of their secondary education.

In May 1986, Australia was requested to host the Pacific Regional Conference in the closing stages of the OECD/CERI International Project on education of young people with disabilities (1983-1986). Throughout the project, the National Steering Committee had seen a two-fold purpose in its efforts:

(a) To provide documentation to the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation in Paris, which could be utilised for international comparison and analysis of common trends and problems. Hence a country position paper and some case studies of innovative good practice in Australia were completed.

(b) To contribute to the development in Australia of services for young people with disabilities through the dissemination of the CERI project material and development of a strategy to assist in improving services and their coordination during the transition period.

The project had an additional objective of formulating a clear, logical statement of how the commonly accepted principles for service provision could be applied in a coordinated manner which would allow many more young people with
disabilities achieve economically and socially viable life styles after their post compulsory school years.

In 1993 DEET funded a project to compile a framework for mapping transition programs (Ross & Kennedy, 1993). The authors reported that these programs were somewhat piecemeal, with many organisations developing programs but in isolation from each other, leading to gaps, overlaps and shortfalls. The various states had pilot programs/projects in place, with NSW having the most advanced of the pilot programs in the NSW Transition Project which began in 1989.

In 1991 the Australian Education Council Review Committee (Finn, 1991), reported on young people's participation in post-compulsory education and training. A major proposal was that:

...further work should be done on initiatives to enhance young people with disabilities participation in post-compulsory education and training, having particular regard to the process of transition. (p.6)

The Committee believed that there should be pilot programs developed to trial the establishment of Transition Coordinator positions in schools in which retention rates are low and in which there are low levels of participation in training and employment. Coordinators would be directly responsible for monitoring the immediate post-school experience of students leaving school.

3.5 Western Australian Context

In the Western Australian context, Blakeman et al (1990) made a number of recommendations, including the following:

1. Endorse the inclusion in Education Support policy documents, of the individual education plan and individual transition plan concept, which formally
include consumers, parents and other service providers as active partners in the decision making process.

2. Endorse the inclusion within Education Support Policy documents, of a curriculum framework which is referenced to a future adult life and community living and encompasses:
   * values and principle;
   * ITPs and the curriculum development process;
   * curriculum resource references; and
   * strategies for designing individualised programs, e.g., elements of work experience, community skills, social skills development and independent life skills;
   * attention to the dissemination of the policy guidelines and curriculum support documents through appropriate professional development activities.

3. Make available the resources to formally extend education support provision for Year 11 and 12 in high school Education Support Centres and, where this is warranted Education Support Units.

Following the Blakeman et al (1990) report the Post School Options program commenced in Western Australia 1991. This was a joint initiative funded by the Commonwealth and State Governments and the Lotteries Commission of Western Australia and was designed to resolve the problems caused by the lack of opportunities for school leavers in Western Australia. Employment and community access options were set up in order to offer individualised funding and service options. The program gives priority to that group of students with disabilities with the highest level of support required for access to employment. Generally, there are no systematic transition planning requirements of special or mainstream schools in Western Australia for young people with disabilities. The extent and detail to which planning occurs depends on the individual school.
In 1993, the Curriculum Development Branch of the Education Department of Western Australia developed the Post-Compulsory Schooling Program for students with disabilities to raise their “competence and confidence level and equip them with the skills to function in integrated post school employment, recreation and leisure, and home and community living environments” (Holmes, 1993, p. 1). In order to achieve this, a curriculum framework was developed and made available for students enrolled in an education support program in one of the following settings: Education Support Schools, Education Support Centres and Education Support Units.

Funding limitations have been a major issue in all these projects. Post-school programs such as Post School Options, and JOBTRAIN were developed to improve the employment prospects of long term unemployed and especially disadvantaged job seekers by providing formal training. People with disabilities are an especially disadvantaged group identified under the Employment Access Program who do not have to fulfil the normal eligibility requirement of being unemployed for six months. Nonetheless, transition programs appear still to be in the pilot phase.
This section provides an outline of the procedures used to collect information about the Transition Support Program processes.

4.1. *Individual Student Activities Record (Appendix A)*  
The Individual Student Activities Record is a record for each student of the time spent by transition support staff in each activity. This recording was completed over 3 periods of time:  
(iii) 7 October 1994 to 9 December 1994  

This data set was designed to provide a description of time spent by staff on student activities within the program in order to identify the major characteristics of the service models adopted and to assess if any changes occurred to the program content over the period of the evaluation.

4.2. *Individual Transition Support Program Survey (Appendix B)*  
This was a survey of Education Department and Non-Government School Sector staff who were involved in the program. The aim was to gather initial data on perceptions of the Program and for them to describe the program models and associated staff roles.

4.3 *Questionnaires for the Key Stakeholder Groups (Appendix C)*  
Towards the end of the school year, a questionnaire was sent to a sample of key stakeholders of the Program seeking qualitative feedback on the efficacy of the Program.
4.4 Interviews
Initially it was proposed that interviews of selected samples of Program stakeholders would take place, but that the need for these would be assessed as the evaluation progressed because of the additional resources required to carry them out. Later it was agreed that the first five components of the evaluation would be sufficient.
One of the tasks of this evaluation was to describe the Transition Support Models that were actually implemented. While the initial brief for the evaluation identified three models, in fact there were four implemented.

5.1 THE PROGRAM STAKEHOLDERS

5.1.1 Description of Students (see Attachment One)

A total of 201 students were involved over the three periods of the program. By the end of the final period, a total of 12 students had left the program, leaving 189 students. Eighteen new students joined the program in the second and third periods.

There was little variability in the classification of students over the three periods as new students entered the program and others exited. By the end of the third period, the majority of students (76.2%) were described by teachers as having an intellectual disability, while 15.9% were reported to have multiple disabilities. Males constituted 57.1% and females 41.8% of the group. Student enrolment ranged from Year 8 to Year 12. A total of 40.8% of students were in Years 11 and 12, that is, in post-compulsory education.

The majority of students (55.6%) in the program were in Education Support Units (classes). A smaller number of students were involved in Education Support Centres (special education facilities within high schools and mainstreamed in option subjects (9%). Two students were involved in home-based education.

5.1.2. Description of Schools

Twenty eight secondary schools participated in the program over two school terms. All schools were grouped into geographical clusters: Northern Metro (5 schools); South-East Metro (6 schools); South-West Metro (5 schools); Bunbury (4 schools);
Albany (5 schools); and Kalgoorlie (3 schools). Eighteen schools were from the Government sector and ten from the Catholic Education system.

By the end of the third period however, data (ie. activity sheets) was only received from 22 of the schools and 146 of the students. The remainder of schools and students were assumed still to be involved in the program although their data had not been sent in. Follow up telephone calls and FAX requests by the TSOs were not successful in obtaining the data.

5.2 TRANSITION SUPPORT PROGRAM MODELS

5.2.1 Description of Schools by Models (see Attachment Two)

By the end of the second period, the type of transition support model used was known for 26 out of 28 schools. By the end of the final period, as mentioned above, 22 schools representing 146 students had returned activity sheets. However, two of these schools (11 students) had not specified the transition support model used and so their data could not be included for analysis. This left the sample size at 20 schools, representing 135 students. One school (one student) utilised more than one model and was counted twice in the data as shown in Attachment Two.

Model 1 One metropolitan cluster of 7 schools and 49 students and another cluster of schools close to a country town involved Transition Support Officers (TSOs). One TSO was employed full-time and another part-time. Their roles included facilitating Individual Transition Plan (ITP) meetings, networking, allocation of teacher relief funds, collation of data for the evaluation, work experience support, providing information on relevant services, professional development and consultation with parents.
Model 2 (6 schools and 46 students) involved class teachers as TSOs. Their role was similar to TSOs in Model 1.

Model 3 (4 schools and 16 students) involved a Coordinator with three contracted specialist agencies to provide transition support, work experience and job placement.

Model 4 (4 schools and 25 students) involved a relief teacher acting as TSO.

5.2.2 Description of Major Activities Within Each Model
The final sample for student data which specified the program model used, represents 20 out of 28 schools (71.4%) and 135 students out of the 189 students in the program (71.4%).

Program activities were divided into nine categories:

1. *ITP Activity*: time allocated to the formulation of each student's Individual Transition Plan, including student, parent and teacher participation and preparation for Individual Transition Plan meetings.

2. *Folio Preparation*: time spent in the preparation and updating of student folios by students and teachers.

3. *Curriculum*: period of time each student was involved in all three curriculum areas of the program's activities: Career Education, Independent Living and Leisure and Recreation.

4. *Work Experience*: time spent by each student in supportive and non-supportive work experience and in work experience interviews. In several cases, the time which teachers spent visiting students on work experience, locating work experience placements and contacting support workers was included in this category.

5. *External Agencies*: amount of time students and teachers spent in contact with one or more external agencies.
7. *Parent Contact*: amount of time provided for parent interviews, parent evenings, telephone calls from the teacher or agency, and general consultations.
8. *Professional Development*: time teachers allocated to Professional Development Days, Cluster Meetings and networking with other transition teachers.
9. *Other*: a small category, which includes undefined activities such as completing evaluation forms.

The nature of the activities in which students took part and the amount of time transition support staff spent on each activity for each student for each service model, is represented in Attachment Three. Attachment Four shows the graphical representation of the percentage of time engaged in each activity type by model.

Attachment Four shows that Model 1 included a significantly greater amount of time to Folio Preparation (52.1%), Curriculum (43.1%), Work Experience (46.6%), Transport Training (58.2%), Parent Contact (59.7%) and Professional Development (60.6%) than any other model. These results are remarkably consistent with those received from evaluations made at the conclusion of the other two periods. Model 3 incorporated the least amount of time to activities, with the exception of Professional Development (39.4%). Allocation of time to ITP activity was only significant for Model 1 (35.4%) and the category Other (51.4%). The other two models used ITPs much less than for the previous two periods. Curriculum, Work Experience and contact with External Agencies were the only activities where a substantial allocation of time was provided in every model.

Attachment Five represents the time attributable to each individual model by activity type (rather than to each activity type by model). From these
calculations we can see that the bulk of activity time for all models was spent on Curriculum Activities and Work Experience-related activities, while all other activity types took up minimal amounts of program time.

5.3 STAKEHOLDER EVALUATION

5.3.1 Description
At the conclusion of the third evaluation period, a questionnaire was compiled and sent to a sample of 40 people from the key stakeholder groups, seeking qualitative feedback on the experience of the program. The four stakeholder groups included fifteen parents of students enrolled in the program, all three agencies, six TSOs and 16 teachers. Questionnaires were distributed across three geographical areas: Country, Northern Metro and Southern Metro. A total of 27 (68%) questionnaires were returned (Attachment Six).

Two types of questionnaires were compiled to address the specific roles and personal opinions of each group. Teachers, TSOs and agencies received a different questionnaire to parents.

5.3.2. Parents
Parent involvement varied considerably between schools. All schools involved parents in ITPs. Some schools apparently had an explicit policy of parent involvement and actively sought this, whilst for others this did not appear to be a high priority.

Eight parents out of 15 responded to the questionnaire. They were all from country areas or northern metro areas and had children in Years 11 or 12, that is in post-compulsory education. A summary of their responses is given below.

• Parents initially found out about the program by letter from the school or post-compulsory teacher. In some cases this was followed up by meetings, parent evenings and workshops.
School and teachers kept parents very well-informed and up-to-date regarding their child's involvement with all of the program activities. Parents were "very happy" with information passed on by the school and the very high levels of support from the school and teachers.

• Parents took an active part in the activities of their children's program. All parents took part in the formulation of ITPs and attended parent evenings. Half of the parents participated in all program activities.

• Parent workshops were commended as being informative, support-giving and "very interesting".

• Work experience received a very positive response from students. Parents remarked that it was "a very enjoyable experience" and "helpful" for their child and that work experience resulted in the development of self-esteem, confidence and "finding out what life is all about".

• Student involvement in the formulation of their own Individual Transition Plans ensured that they were given attainable goals and were happy to accept responsibility for their implementation. Parents also remarked that support from agencies and TSOs was invaluable for their children.

• Independent Living Skills was seen as a very positive experience for students by parents. Learning practical skills such as paying bills, budgeting and washing and ironing, encouraged in them a sense of independence and responsibility. According to one parent, his son is as a result "well-equipped to live independently some time in the future".

• Leisure and Recreation programs allowed students to explore such activities as drama, music and sports (including Disabled Olympics). Parents felt that these activities provided their children with important social/interactive skills, which they might have found difficult before the program began. Not only did they find the activities enjoyable, but they increased their sense of independence and improved confidence and self-esteem.
5.3.3. Agencies

Only one agency responded to the questionnaire. The agency was given the same questionnaire as the teachers and the TSOs. A summary of the agency's responses is given below.

- The agency had benefited from interaction with local schools and students. Work Skills programs at schools had also helped students to be more prepared for work environments when they were registered with the agency.
- For work experience, this agency prepared work experience placements for students, gave on-the-job support and provided support workers. As a result six students had casual or full-time positions.
- Greater agency involvement in ITPs was preferred, with the aim of determining work experience goals at the early stages of the transition process.
- Contact with parents was considered valuable in order to explain the resources available for their children. An information booklet entitled "From School to Work" was created by the agency job coordinator to further describe the process.

The agency identified three problems with the program.

- The agency experienced difficulties in providing 29 students with job support, without the support of teachers.
- The geographical spread of the cluster of schools meant that travel was time-consuming and expensive.
- There was uncertainty about the expectations of the agency within the program.

The agency made several suggestions for improvement of the program.

- Compulsory on-the-job support for every student on work experience.
• Stronger partnerships between schools and agencies.
• Standardised reporting to be required from all clusters at regular intervals.

This agency also reported that “29 students had benefited from their work experience by gaining confidence in their abilities. Their interaction in an adult environment helped develop maturity and a realistic view of life after school”.

A summary of the outcomes for these students is provided below:

- 9 left school;
- 1 has a car detailing traineeship;
- 1 has work packing fish;
- 2 have possible jobs in 1995 from their work experience;
- 1 has work from work experience;
- 1 will be entering TAFE;
- of the students who are continuing in the program, 3 obtained casual work as a direct result of their work experience.

A second agency reported directly to the Department of Education. This agency reported that they had organised work experience for 14 students in the region. They stated that “although these placements had not resulted in paid employment, one student was highly recommended as an applicant for relief work by a local government authority. Another student who had been at a local day care centre was also asked if she could be placed on their relief books, which she gladly accepted”. The agency further reported that small business and government bodies in the area had been “nothing short of fantastic”.

5.3.4 Transition Support-Officers
The role of the Transition Support Officer, as described in the initial survey, entailed:
• chairing meetings;
• facilitating Individual Transition Planning;
• liaising and networking with teachers, agencies and parents;
• financial management of teacher release funds;
• collection of data for the evaluation;
• monitoring and supporting students work experience;
• constructing resource lists of relevant resources;
• preparation for and presentation at Professional Development Days;
• conducting parent evenings and facilitating parent workshops.

Responses to questionnaires were received from TSOs from each of the three areas. One TSO was also a teacher from the Country area, so his feedback has been included in the summaries of both sets of stakeholder responses. A summary of responses of the TSOs is given below.

• All TSOs saw the major benefit of the program in networking with other teachers, students and parents. Each TSO gained great satisfaction from their organisational role in the program, particularly their involvement in "building up a team" amongst teachers, students, parents and agencies. TSOs also benefited from "disseminating knowledge" in such tasks as providing agency links and ITPs.

• Each TSO was highly involved in the area of work experience, mainly to provide additional support to teachers with students on work experience. Two TSOs compiled work experience booklets to distribute amongst parents, teachers and employers.

• TSOs also played a large role in the formulation of ITPs for students in their clusters. An ITP was prepared for each of the 201 students involved in the program. All TSOs saw the benefit of ITPs for teachers, who were able to use them to build a curriculum structure for each student. ITPs
were followed up by two TSOs, and results indicated that "most [teachers] were doing a good job".

- The level of involvement in parent evenings by TSOs was very high. Each TSO organised at least two parent evenings. Transition Support Officers remarked that these meetings were very important in informing parents of the nature of the program, "how they can help", and the type of agency support available for their child. One TSO was involved in parent workshops. The TSO regarded these workshops as a very positive and rewarding experience for teachers, students and parents.

- Two TSOs had a high level of involvement in independent living skills. The nature of this involvement included organising specific activities for the program and in the case of one TSO, helping teachers develop and implement programs and developing a database of recreational activities.

- The organisation of professional development days for teachers from each cluster was a large responsibility for TSOs. Teachers were trained by TSOs in all areas of the program, including the demonstration of ITP meetings, providing suggestions for supporting students on work experience, suggesting program strategies and dealing with problems. This networking received a positive response from teachers.

- Teachers and Transition Support Officers reported that a total of 24 external agencies were utilised in the Transition Support Program, representing a very significant achievement in terms of networking with relevant community agencies.

TSOs each experienced similar problems with the program. Three main problems have been identified.
• The lack of sufficient human resources (i.e., support) to adequately provide for students with high support needs, and to meet heavy clerical demands.

• There was uncertainty of the role of TSOs on the part of both TSOs and teachers at the start of the program, resulting in teachers having unrealistic expectations of TSOs and the responsibilities of the TSO extending too far geographically and physically.

• The lack of material resources, such as computers and office space.

TSOs made several suggestions for improvement of the program. The first suggestion was offered by each TSO. Other responses were made by only one TSO.

• More support is needed in the form of support workers (job trainers) for students on work experience, and access to clerical staff.

• There is a need for a clearly-defined job statement for TSOs.

• There was a need for TSOs "to be located in a manageable geographic area".

• Involvement of Principals in any new schools included in the program.

5.3.5. Teachers
All 16 teachers to whom the questionnaire was sent responded. There was an even distribution of responses according to geographical area: 5 from Country Areas, 6 from the Northern and 5 from the Southern Metropolitan area.

Teachers were asked the nature of the benefits of the program. Benefits are listed from most common to the least common responses.
• Networking with other teachers, schools and students in post-compulsory education. Sharing of ideas and experiences was helpful to most teachers.

• TSOs provided a very important supportive role for teachers: "It made the load seem shared".

• Teacher relief was widely used for additional assistance and support with such activities as placing and organising work experience students, collating work experience data and completing portfolios. This allowed teachers much more time to devote to other class activities and to attend in-servicing.

• Professional development days and were considered very effective in "meeting all teacher needs".

• Liaising with agencies, and the formation of a "close working relationship" with agencies, were very useful to teachers.

• Additional support for parents through parent evenings, workshops and distribution of information on ITPs and post-school options were beneficial.

• Resources including data bases compiled for work experience, resources for parents on the availability of transition services, and data bases on community-based and recreational excursions and activities proved very useful.

• ITPs were perceived to be more goal-oriented and meaningful than "lengthy annual case conferences".
Two teachers gained satisfaction from the successful results of the program, i.e., students leaving school for employment. They were also motivated to begin the program and confident about the guidelines for the program.

Teachers were then asked to indicate their level of involvement, the nature of their involvement, and their personal opinions of several program activities.

75% of teachers had a high level of involvement in the area of work experience. All teachers were involved in coordinating work placements for students (i.e., arranging interviews and workplaces, following up with paperwork, workplace visits, consulting with employers). Most teachers agreed that work experience was the “most important component in the program” and that it provided them with the opportunity “to develop the work and social skills students require”. TSOs, teacher relief and agencies all provided valuable support and assistance for teachers, but some commented that this support was insufficient to cope with the demands of organising work experience. Numerous resources for work experience such as data bases, manuals and brochures were created by teachers for use by teachers, parents, agencies and students.

A total of 10 teachers had a high level of involvement in ITPs and 3 had a medium level of involvement. Each student was set attainable goals via a “workable plan”. Most teachers felt that as parents, students, teachers and TSOs were present at the meetings, “all parties are accountable” and focused. The high level of parent involvement in the program through ITPs was seen as very important, particularly in breaking down some student/parent “barriers” and helping parents understand the aims of the program. Only three schools from the Southern Metropolitan area found it difficult to involve parents in ITPs, leaving the teacher with most of the responsibility for meetings. The involvement of the students themselves in ITPs was significant in developing their responsibility for the plan’s
implementation. Teachers also benefited from ITPs in the planning of a curriculum for each individual student. The advice and “professional” input of the TSO at meetings was regarded as beneficial to teachers.

- The level of involvement of teachers and parents in parent evenings was generally low. Four teachers had a high level of involvement and seven had low to zero involvement. Although there were only five schools where parents showed a willingness to attend parent evenings, they were of great benefit to the parents in “realising their part in the Transition process”. The remainder of schools had either attempted to organise parent evenings, but attendance had been poor, or had contacted parents through ITPs and day parent meetings (also poorly attended in most cases).

- Teachers had an even lower involvement in parent workshops. Half of the schools surveyed organised parent workshops, six of these were from the Northern Metro area. Workshops were seen as very helpful to parents in “learning how to gradually encourage their children to be more independent at home and how to manage their behaviour in a more effective manner”. They also allowed parents to share common experiences. For one parent, it was “as good as a tonic”. The reasons that most schools did not hold parent workshops are similar to those discussed for parent evenings.

- The majority of teachers had a high level of involvement in independent living skills. Like parents, all teachers agreed that independent living skills was one of the most important activities in the program in terms of improving social skills (forming relationships, communication, interaction), student self-esteem and confidence in coping with life in the community. Many schools have implemented community skills and transport training programs. Work skills and social skills programs were also available in some schools.
Teachers from the Northern and Southern Metro areas stated a medium to high level of involvement in professional development. Those teachers who responded from the Country areas, with the exception of one school, did not specify the nature of their professional development. Responses from the Northern Metropolitan areas regarding professional development were extremely positive. All teachers commented on the value of networking, Professional Development Days, district meetings and the TSO whose "expertise and wide experience has been so generously shared". Teachers from Southern Metro areas attended similar in-service and networking, but commented that Professional Development Days became repetitive after the first session.

Teachers had few major problems with the program. Most teachers stated their lack of time as the most pressing problem, i.e., time needed to implement independent living skills, to complete forms, to organise support staff, to spend with TSO and attend network meetings. A few teachers found it difficult to contact TSOs who were "spread too thinly across schools".

Late entry into the program for some schools was a problem for two teachers. Other problems were specific to a particular school and thus not reported here.

Teachers suggested improvements that they would like to see in the program, the first being suggested by most teachers. Other suggestions have been made by only one or two teachers.

More support is needed to train and support more students with average and high support needs in the work experience program. The employment of a full-time Social Trainer for those students with high support needs, additional relief teachers and support workers were seen as crucial.
• Increasing the time for networking with other transition staff and professional development was suggested. One teacher suggested the formation of a “Transition Club” to link social networks from North and South of the river.

• Only transition teachers should teach transition classes.

• TSO should be supplied with a mobile phone.

• Simplification and centralised data collection of all forms.

• TSOs to run ITPs.

• Centralised work placement listings to be held by TSO.

• Individual students to decide on which model best fits their specific requirements.

5.3.6. Summary of Stakeholder Evaluation
It can be concluded from these responses that the great majority of parents, TSOs, teachers and the agencies were highly supportive and displayed a significant level of involvement in the program. Feedback indicated that each stakeholder group was satisfied with the implementation, content and results of the program and wished to see it continue in the future. The role of the TSO was seen as instrumental to the success of the program. All parties perceived similar benefits of the program for students, mainly in terms of improving self-esteem; encouraging independence through work experience, independent living skills and ITPs; and in promoting relationships with other students, teachers, parents and agencies. According to parents, students benefited greatly from these experiences.
Regular contact and networking between all four groups ensured that an adequate support network existed throughout the program, particularly in regard to parent support. However, teachers, TSOs and the agency perceived several problems and improvements which could be made to strengthen this support network. Clearly, significant increases in additional support for students, teachers, TSOs and agencies is necessary. More support is needed in the form of trained support workers, relief teachers and clerical staff. They would provide on-the-job support for students on work experience; support for those students with high support needs; and would be able to formulate and update student and work experience databases.

Although parents had clear expectations of their role in the program, guidelines needed to be established at the beginning of the program for teachers, TSOs and agencies. There was a considerable amount of confusion and inconsistency regarding the exact nature and expectations of their roles in the program. The same set of guidelines needs to be implemented across the whole program, ensuring that all program tasks are shared equally and fairly and ensuring maximum support for all involved. This is particularly pertinent to the role of the TSO, who was left with many of the responsibilities for tasks which others could have completed (e.g. clerical work). This problem could be addressed by having more than one TSO for each cluster and limiting the responsibility of each TSO to a smaller, more manageable geographical area.
6 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section, the limitations of the methodology that was used in the evaluation will be discussed and recommendations based on the findings will follow.

6.1 LIMITATIONS OF THE METHODOLOGY

This evaluation was necessarily limited by a number of constraints, including the fact that it was designed as a process evaluation, was restricted in duration and there was incomplete data from some stakeholders.

6.1.1 Process Evaluation

This evaluation, as a process evaluation, was concerned with what happens in practice and as a consequence does not provide substantial information about the outcomes of the Transition Support Program. While it would have been possible to obtain some outcome information during the period covered by this evaluation, such data would have been significantly limited because it would not have portrayed the long term effectiveness of the program. Such outcome data would have to be collected over at least two years to provide a realistic picture of the outcome for students with disability of their transition from the school system to the community.

6.1.2 Restricted Timespan

This evaluation took place between July and December 1994. It did not cover the planning stages of the Transition Support Program, nor the decision-making processes that were the basis for the development of the transition models. Consequently, the findings of this evaluation are restricted to the implementation stage of the program in the second half of 1994.
6.1.3 Incomplete Data

The findings of this evaluation do not include all the data that was sought. Three sources of data were incomplete:

- Teachers returned Activity Sheets for 135 out of 189 students, 71%. The Activity Sheets for the third period of data collection from the South West and Southern Metropolitan Districts were not returned.

- Questionaries were returned by seven parents and two agencies. This data was sought from the South West and Southern Metropolitan Districts.

Data for the third period was due for submission near the conclusion of the school year and thus competed with demands in a busy time. Many of the problems resulting from incomplete data could have been overcome if there had been continuity of employment of Transition Support Officers. Much of the data for the third period was received in early 1995 and was sent through the Transition Support Officer who was still operating as such. However this was not the case in all other areas.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: POLICY AND FUNDING

*That there must be long-term Government commitment to policy development and funding of Transition Support Programs as a priority.*

The response to transition issues for young people with disabilities in Australia has been described as piecemeal, lacking policy and program development and committed funding, with transition programs still in the pilot phase (Andrews
This situation is still apparent in Western Australia where the funding for the 1994 Transition Support Program was based on a grant from DEET as a pilot project. There is a need for clear policy and funding commitments for transition programs on an ongoing basis. The issue of whether such funding should be wholly State or a combination of Commonwealth and State should be addressed as a matter of urgency if these programs are to be continued and effective.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: PLANNING AND COORDINATION**

Collaboration between the Education Department of Western Australia, the Independent Schools sector, and the Catholic Education Commission be continued and fostered in order to ensure coherent planning and resourcing of the Program and co-ordination between external agencies and schools.

Program issues included the perception of a need for a stronger partnership between external agencies and schools and clearer expectations of their respective roles. Transition Support Officers required more material support and clerical backup. Resources were generally considered to be spread too thinly. There was a need to further develop resource material to support the Program. The current mechanism for forward planning is the Transition Support Program for Students with Disabilities Steering Committee, including representatives from the three education sectors.

**RECOMMENDATION 3: ROLE OF THE TRANSITION SUPPORT OFFICERS**

The role of Transition Support Officers should be clarified with clear job description and responsibility statements.

It was clear that there was uncertainty on the part of both TSOs and teachers at the start of the program concerning the role of the TSO. Some teachers had unrealistic expectations of TSOs and the TSOs indicated that their roles were never entirely clarified. There was also concern that the responsibilities of TSOs extended too far geographically.
RECOMMENDATION 4: MODEL OF IMPLEMENTATION

That Model 1, involving the employment of Transition Support Officers be continued and further developed. In particular the issue of whether or not it is necessary to have full-time Transition Support Officers in a coordinating role across schools be further investigated.

In Model 1 the Transition Support Officer’s role included running Individual Transition Plan (ITP) meetings, networking, allocation of teacher relief funds, collation of data for the evaluation, work experience support, providing information on relevant services, professional development and consultation with parents. This model was characterised by utilising more activities time in the categories of professional development, parent contact, transition training, folio preparation and work experience. Overall, Model 1 appeared to best fit the program’s stated objectives.

RECOMMENDATION 5: FURTHER MODEL DEVELOPMENT

That Model 3, involving a Coordinator and specialist agencies, be further developed and evaluated in order to ascertain the suitability of this model.

We believe it is premature to discount the effectiveness of Model 3 (Coordinator with specialist agencies) without further development of the Model. The performance of the Model was influenced by spreading the specialist agency over too wide an area, giving responsibility for too many students, communication difficulties and the need to trial the Model more widely.

RECOMMENDATION 6: ROLE OF JOB COACHES

That job coaches be employed to provide on-the-job and work experience support for students with disabilities as a necessary component of Transition Support Programs. The roles and responsibilities of such personnel should be clarified and included in job statements.
It was also considered essential that students be provided with on-the-job support during work experience. Support to students for off-campus activities is a necessary component of successful transition programs.

**RECOMMENDATION 7: INDIVIDUAL TRANSITION PLAN**

*That the Individual Transition Plan be retained as a central part of future Transition Support Programs.*

**RECOMMENDATION 8: PARENT/FAMILY INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION PLANNING**

*That parents and families continue to be included as full participating members of individual transition planning meetings and that strategies and practices be put in place to encourage this.*

**RECOMMENDATION 9: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

*That the Education Sectors should support professional development in the knowledge and skills required for teachers to assist transition from school to community settings of students with disabilities.*

**RECOMMENDATION 10: FUTURE EVALUATIONS**

*That future evaluations of Transition Support Programs apply a sampling approach over an extended period of time, including direct data collection within the program and long-term program outcome effects.*

### 6.3 CONCLUSION

There has been growing recognition of the importance of programs to support transition from school to the community for students with disabilities in Australia since the early 1980s. It is evident from the identified program strengths of the 1994 Transition Support Program that there is also considerable support to continue a Transition Support Program for students with disabilities in Western Australia. It is imperative that Transition Support be continued with strong policy development, adequate funding and resource allocation.
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## ATTACHMENT ONE

### SUMMARY OF STUDENT INFORMATION AT END OF EACH DATA PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>% Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>Period 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>79.78</td>
<td>76.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>57.92</td>
<td>58.47</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42.08</td>
<td>41.53</td>
<td>41.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Enrolment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>35.52</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.S.C.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.S.U.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>57.92</td>
<td>56.28</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Sub./Home</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT TWO

TRANSITION SUPPORT MODEL DETAILS: PERIOD 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Student Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1:</strong> One Teacher as Specialist TSO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>171-175,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64-69,166-167,169-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>160-164,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29-33, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-17,195-196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7564 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49 Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Model 2: Class Teachers as TSOs          | 1           | 8               | 116-123             |
|                                          | 2           | 6               | 72-76,187           |
|                                          | 5           | 11              | 94-104              |
|                                          | 19          | 1               | 183                 |
|                                          | 21          | 9               | 55-63               |
|                                          | 22          | 11              | 40-50               |
| **TOTAL:**                               |             |                 | 3581.5 hr           |
| **6 Schools**                            |             |                 | 46 Students         |

| Model 3: Coordinator with Specialist Agencies | 8           | 6               | 154-159             |
|                                             | 9           | 3               | 124-126             |
|                                             | 16          | 6               | 4-5,7-9,197         |
|                                             | 19          | 1               | 183                 |
| **TOTAL:**                                 |             |                 | 1757.5 hr           |
| **4 Schools**                              |             |                 | 16 Students         |

| Other: Relief Teacher as TSO              | 3           | 16              | 77-78,80-93         |
|                                          | 17          | 3               | 179-181             |
|                                          | 18          | 3               | 1-3                 |
|                                          | 20          | 3               | 188-190             |
| **TOTAL:**                                |             |                 | 4155 hr             |
| **4 Schools**                             |             |                 | 25 Students         |

NB. The following results were obtained from all activity sheets+ returned for Period 3. Each school (except two+) had specified the service delivery model used. 43 activity sheets were not returned at all. The sample represents: 20 schools/28 schools: 71.43%. 135 students/189 students: 71.43%.

+Harvey Agricultural S.H.S. (2 students) and Mandurah S.H.S. (9 students) also returned activity sheets for Period 3. However, none of this data could be used as the service delivery model for these schools was unknown.

* Katanning S.H.S. teachers used a combination of two models. Thus, all data received for the student has been repeated for both models.
## ATTACHMENT THREE

### TOTAL HOURS (%) PER ACTIVITY TYPE FOR EACH SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL FOR PERIOD 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>ITP Preparation</th>
<th>ITP Participation In Meetings</th>
<th>Folio Preparation/Updating</th>
<th>Curriculum: Career Education</th>
<th>Curriculum: Independent Living</th>
<th>Curriculum: Leisure &amp; Recreation</th>
<th>Work Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: One Teacher as Specialist TSO</td>
<td>78 (32.43%)</td>
<td>63 (55.26%)</td>
<td>199 (52.09%)</td>
<td>620 (42.85%)</td>
<td>2198 (42.90%)</td>
<td>1313 (44.07%)</td>
<td>999 (50.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: Class Teachers as TSOs</td>
<td>32.5 (0.91%)</td>
<td>18 (0.50%)</td>
<td>79 (2.21%)</td>
<td>584 (16.31%)</td>
<td>1110 (30.99%)</td>
<td>669.5 (18.69%)</td>
<td>7 (0.20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3: Coordinator with Specialist Agencies</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.75%)</td>
<td>13 (3.40%)</td>
<td>195 (13.48%)</td>
<td>552 (10.77%)</td>
<td>312 (10.47%)</td>
<td>386 (19.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Relief Teacher as TSO</td>
<td>161 (66.94%)</td>
<td>44 (38.60%)</td>
<td>92 (24.08%)</td>
<td>92 (6.36%)</td>
<td>1263 (24.65%)</td>
<td>685 (22.99%)</td>
<td>596.5 (30.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>271.5 (1.59%)</td>
<td>127 (0.74%)</td>
<td>383 (2.25%)</td>
<td>1491 (8.74%)</td>
<td>5123 (30.03%)</td>
<td>2979.5 (17.47%)</td>
<td>1988.5 (11.66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL HOURS (%) PER ACTIVITY TYPE FOR EACH SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL FOR PERIOD 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>Work Experience Interview</th>
<th>Supportive Work Experience</th>
<th>External Agencies</th>
<th>Transport Training</th>
<th>Parent Contact</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: One Teacher as Specialist TSO</td>
<td>18 (5.54%)</td>
<td>1404 (52.29%)</td>
<td>78.5 (33.05%)</td>
<td>397 (58.64%)</td>
<td>175.25 (61.55%)</td>
<td>21.5 (60.56%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7564.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: Class Teachers as TSOs</td>
<td>48 (1.34%)</td>
<td>696 (19.43%)</td>
<td>242 (6.76%)</td>
<td>47 (1.31%)</td>
<td>28.5 (0.80%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>20 (0.56%)</td>
<td>3581.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3: Coordinator with Specialist Agencies</td>
<td>80.5 (24.77%)</td>
<td>98 (3.65%)</td>
<td>70 (29.47%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>26 (9.13%)</td>
<td>14 (39.44%)</td>
<td>9 (31.03%)</td>
<td>1757.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Relief Teacher as TSO</td>
<td>179.5 (55.23%)</td>
<td>679 (25.29%)</td>
<td>61 (25.68%)</td>
<td>238 (35.16%)</td>
<td>64 (22.48%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>326 (1.91%)</td>
<td>2877 (16.87%)</td>
<td>451.5 (2.65%)</td>
<td>682 (4.00%)</td>
<td>293.75 (1.72%)</td>
<td>35.5 (0.21%)</td>
<td>29 (0.17%)</td>
<td>17058.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(100%)
ATTACHMENT FOUR

For each activity, % of time attributable to each model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ACTIVITY</th>
<th>ITP ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FOLIO PREP.</th>
<th>CURRICULUM</th>
<th>WORK EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>EXTERNAL AGENCIES</th>
<th>TRANS. TRAINING</th>
<th>PARENT CONTACT</th>
<th>PROF. DEVELOP.</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL 1</td>
<td>35.38</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>43.06</td>
<td>46.63</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>58.21</td>
<td>59.66</td>
<td>60.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL 2</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>24.64</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68.97</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL 3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>39.44</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>51.44</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT FIVE

% OF TIME IN ACTIVITIES BY MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ACTIVITY</th>
<th>ITP ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FOLIO PREP</th>
<th>CURRICULUM</th>
<th>WORK EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>EXTERNAL AGENCIES</th>
<th>TRANS. TRAINING</th>
<th>PARENT CONTACT</th>
<th>PROF. DEVELOP.</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL 1</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>54.61</td>
<td>32.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL 2</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>65.99</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL 3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>60.26</td>
<td>32.12</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>35.02</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ATTACHMENT SIX**

**END OF YEAR QUESTIONNAIRE: SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
<th>Name of School/Agency/TSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Northern Metro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eastern Goldfields E.S.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newton Moore S.H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esperance S.H.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peel Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSOs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>John Hanczakowski*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Leonora D.H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esperance S.H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Goldfields E.S.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harvey Agricultural*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Albany S.H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The information on this questionnaire form is counted twice, as John Hanczakowski served as both a T.S.O. and a teacher at Harvey Agricultural S.H.S.
CONFIDENTIAL

EDITH COWAN UNIVERSITY
CENTRE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

TRANSITION SUPPORT PROGRAM EVALUATION

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT PERSONAL DETAILS

SCHOOL:

NAME:

ADDRESS:

CONTACT PERSON AND RELATIONSHIP:

ADDRESS (if different to above):

DATE OF BIRTH:

GENDER:

ETHNIC ORIGIN:

TYPE OF DISABILITY (e.g. intellectual, physical):

YEAR/LEVEL OF ENROLMENT:

NATURE OF EDUCATION SUPPORT PROVISION:

DATE ENROLLED IN TRANSITION PROGRAM:

Signed: ____________________________ Date: ________________

Name (Please print) ______________________

Please return to:

Centre for the Development of Human Resources
Edith Cowan University
Joondalup Drive
JOONDALUP WA 6027
CONFIDENTIAL

EDITH COWAN UNIVERSITY
CENTRE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

TRANSITION SUPPORT PROGRAM EVALUATION
INDIVIDUAL STUDENT ACTIVITIES
RECORD No. 1 (25/7/94 - 2/9/94)

STUDENT NAME: 
SCHOOL: 

DATE ENROLLED IN TRANSITION PROGRAM: 

DATE EXITED TRANSITION PROGRAM (if applicable): 

DATE OF ITP MEETING (if held): 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>22-26</td>
<td>29 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Sept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Transition Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folio Preparation/ Updating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with External Agencies (Please Name)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other : Please list over the page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTIVITY TIME KEY: to nearest hour e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 hour / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 hours / week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 hours / week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: ___________________________ Date: _______________________

Name (Please print) ___________________________

Return to:
Centre for the Development of Human Resources
Edith Cowan University
Joondalup Drive
JOONDALUP WA 6027
The purpose of this form is to describe as accurately as possible your role and the way your program is operating. Tow...ds the end of the school year you will receive a questionnaire seeking your qualitative feedback on the program. Please answer those questions that are applicable to your role.

### TRANSITION SUPPORT PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

**TRANSITION SUPPORT OFFICER (TSO)** OR **TEACHER**

Name __________________________

Contact Phone ______ Fax ________

Cluster ________________________

School _________________________

1. **Which service delivery model are you implementing?**
   - [ ] Model One: One teacher as Specialist TSO
   - [ ] Model Two: Class teachers as TSOs
   - [ ] Model Three: Coordinator with specialist agencies
   - [ ] Other (Please describe):

2. **Please briefly describe what your work in the Transition Support Program entails (ie. the actual activities).**

3. **Please briefly describe how each of the following activities (if applicable) is carried out in your program.**

   - 3.1 Individual Transition Plan (ITP)
   - 3.2 Folio Preparation/ Updating
   - 3.3 Curriculum Areas
   - 3.4 Work Experience
   - 3.5 Contact with External Agencies
   - 3.6 Transport Training
   - 3.7 Parent Contact
   - 3.8 Other
4. How do students gain access to your program?

5. Please list any additional resources that you have been allocated for this program.

6. Please describe which external services/resources you utilise and how you do this (if applicable).

7. Please describe nature, extent and issues of family involvement in your program.

8. Please list major strengths and weaknesses that you see in the program at this stage.

Signed: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Name (Please print): ____________________________

Please return (by 23/9/94) to:
Director
Centre for the Development of Human Resources
Edith Cowan University
Joondalup Drive
JOONDALUP WA 6027
CONFIDENTIAL

TRANSITION SUPPORT PROGRAM

END OF YEAR QUESTIONNAIRE

School: ____________________________

This questionnaire is designed to give you an opportunity to provide feedback about your reactions to and how you feel about the Transition Support Program.

What have the benefits of the Transition Support Program for you? (e.g. Teacher Relief etc.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

A list of the components of the Transition Support Program is provided below. For each activity, please indicate your level of involvement and how you felt about the activity.
### Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Transition Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parent Evenings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Parent Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
What problems have you experienced with the program to date?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Please describe any improvements you would like to see in the program in the future.

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Please return this questionnaire by 6th December 1994 to:
Centre for the Development of Human Resources
Edith Cowan University
Joondalup Campus
JOONDALUP WA 6027
FAX 405 5657
Appendix C  End of Year Questionnaire for Parents

CONFIDENTIAL

TRANSITION SUPPORT PROGRAM

PARENT/GUARDIAN QUESTIONNAIRE

School: ___________________________ School Year of Student: _________________

Dear Parent/Guardian

This questionnaire seeks information on your feelings about the Transition Support program in which your child has been involved. This program started in July 1994 in both Government and Non-Government Schools. It is designed to assist students make the transition from school to adult life.

How did you find out about the Transition Support Program?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Which of the following Transition Support Program activities were you given information about?

☐ Work Experience

☐ Individual Transition Plan

☐ Parent Evenings

☐ Parent Workshops

☐ Independent Living Skills

☐ Leisure and Recreation

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
In which of the following Transition Support Program activities did you take part?

☐ Work Experience

☐ Individual Transition Plan

☐ Parent Evenings

☐ Parent Workshops

☐ Independent Living Skills

☐ Leisure and Recreation

Comments:
How did you feel about the level of support the school gave you in relation to this program?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please tell us your son/daughter feels about his/her experience with:

☐ Work experience

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

☐ Individual Transition Plan

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
☐ Independent Living Skills

☐ Leisure and Recreation

Please return this questionnaire by 6th December to:

Mrs Dorothy Kabisch
C/- Craigie Senior High School
Arawa Place
CRAIGIE WA 6025

FAX 307 6930