The Bridging Early Services Transition (BEST) Project--Outreach was designed to help families, administrators, and service providers facilitate the transition of young children, birth through age 5, as they move between services and service systems including: from early intervention to special preschool services; from Head Start or preschool to kindergarten-level programs; and from more restrictive special programs to less restrictive centers which serve all similar aged children in the community. Planning for these transitions as part of each family's Individualized Family Service Plan is required under federal law. The BEST model includes formats for: (1) local interagency needs assessments; (2) interagency agreements; (3) communication between families and service providers; (4) family partnership in decision-making; (5) constructing interagency and intra-agency transition timelines; (6) building a transition timeline for each child; (7) identifying local agencies for referral; (8) preparing the child for changes in programs and personnel; (9) systems change to incorporate more options for inclusive services; and (10) evaluation of transition procedures. The project worked with state leaders and local service systems in 17 states to develop state and local transition services. Sections of this final report address goals and objectives, the project's conceptual framework, a description of outreach activities, problems encountered, evaluation findings, project impact, and future activities. Appendices include a project brochure, staffing information, and evaluation data. (Contains 89 references.) (DB)
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II. ABSTRACT

Bridging Early Services Transition Project -- Outreach

Sharon Rosenkoetter, Ph.D.  Cynthia Shotts, M.Ed.
Project Director  Project Coordinator

Bridging Early Services Transition (BEST) Project -- Outreach was designed to help families, administrators, and service providers facilitate the transition of young children, birth through age five, as they move between services and service systems. Transitions of concern included these three: from early intervention to special preschool services, from Head Start or preschool to kindergarten-level programs, and from more restrictive special programs to less restrictive centers which serve all similar-aged children in the community. Part H of Public Law 99-457 requires transition planning as part of each family's Individualized Family Service Plan and Public Law 102-119 requires state level coordination to promote effective transitions between early intervention and special preschool services.

Three strategies are recommended to assist children and families with transitions: interagency collaboration between the sending and receiving programs, partnerships between families and service providers in transition decision-making, and support for the child through orientation activities, curriculum planning, and environmental modification. The BEST Model includes formats for (a) local interagency needs assessments, (b) interagency agreements, (c) communicating between families and service providers, (d) family partnership in decision-making, (e) constructing interagency and intra-agency transition timelines, (f) building within the IFSP/IEP a transition timeline for each child, (g) identifying local agencies for referral, (h) preparing the child for changes in programs and personnel, (i) systems change to incorporate more options for inclusive services, and (j) evaluation of transition procedures. This model has been found effective for rural and urban communities of various sizes, for children of different ages and types of disability, and for families with diverse ethnicities, resources, and histories of participation.

The project worked with state leaders and selected local services systems in 17 states to develop state and local transition services. It produced materials which have been widely disseminated, including publication of a book released late in 1993 by a highly respected publisher. It presented at 18 international and national conferences, as well as eight regional and 61 state meetings; published nine scholarly articles; and produced seven transition manuals for states. It provided individualized technical assistance as requested to more than 750 individuals.

An extension of this project was funded in 1993 to provide services to seven states and nationally; it will continue until 1996.
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IV. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

A. Source of Project Goals

The aims of this project are firmly grounded in the law. Part H of Public Law 99-457 required transition planning as part of each family's Individualized Family Service Plan. Thereafter, the Congress acknowledged the challenges inherent in establishing a "seamless" system of services for young children with special needs when it made transition one of the central elements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, P.L. 102-119 (1991). This legislation mandated state lead agencies to establish procedures to guide transition planning for children moving between early intervention and special preschool services. Only a few states have developed and implemented these transition policies and procedures fully, though most are in the process of doing so (Shotts, Rosenkoetter, Streufert & Rosenkoetter, 1994). This project has helped states to meet these requirements and also assisted local areas in complying with the resulting state regulations. P.L. 102-119 encouraged states to train personnel "to coordinate transition services for infants and toddlers with disabilities from an early intervention program...to a preschool program under Section 619...." Subsequently, a national survey of early childhood leaders in all 50 states (Shotts et al., 1994) found that the need for personnel training related to transition was listed as a top priority.

Early childhood commentators have suggested that the policies developed for the transition between services at age three can serve as exemplars to ease transitions between services at other ages (Rosenkoetter, 1992). Indeed, two national forums convened jointly by the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services have called for improved transition practices for all children at the time of elementary school entry (National Forum on Transition, 1991; 1992); the practices proposed for all children and their families are similar to those developed for this project over the past 15 years. Goal 1 of America 2000 speaks to the transition to elementary school from home or preschool as a critical milestone in the development of a well-educated citizenry. The manual published by the U.S. Department of Education (U.S.D.O.E., 1991) for Goal 1 espouses many of the elements that the Bridging Early Services Transition Project has long advocated. Nevertheless, despite well-publicized policy statements favoring transition planning, recommended practice and actual practice in states and localities remain far apart (National Forum on Transition, 1992).

Finally the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990) prohibits discrimination in public accommodations, including child care centers. This means they cannot deny a child with disabilities the
opportunity to participate in their program. This legislation has led to many questions of how to ease transition into child care for children with special needs. Both attitudinal and procedural issues are under discussion at state and local levels (Child Care Law Center, 1990). Transition to least restrictive environments has been a foundation of Bridging Early Services' technical assistance since its inception in the late 1970s. Multifaceted research on developing services in natural environments (Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 1990), the increasing emphasis on community-based placements from leaders in early intervention (NEC*TAS, 1990; Peck, Odom, & Bricker, 1993), and this project's experiences with implementing transition to community-based placements have further stimulated this work. Several states served by this project have declared LRE to be a priority issue. Transition-planning teams for communities and for individual children and their families wish to receive not only motivational speeches but also workable strategies and technical support to ensure success in community-based placements (Kontos & File, 1992).

From the above, it is obvious that a critical need in early childhood intervention is to help young children with special needs and their families prepare for and adjust to new service settings. Equally necessary is collaboration among service systems to promote successful transitions. Significant transitions include movement from early intervention to special preschool services, from early childhood special education to kindergarten-level programs, and from more restrictive special programs to less restrictive centers which serve all similar-aged children in the community.

B. Project Foci

In order to address the concerns highlighted by recent legislation, this outreach project adopted four major goals. Initial objectives of the project are presented below under each of the relevant goals.

Provide consultation and ongoing technical assistance to state leaders attempting to guide effective practices for transition planning.

1. Complete a technical assistance needs assessment to determine the emphasis on transition planning in the outreach state's comprehensive system of services to young children with special needs and their families; to determine strengths and weaknesses in planning, implementation, follow-up, and evaluation stages of such transitions in the state, and to learn from state leaders which issues and audiences should be targeted for technical assistance during the three years of the project.

2. Negotiate a written agreement between this project and the Part H and Section 619 coordinators in each outreach state. This agreement was intended to address specific transition-related needs
and provide for onsite training, ongoing communication, and evaluation of the effectiveness of technical assistance and outreach site services delivered.

3. **Inform state leaders** about specific characteristics of the technical assistance model by demonstrating and explaining the model and by providing examples in print and audiovisual materials.

4. **Teach a mentor(s)** in each outreach state to provide technical assistance to programs in that state and to coordinate such efforts through the lead agency(ies) for early childhood services.

Provide training, technical assistance, and follow-up to communities striving to develop and implement effective transition practices.

5. **Inform audiences** within each state about specific characteristics of the model and strategies for achieving effective transitions -- by demonstration and explanation, by providing examples in print and audiovisual materials, and by helping local staffs adapt the model to their local situations.

6. **Train families and staff members** at outreach sites in the areas of interagency collaboration, transition planning, family partnership, child preparation, follow-up, and evaluation. Provide guidance in the forms of planning assistance, workshops, follow-up consultations, and individualized technical assistance.

Study policy and procedural issues related to transition and develop materials and data that speak to consumer needs.

7. **Monitor and evaluate** ongoing technical assistance activities, including communications with outreach states, services to outreach states, interaction with personnel and sites in other areas, and dissemination activities.

8. **Continue to study policy and procedural issues related to transition and to develop resources** which address consumer concerns.

Develop and disseminate materials and information to assist individuals, programs, and agencies.

9. **Disseminate technical assistance materials**, through continued publications in journals, conference and workshop presentations, a project brochure, a project manual, and a summary videotape, and through responses to ongoing requests for information.

10. **Sponsor during year two a nationally advertised**
V. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT

A. Significance of the Issues Addressed

Systematic transition planning has been included among requirements in all major recent legislation pertaining to young children with special needs. Lawmakers have recognized that transition planning determines the location, nature, adequacy, and continuity of a young child's services as well as those available to other family members. Transition planning aids family members in supporting their child at critical times (Pensacola ARC, 1992). Effective transitions promote optimal development for children, minimize stress for families, assist in intervention planning by professionals and parents, aid agencies in developing ongoing working relationships and structures, promote developmentally appropriate intervention in natural environments, and provide families with a formative experience in advocacy as well as participation in guiding their children's education (Diamond, Speigel, & Hanrahan, 1988; Fowler, 1980, 1982, 1988; Hains, Fowler, & Chandler, 1988; Feichtl, Rule, & Innocenti, 1989; McDonald, et al., 1989; Rosenkoetter, Hains, & Fowler, in press; Wolery, 1989).

The transition process also influences programmatic change in other areas. For example, because transition usually requires interagency planning, it can be an excellent vehicle for fostering interagency collaboration, which then assists in resolving issues less related to transition, such as Child Find, common intake forms, and data management (Shotts & Rosenkoetter, 1992; Hazel et al., 1988). Decision-making regarding transition increasingly elicits concerns about least restrictive environment—sometimes on the part of parents, sometimes on the part of agency personnel—and prompts the search for more natural service delivery options (McLean & Hanline, 1990; Peck, Odom, & Bricker, 1993). Discussion of placement options also stimulates examination of existing curricula with the goal of providing "all children with the nurturance, stimulation, and opportunities for growth required for educational success" (U.S.D.O.E., 1991, p. 2).

B. The Bridging Early Services Transition Model

The Bridging Early Services Transition Model is diagrammed in Attachment 1 (Rosenkoetter, Hains, & Fowler, 1994). The model describes a process, not a static event on a single day. All transitions occur within a broad context framed by

* national and regional trends for best practices in services for young children and their families
* federal and state laws, regulations, and budgets
* local customs, resources, and constraints
* family advocacy
The Bridging Early Services Transition Model

Federal and State Laws, Regulations, and Budgets

Interagency Collaboration

Partnership with Families

Supporting The Child

WRITTEN POLICIES, PROCEDURES, TIMELINES, & RESPONSIBILITIES

Develop/nurture/evaluate

Preschool/Head Start to Kindergarten

Transition between Agencies

Home-based to Center-based,

Hospital to Home

Transition out of Special Services

Family Leadership
These realities differ from transition to transition, but they always have a major role in determining how a transition will transpire. These elements are diagrammed here outside the rectangle.

The oval inside the rectangle contains some of the many transitions families will experience during their child's first eight years of life. Again, the three primary transitions addressed by this project are those that occur around age three, around age five, and any time children or service systems move from segregated services to community-based services with typical peers.

Two major factors ease or strain a transition: 1) the relationships between professionals and other professionals, between families and professionals, between families and other families, and between the child and the child's various care providers, and 2) the procedures, agreements, timelines, and role descriptions which govern transition events. Both of these factors require careful development, maintenance, evaluation, and refinement over time. Both of these factors pertain to each of the key components of the transition process, which also relate to one another: interagency collaboration, family partnership in transition planning, and support for the child by means of orientation activities and environmental management.

In this model, interagency collaboration on transition is accomplished by ongoing mutual effort as well as through one or more interagency agreements. Interagency collaboration involves local definition of roles and responsibilities, composition of a local timeline for transition which is responsive to local resources and constraints, commitment by all agencies' personnel to family participation in decision-making, and joint effort by agencies and families to modify curricular experiences and environmental supports to ensure children's continuing accomplishment in new environments.

Partnership between the family and service providers is attained through an individualized transition plan, incorporated into the IEP or IFSP. The individualized family transition plan is developed through open-ended conversations three and nine months prior to the transition, and during the transition; it is evaluated six months after the transition. Use of these interviews and satisfaction surveys facilitates continuity in delivery of services to child and family across program enrollments. It also helps local programs to evaluate their transition procedures. The outreach model also provides for the development of a central directory, which includes child care centers, specialized and community preschool facilities, medical and social services, and special and regular, public and private kindergarten-level programs. Such a directory aids parents and professionals in exploring potential next environments for their children. Finally,
the model encourages the development of a parent mentoring group to assist families approaching a significant transition.

The model contains procedures for supporting the child by increasing communication between professionals in the sending and receiving programs (i.e., bridging early services). The goal of such coordination is to minimize differences in approaches between teaching/therapy programs for individual children. Such communication has been very important to child adjustment when transitions are from special education programs to community-based programs (cf. Johnson, Chandler, Kerns, & Fowler, 1986) and from home-based programs to center-based programs (Hanline & Knowlton, 1988). The model also offers other strategies for reducing children's fears about unfamiliar settings and for building individually appropriate skills to promote confidence and competence in the new environment.

The model developed for this project emphasizes comprehensive transition services for infants, toddlers, and young children with special needs and their families. It guides the movement of agencies, their personnel, and families from present practices toward the goals they set for their local transition efforts. The model, its three primary components, and its instrumentation support both the requirements and the spirit of recent federal legislation. They openly discuss the change process and help users develop strategies for coping with change, strategies useful for other transitions than the ones emphasized by this project.

C. Foundations in Previous Research

This outreach model is based on recent research findings from the fields of psychology, early childhood education, special education, sociology, and adult learning. Initial concepts and strategies in this outreach model were developed and validated during previous demonstration and outreach projects at the University of Kansas (Susan Fowler, project director) and a training contract from the State of Kansas in 1988-90. During the four years of the effort described herein, the model and its activities have been modified as a result of recent legislation and regulations, new understandings of family roles and community development, growing interest in transition planning for all children, and comments from consumers in the outreach states.

Bridging Early Services staff are also strongly indebted to work by other transition researchers such as Lisabeth Vincent and her colleagues (Vincent et al., 1980; Murphy & Vincent, 1989), Mary Frances Hanline (1988; Hanline & Knowlton, 1988; Hanline, Suchman, & Demmerie, 1989); Michael Conn-Powers and Jane Ross-Allen (Conn-Powers, Ross-Allen, & Holburn, 1990), Peggy Stephens and Beth Rous (Rous, 1992), Jennifer Kilgo and Mary Jo Noonan (Noonan & Kilgo, 1987; Noonan & Ratokalau, 1991; Torres & Noonan, 1989), Sarah Rule and Barbara Fiechtl (Fiechtl, Rule, and Innocenti, 1989); Mabel Rice and Marion O'Brien (1990); Diane Sainato (Sainato & Lyon, 1989), and Judith Carta (1991).

Another line of research impinging upon Bridging Early Services outreach comes from interest in transition to kindergarten for all children, not just those with identified disabilities. Recommendations have come from a major national research study (Love, Logue, Trudeau, & Thayer, 1992) as well as from position statements by the U.S. Department of Education (1991), the National Association of State Boards of Education (1988, 1991), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (1990), the National Association for the Education of Young Children (Bredekamp, 1987), and Head Start (Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, 1988).

It is impressive that the array of research and policy development on transition, conducted by a variety of individuals and groups in diverse geographic areas, comes to remarkably similar conclusions about facilitating effective transitions for young children and their families. The three components which have comprised the Bridging Early Services Transition model since its inception -- interagency collaboration, individualized family participation, and preparation of new environments for entering children and children for new environments--are supported again and again. What continues to be needed is connection between the strategies recommended in the professional literature and the everyday transition experiences of young children and their families in communities across America.

For the interagency component, the project draws heavily on work by Elder and Magrab (1980, 1981), Morgan and Swan (1988; Morgan, Guetzloe, & Swan, 1991; Swan and Morgan, 1993), and Hazel et al. (1988). Research on adult learning (Davis, 1974; Eitington, 1989) and the change process (Dreiford Group, 1986; Edelman, 1992; Elmore, 1990; Olson, 1989) guides our efforts to facilitate state and local planning for transition.

For the family component the project seeks to ensure that educational choices are compatible with both child and family
needs, the project employs a family systems approach. It individualizes the characteristics of family involvement to accommodate the varying circumstances, needs, and culturally-based preferences of families (Bailey et al., 1990; Dunst et al., 1989; Hains, Rosenkoetter, & Fowler, 1991; Lynch and Hanson, 1992; McWilliam & Winton, n.d.; Turnbull & Turnbull, 1986).

For the child component, the project urges sending and receiving personnel to use a variety of strategies to help young children cope with the change in environments (Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, 1988; Carta, 1991; Rosenkoetter & Fowler, 1987; Wolery et al., 1992; Ziegler, 1985). To ensure that children carry over skills important to their adjustment in new programs, a technology of generalization, identified by Stokes and Baer (1977) and elaborated by Vincent and her colleagues (1980, 1981; Salisbury & Vincent, 1991) and Carta (1991) is incorporated into all phases of child preparation for transition. Curricular modifications to meet the developmental needs of all children, whatever their developmental level, occur on both a system level (e.g., Goffin & Stegelin, 1992) and an individual child level (Peck et al., 1993).

Furthermore, this model provides for the collection of evaluation data to document the success and satisfaction experienced by each participant during the child and family's transition from one program to another. Trainees are taught to use evaluation instruments to determine the success of their transition procedures and to individualize such instruments to meet the particular needs of their consumers. This allows trainees to determine for themselves whether a recommended transition strategy is efficacious and worthwhile in their particular setting. These data, collated by the project, help to shape future technical assistance locally and in other areas. State leaders also evaluate the impact of this project upon the development of their comprehensive statewide systems for service delivery, specifically upon the growing awareness of the need for transition planning among state and local service agencies. Such data help to shape project planning.

VI. DESCRIPTION OF OUTREACH

The project described in this report was slated to run from August 1990 through July 1993. However, the postponement of activities in several states caused the project to be extended until August 30, 1994. Due to that extension, it overlapped somewhat with a second outreach project of the same name (sponsored by the same institution) that began in July 1993.

Staff of the Bridging Early Services Transition Project—Outreach are listed in Appendix A, as are the names of members of the National Advisory Board. Members of the Transition Taskforces
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in Kansas, Missouri, and Wisconsin are on file in the project office.

Bridging Early Services Transition Project--Outreach has provided (and continues to provide) training, technical assistance, and materials development to support the transition of young children with disabilities, developmental delay, or at-risk conditions from one service program to another. Specifically, this project provided technical assistance on transition to state and local leaders, direct service providers, personnel trainers, and families in at least 12 states. That outreach process is diagrammed in Attachment 2 and further described below. The project also shared results of ongoing product development and research with national audiences via publications and conference presentations, as delineated below. Transitions addressed include (a) early intervention programs to preschool programs, (b) special preschool/Head Start services to kindergarten-level services, and (c) restrictive special programs to intervention in community-based early childhood programs, where such a placement is appropriate to children's goals. Materials were also gathered and shared upon request regarding transition strategies for transition from the neonatal intensive care unit to community services for newborns and their families. Strategies taught across all transitions include state and local interagency collaboration in transition planning, family partnership in both transition policy development and individual decision-making, and careful preparation of children for their next environment(s) and of the environments themselves to serve developmentally diverse children and families.

While much of the discussion above pertains to content, it is worth noting that the Bridging Early Services staff strived to conduct all training and technical assistance in accord with principles of adult learning (Zemke, 1981).

A. Outreach to States

Nine states were initially approved for outreach activities. All of the states had targeted improved transitions in their plans to develop comprehensive service systems for young children with disabilities. In each state the coordinators for Part H and Section 619 had invited our assistance and had pledged to support actively our work in their states. Chairs of these states' interagency coordinating councils, comprehensive systems for personnel development, and Division for Early Childhood (professional organization) groups had, in many cases, also invited our assistance to them.

The project worked in all nine of the targeted states plus at least eight others. One additional state was formally added to the service roster due to the intensity of consultations that occurred. In three of the target states, outreach was more limited than in the others. This was due to changing priorities within the states.
Attachment
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General plan for outreach services

Assess needs in state or at site

Define desired outcomes
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and, in several cases, to the availability of technical assistance closer to home.

Priorities, timelines, and activities requested by the states varied considerably. Each will be briefly profiled below:

Alaska

The project shared extensive materials with state Part H and Part B coordinators, higher education, two Head Start grantees, and a variety of local programs. Information from project materials has been included in state and local transition policies and materials. Staff met in Alaska with state leaders on 13 occasions, presented three 2 1/2 day workshops during the Alaska Summer Academies, met with parent groups in two communities, facilitated community interagency meetings in four communities, conducted two one-day and one two-day workshops, spoke at four state conferences, contributed to a distance learning module, and consulted with local service providers on-site in 12 communities. Services were delivered in three remote sites as well as rural and urban communities. Technical assistance is ongoing.

Colorado

The project shared materials with state leaders in Colorado and went through Colorado's required training for out-of-state inservice providers. Staff presented at three state conferences. On two occasions project personnel consulted in person with representatives from a group attempting to facilitate transitions for Navajo children moving from a reservation Head Start into a community kindergarten. During much of this grant period, Colorado had moved to other priorities than transition and did not wish further technical assistance.

Florida

The project shared materials with state leaders and consulted with them on efforts to merge pre-kindergarten and early childhood special education. We consulted with early childhood personnel from SERVE, the U.S.D.O.E. regional laboratory, on several occasions and met with them and others in efforts to develop a comprehensive planning document. On three occasions project personnel consulted with and trained staff from the national Head Start Transition Project in Miami, FL. Bridging Early Services presented at five statewide meetings and worked in at least nine Florida communities during this funding period.

Idaho

Not originally included in the list of outreach states, Idaho was added in a continuation proposal when it became clear that some other states were going to require fewer services that originally
envisioned. Project staff met with members of the Interagency Coordinating Council for an extended period and helped members to develop their state's policy on transition at age 3. Extensive materials were shared with state personnel, and elements of them were incorporated into the state's guidelines on transition. Two staff members presented three full-day regional workshops for community teams in Moscow, Boise, and Pocatello. They also presented a three-day class on Innovative Educational Strategies (including transition) for a statewide leadership group in Summer 1992.

**Kansas**

Given that the project is based in this state, more technical assistance occurred here than anywhere else. Project Director Sharon Rosenkoetter served as Vice Chair of the Interagency Coordinating Council during much of this period and shared materials with it and staffs of member agencies on numerous occasions. Formal and informal consultations occurred at state, regional, and local levels. The project presented to two parent groups, worked with 23 local communities on transition efforts, and spoke or presented workshops at 28 state meetings in Kansas. BEST provided several drafts for the transition section of Kansas Guidelines for the Implementation of Early Childhood Special Education. As the project's scheduled funding period was ending, state leaders proposed to the state's Interagency Coordinating Council that a state taskforce on transition be established. Their recommendation was followed. Dr. Rosenkoetter has been chairing that group, and the project has been staffing it. Accomplishments include a draft policy on transition, three publications scheduled to receive wide circulation across the state, the recommendation of a uniform policy on transitions across agencies, and regional meetings to be conducted across the state. The project worked intensively with two local projects in an effort to develop replicable transition strategies: one project developed ways to include children with special needs in a community child care program, while another moved to merge Head Start and ECSE services at the classroom level.

**Minnesota**

Project staff met on three occasions with Minnesota leaders and shared materials with them over the course of the project. Two trainings were conducted with regional coordinators. A two-day cross-agency workshop was conducted in Virginia in northern Minnesota and followed up with a later visit and ongoing discussions. Regional workshops were conducted in two other areas.

**Missouri**

At the project's beginning, Missouri was extremely busy attempting to implement its new preschool mandate, but a year
later, state leaders felt the need to train the entire state on transition procedures quickly. At the request of a Transition Taskforce, Bridging Early Services developed a videotape and accompanying training manual and, with outstanding cooperation from state personnel, equipped 11 teams of trainers to introduce the concepts to the entire state within a two-month period. Later work in Missouri, under the direction of Project Coordinator Cynthia Shotts, centered around facilitating local interagency coordinating councils and the issues they uncovered in attempting to do transition planning. The project presented at numerous statewide meetings, and Ms. Shotts facilitated stakeholders' strategic planning for Part H over a three-day session. Project materials have been shared extensively and incorporated into several state publications which received wide circulation.

Nebraska

Nebraska was heavily involved with planning Part H services and implementing developmentally appropriate primary curricula; the state showed little interest in transition issues beyond these topics during the tenure of this grant project. Several consultations with state leaders and mutual exchanges of materials did occur, and a statewide transition meeting was co-sponsored with the BEST Project for approximately 200 people.

Wisconsin

Dr. Ann Hains coordinated the extensive project activities in Wisconsin, with the aid of the BEST Planning Committee, which met three times each year and formulated the transition agenda for the state. Composed of state leaders, local service providers, and parents from around the state, the Committee has shown an admirable propensity to pool funds, elicit broad-based participation, and stay the course in accomplishing reform in practices related to transition. BEST materials have been shared widely in this state. In Wisconsin, this project has presented a statewide conference on transition, published a manual of recommended practices, developed a joint Head Start/ECSE planning form that incorporates IFSP and IEP elements, trained communities in producing interagency agreements, shared newsletter items on recommended practices, and developed a network of communities to pilot test use of the IFSP to age six. Numerous presentations and publications have resulted from Dr. Hains' work in Wisconsin.

Wyoming

Wyoming leaders were eager to begin working on transition at the time the application for this project was written. During the time between proposal development and project start-up, they arranged to receive assistance on transition from another technical assistance provider. This project shared materials with them and made one appearance at a state meeting but saw no reason to
continue, given the state's access to services from other sources. Wyoming leaders agreed with this assessment.

Consultation with state leaders and workshops with large attendance were also provided to Indiana, Iowa, New Hampshire, Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Pennsylvania.

B. National Outreach

National outreach included presentations at international, national, and regional meetings; contributions to policy development on transition; dissemination of materials for practitioners' use; dissemination of scholarly articles; sharing with personnel trainers; and responses to requests for information and advice.

Presentations at International, National, and Regional Meetings

During this funding period, Bridging Early Services presented at 18 international and national meetings, including the Society for Research in Child Development, the International Early Childhood Conference on Children with Special Needs, the International Conference on Special Education, the International Council for Exceptional Children, Zero to Three, and the National Transition Forum, co-sponsored by the U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services. At a highly-rated pre-conference workshop at the International Early Childhood Conference on Children with Special Needs, project staff worked intensively for six hours on transition issues with 50 state leaders. Presentations are listed in Attachment 3.

During the same period, the project presented at eight regional meetings, such as the Midwest Transition Symposium, the Northern Midwest Regional Early Childhood Forum, and the Region VI Head Start Conference.

Two 1992 presentations on APPLES Magazine of the Illinois State Board of Education's Satellite Education Network were beamed nationwide and also distributed by APPLES in videotape form.

Contributions to Policy Development on Transition

The project provided comments on transition issues pertinent to Federal legislation and regulations, participated in the development of the transition section of the Division for Early Childhood's Recommended Practices document, and each year provided a staff member for four or five days to review grant applications for the Early Education Program for Children with Disabilities.

Transition to kindergarten is a major initiative of the U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services (National Forum on Transition, 1992). BEST was contacted by the National
### BEST PRESENTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Presentation/Workshop Title</th>
<th># Persons Evaluating</th>
<th># Persons Attending</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>August 4, 1994</td>
<td>Alaska Elementary Restructuring Institute</td>
<td>&quot;What shall we do with Krissy?&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 5.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham, AK (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>July 22, 1994</td>
<td>Dillingham Interagency Council</td>
<td>Decision-Making in Early Childhood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 4.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak, AK (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>July 7, 1994</td>
<td>Kodiak Children's Network</td>
<td>Brainstorming Workshop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1-4 scale = 3.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer, AK (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>June 23-24, 1994</td>
<td>Kenai Peninsula Early Childhood Workshop</td>
<td>Decision-Making in Early Childhood</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 5.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>June 19, 1994</td>
<td>Midwestern Consortium for Faculty Development</td>
<td>How to Develop and Nurture Practicum Sites</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1-4 scale = 3.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS (Rosenkoetter, Shotts, Smith)</td>
<td>May 7, 1994</td>
<td>Community Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6 scale = 4.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>May 6, 1994</td>
<td>Coordination Council</td>
<td>Early childhood development services</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson, KS</td>
<td>May 3, 1994</td>
<td>ACCK Education Faculty</td>
<td>Teaming and collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-5 scale = 1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Excellence and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay, WI</td>
<td>April 22, 1994</td>
<td>(Hains)</td>
<td>Spring Follow-up: Planning Transitions for Young Children with Special Needs and Their Families</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 5.571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsborg, KS</td>
<td>April 19, 1994</td>
<td>Leadership Lindsborg</td>
<td>Take Care of Our Children</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>April 7, 1994</td>
<td>Council for Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Transition at age 3: The challenges and the opportunities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 5.429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>March 25, 1994</td>
<td>Indiana Transition Taskforce Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 5.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>March 24, 1994</td>
<td>Flopida Early Childhood Leaders</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterling, KS</td>
<td>March 24, 1994</td>
<td>Sterling College</td>
<td>Early Childhood Services</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson, KS</td>
<td>March 21, 1994</td>
<td>ACCK ECSE Methods Class</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 5.846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina, KS</td>
<td>March 10, 1994</td>
<td>Kansas Head Start Conference</td>
<td>Hellos and goodbyes: Early childhood transitions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 4.867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eau Claire, WI</td>
<td>March 5, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation of children and families for transition to kindergarten at age 5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 4.848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>March 5, 1994</td>
<td>Kansas Division for Early Childhood 1994 Spring Conference</td>
<td>Writing successful grant applications</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>106 scale = 5.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>March 4, 1994</td>
<td>Kansas Division for Early Childhood 1994 Spring Multi-disciplinary Conference</td>
<td>Who will help plant the seed? An integrated curriculum approach</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 5.143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Evaluation Rating</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>Facilitated panel discussion with Sue Bredenkamp and Susan Fowler</td>
<td>March 4, 1994</td>
<td>Rosenkoetter</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>Planning transitions from Head Start to kindergarten</td>
<td>March 3, 1994</td>
<td>Talbott, Rhodes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eau Claire, WI</td>
<td>Resource raising for Kansas communities in support of infant and toddler services</td>
<td>February 26, 1994</td>
<td>Herms</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>Transitions to new settings: A child's eye view</td>
<td>February 24, 1994</td>
<td>Shotts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays, KS</td>
<td>Transitions at age three</td>
<td>February 16, 1994</td>
<td>Shotts</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
<td>Transition Planning</td>
<td>February 11, 1994</td>
<td>Rosenkoetter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina, KS</td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>January 21, 1994</td>
<td>Shotts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterling, KS</td>
<td>Services to Young Children and Their Families</td>
<td>January 17, 1994</td>
<td>Rosenkoetter</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Community collaboration for transition planning: Families, local, and state agencies working together</td>
<td>December 11-15, 1993</td>
<td>Rosenkoetter, Friedebach, Haseltine, Dale, Shotts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Scale values indicate the range of scores based on a 1-6 rating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>December 6, 1993</td>
<td>Indiana Early Childhood Special Education Forum, Hellos and Goodbyes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>December 3, 1993</td>
<td>Poster session, Zero to Three National Center for Clinical Infant Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay WI</td>
<td>November 19, 1993</td>
<td>Planning Transitions for Young Children with Special Needs and their Families</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>November 15-17, 1993</td>
<td>Missouri Early Intervention Summit, Roles of families; Family service coordinators and service providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson, KS</td>
<td>November 12, 1993</td>
<td>Area Early Childhood Personnel, Working as a Team for Young Children with Special Needs in Inclusive Settings</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedalia, MO</td>
<td>November 5, 1993</td>
<td>Sedalia Mo Transition Conference, Transition from Early Intervention to Early Childhood</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson, KS</td>
<td>November 2, 1993</td>
<td>McPherson Mother’s Club, Early Childhood Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina, KS</td>
<td>October 29, 1993</td>
<td>Head Start and ECSE, Team building Skills</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
<td>October 28, 1993</td>
<td>Jay Shidler School, Transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
<td>October 27, 1993</td>
<td>Department of Health and Environment, Resource Raising Workshop</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, KS</td>
<td>October 23, 1993</td>
<td>KAEYC, What shall I do with my room?</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1-6 scale = 4.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, KS</td>
<td>October 23, 1993</td>
<td>KAEYC, Uniting a community to care for its children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event/Meeting</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
<td>October 22, 1993</td>
<td>Kansas Infant-Toddler Network</td>
<td>Resource raising for Kansas communities in support of infant and toddler services: Overview of public sector funders</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina, KS</td>
<td>October 14, 1993</td>
<td>CEC Annual Conference</td>
<td>Transition at age three: The challenges and the opportunities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>October 7, 1993</td>
<td>Health Care Challenges during the Early Years</td>
<td>Transition: Parent’s and professional’s perspectives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>October 1, 1993</td>
<td>IFSP/IEP demonstration sites’ meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>September 23, 1993</td>
<td>Magic Years VI Conference</td>
<td>Parents and professionals joined in transition</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson, KS</td>
<td>September 20, 1994</td>
<td>Developmentally Disabled EXPO</td>
<td>Poster display sharing services and resources for young children with disabilities and their families through BEST</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls, SD</td>
<td>August 25, 1993</td>
<td>Toward South Dakota 2000</td>
<td>Bridging Early Services: The Community’s Challenge</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Presentation/Workshop Title</td>
<td># Persons Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eau Claire, WI</td>
<td>April 30, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning transitions for young children with special needs and their families</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hains)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield WI</td>
<td>April 23, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning transitions for young children with special needs and their families</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hains)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>April 15, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Care for Kids Who are Special</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shotts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community planning for early childhood transitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg, KS</td>
<td>April 2, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>It's a big step! Planning for transition to kindergarten</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shotts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan, KS</td>
<td>March 16, 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>It's a big step: Transition to kindergarten</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rosenkoetter &amp; Shotts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan, KS</td>
<td>March 11, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rosenkoetter &amp; Shotts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody, KS</td>
<td>March 9, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peabody Mothers Club</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shotts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hellos and goodbyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigo, WI</td>
<td>March 5, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>Langdale Health Care Center - Birth to three Program</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hains)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning transitions for preschool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, KS</td>
<td>March 5, 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td>KDEC</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing successful grant applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, KS</td>
<td>March 5, 1993</td>
<td>KDEC</td>
<td>What shall I do with my room: Good ideas for setting up the environment to facilitate developmentally appropriate intervention</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>February 27, 1993</td>
<td>KAEYC</td>
<td>Hellos and goodbyes: Helping young children make transitions to new environments</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Dells (Hains)</td>
<td>February 18-19, 1993</td>
<td>DPI-DHSS</td>
<td>DPI-DHSS preschool transition workshop: Interagency collaboration</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsborg, Kansas (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>February 17, 1993</td>
<td>USD400</td>
<td>Transition to kindergarten</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, WI (Hains)</td>
<td>January 25 and February 1, 1993</td>
<td>Transitions for young children</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola, Fl (Shotts)</td>
<td>January 30, 1993</td>
<td>Association for Retarded Citizens</td>
<td>Transition planning for children with special needs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida (Shotts)</td>
<td>January 28, 1993</td>
<td>Florida Mental Health Institute</td>
<td>Bridging early services: Community transition planning</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardee County Florida/Highlands County, Fl. (Shotts)</td>
<td>January 27, 1993</td>
<td>Bridging early services: Planning for the transition of young children from early childhood programs to kindergarten</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk County Florida (Shotts)</td>
<td>January 26, 1993</td>
<td>Bridging early services: Planning for the transition of young children from early childhood programs to kindergarten</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction City, KS (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>January 21, 1993</td>
<td>It's a big step: Transition to kindergarten</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>December 16, 1992</td>
<td>Kansas Child Care Advisory Board</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays, KS (Shotts)</td>
<td>December 11, 1992</td>
<td>Interagency group</td>
<td>Transition to kindergarten</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC (Rosenkoetter, Shotts, Hains, Fowler, Gwost)</td>
<td>December 3, 1992</td>
<td>Division for Early Childhood; Council for Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Strategies for transition planning: A critical component of comprehensive state and local intervention systems</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC (Shotts, Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>December 3, 1992</td>
<td>Division for Early Childhood; Council for Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Effective transition models</td>
<td>No evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC 2 sessions (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>November 4-5, 1992</td>
<td>Department of Education: Department of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>Second National Transition Forum</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Brook, IL (Hains)</td>
<td>October 19, 1992</td>
<td>Regional Early Childhood Forum</td>
<td>Moving On: Bridging Early Services Transitions</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, KS (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>October 16, 1992</td>
<td>Interagency group</td>
<td>Transition at age three</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia, KS (Streufert, Bartus)</td>
<td>October 10, 1992</td>
<td>Kansas Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
<td>Hellos and goodbyes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, AK (Shotts)</td>
<td>October 7, 1992</td>
<td>Infant Learning Conference</td>
<td>Promoting Coordination and Collaboration in your Interagency Taskforce</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS (two sessions) (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>September 12, 1992</td>
<td>Statewide Conference</td>
<td>Planning transition in early childhood: Workable strategies with young children, their families, and service providers</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Columbia, Mo (3 Workshops) (Shotts) | August 5-6, 1992     | Partnerships for Progress IV Conference | 1. Transition at Age Three and Five  
2. Partnerships: Parents and Professionals Plan together for Transitions of Young Children  
3. Local Interagency Coordinating Council Preconference Session | 31         | 100    | Not Evaluated                      |
<p>|                                      |                       |                                                   |                                                        | 47         | 50     | 1 - 6 scale = 5.064                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Transition Update</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Not Evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>August 8-12, 1992</td>
<td>Partnerships for Progress V Conference</td>
<td>Transition Update: The Bridging Early Service Transition Model</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
<td>July 28-30, 1992</td>
<td>_transition from head start to kindergarten</td>
<td>A Shared Vision for Innovative Educational Strategies</td>
<td>Day 1: 43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1 - 6 scale = 5.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, FL.</td>
<td>June 3-4, 1992</td>
<td>Dade County Public Schools</td>
<td>Transition planning in the preschool</td>
<td>Day 2: 39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1 - 6 scale = 5.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park, KS</td>
<td>May 28, 1992</td>
<td>Region VI Head Start</td>
<td>Goodbyes and hellos: effective strategies for bridging early services</td>
<td>Day 3: 37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1 - 6 scale = 5.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall - 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall - 37</td>
<td>Overall: 37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1 - 6 scale = 5.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb, IL</td>
<td>May 20, 1992</td>
<td>APPLELS Magazine via the WIU-ISBE Satellite Education Network</td>
<td>Satellite Transmission</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>May 14-15, 1992</td>
<td>Midwest Transition Symposium: Easing the Transition from Head Start and other Early Childhood Education Programs to Kindergarten</td>
<td>Bridgebuilding: Interagency strategies for overcoming transition problems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 - 6 scale = 5.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>May 14-15, 1992</td>
<td>Midwest Transition Symposium: Easing the Transition from Head Start and other Early Childhood Education Programs to Kindergarten</td>
<td>Bridgebuilding: Interagency strategies for overcoming transition problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 - 6 scale = 5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>May 1, 1992</td>
<td>The Seventh Indiana Conference on Least Restrictive Environment</td>
<td>Transition planning for young children with special needs and their families</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO</td>
<td>April 4, 1992</td>
<td>Colorado Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
<td>Hellos and goodbyes - helping young children make transition to new environments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 - 6 scale = 5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola, FL</td>
<td>April 4, 1992</td>
<td>North Florida Head Start/DEC Meeting</td>
<td>Transition planning</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 - 6 scale = 5.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organizing Body</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Meeting Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola, FL</td>
<td>April 3, 1992</td>
<td>North Florida Head Start/DEC Meeting</td>
<td>Bridging the gap between preschool and kindergarten</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade County, FL</td>
<td>April 2, 1992</td>
<td>Dade County Public Schools</td>
<td>Interagency collaboration in planning early childhood transitions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton, NJ</td>
<td>March 1992</td>
<td>NJ Department of Education</td>
<td>Transition at age 3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson City, MO</td>
<td>March 17-18, 1992</td>
<td>Facilitator Training</td>
<td>Trainer of trainers workshop</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>March 5, 1992</td>
<td>Kansas Division for Early Childhood</td>
<td>Coping with change</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, MN</td>
<td>March 2, 1992</td>
<td>Annual Special Education Day of Excellence Conference</td>
<td>Transition planning for young children</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Lakes, MN</td>
<td>February 27, 1992</td>
<td>West Central Educational Cooperative Service Unit</td>
<td>Transition planning for young children with special needs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson City, MO</td>
<td>February 13-14, 1992</td>
<td>Missouri First Steps</td>
<td>Video taping bridging early services: interagency planning for transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>February 3, 1992</td>
<td>Anchorage Transition Task-Force</td>
<td>Transition planning</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshkosh, WI</td>
<td>January 29, 1992</td>
<td>Head Start Conference</td>
<td>Curriculum strategies</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina, KS</td>
<td>January 28, 1992</td>
<td>Salina Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
<td>Hellos and goodbyes: Transition in children’s lives</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>November 16, 1991</td>
<td>Division for Early Childhood; Council for Exceptional Children</td>
<td>A retrospective transition interview with parents of infants discharged from the NICU</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>November 16, 1991</td>
<td>Division for Early Childhood; Council for Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Transition planning: A critical component of comprehensive state and local intervention systems</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization/Group</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>November 9, 1991</td>
<td>National Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
<td>Working together for young children and their families</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>November 9, 1991</td>
<td>National Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
<td>What do prekindergarters know about the structure of prose, and what does this mean for good teaching?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello, ID</td>
<td>November 1, 1991</td>
<td>Idaho Interagency Coordinating Council</td>
<td>Hellos &amp; goodbyes: Planning for program change with special needs children</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
<td>October 31, 1991</td>
<td>Idaho Interagency Coordinating Council</td>
<td>Coming &amp; going: Partnerships in transition for young children with special needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow, ID</td>
<td>October 30, 1991</td>
<td>Idaho Interagency Coordinating Council</td>
<td>Coming &amp; going: Partnerships in transition for young children with special needs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>October 19, 1991</td>
<td>University of MO at St. Louis</td>
<td>Playing together: Helping children develop play skills</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>October 19, 1991</td>
<td>University of MO at St. Louis</td>
<td>Building effective transitions for children and their families</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina, KS</td>
<td>October 18, 1991</td>
<td>Saline County Interagency Council</td>
<td>Bridging early services: Transition planning for young children and their families</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Satellite System (Fowler)</td>
<td>September 25, 1991</td>
<td>APPLES Magazine</td>
<td>Past reflections...new directions</td>
<td>Satellite Transmission</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, KS</td>
<td>August 30, 1991</td>
<td>TARC, Topeka Interagency Group</td>
<td>Transition planning for young children with special needs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Point, WI</td>
<td>August 14, 1991</td>
<td>Multiple Sponsorships and Wisconsin Division for Early Childhood</td>
<td>Planning transitions for young children with special needs and their families</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Point, WI</td>
<td>August 1991</td>
<td>Collaborative Conference</td>
<td>Family centered intervention</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>July 31, 1991</td>
<td>Leadership Conf. Exceptional Child Programs of Florida</td>
<td>Introduction to BEST Project</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola, FL</td>
<td>July 24, 1991</td>
<td>FDLRS Westgate Florida Panhandle</td>
<td>Transition planning for young children with special needs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola, FL</td>
<td>July 23, 1991</td>
<td>Early Childhood Interagency Council</td>
<td>Interagency issues in transition</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>July 18, 1991</td>
<td>University of Milwaukee</td>
<td>The individualized family service plan</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey, PA</td>
<td>June, 1991</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Department of Education Preschool Symposium</td>
<td>Ensuring quality of services: New challenges for the nineties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau, AK</td>
<td>June 5-7, 1991</td>
<td>Summer Institute in Special Education</td>
<td>Solve behavior problems: Building for classroom management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>May 1991</td>
<td>Association for Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>A needs assessment to assist mothers of premature infants in their transition from the neonatal intensive care unit before, during and 6 months after discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat-Su, AK</td>
<td>May 31, 1991</td>
<td>Matanuska-Susitina School District</td>
<td>Grant writing workshop</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham, NH</td>
<td>May 1991</td>
<td>University of NH</td>
<td>Current events in early childhood special education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>May 1991</td>
<td>Association for Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>Intervention research in mainstream settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>May 1991</td>
<td>Association for Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>Interventions and assessments with families of young children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park, KS</td>
<td>May 30, 1991</td>
<td>Region VI Head Start</td>
<td>Transition planning for young children</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>May 24, 1991</td>
<td>International Association for SPED</td>
<td>Critical issues in early childhood Transition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - 5 scale = 4.60
1 - 6 scale = 5.63
1 - 4 scale = 3.94
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors/Year</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia, MN</td>
<td>May 21-22, 1991</td>
<td>Educational Service Region</td>
<td>Transition planning for young children with special needs</td>
<td>Rosenkoetter/Hains</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>May 1991</td>
<td>International Conference on</td>
<td>Early intervention prevention and remediation</td>
<td>Hains</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan, KS</td>
<td>April 13, 1991</td>
<td>Kansas Student CEC Conference</td>
<td>Planning school transitions</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreveport, LA</td>
<td>April 8, 1991</td>
<td>Drake University</td>
<td>Administrator involvement in early childhood transitions</td>
<td>Hains</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, IA</td>
<td>April 1991</td>
<td>Illinois Division for Early</td>
<td>Transitions from early intervention to preschool and from preschool to kindergarten</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Brook, IL</td>
<td>April, 1991</td>
<td>Society For Research in Child Development</td>
<td>A longitudinal study of prekindergarten transition screening: Teacher report and traditional Testing</td>
<td>Fowler/Rosenkoetter/Rosenkoetter</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>April 20, 1991</td>
<td>Shawnee Mission Schools</td>
<td>Transition planning for young children with special needs</td>
<td>Fowler/Rosenkoetter/Woods</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau, AK</td>
<td>March 16, 1991</td>
<td>Southeast Alaska Early</td>
<td>Beginnings are important</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau, AK</td>
<td>March 15, 1991</td>
<td>Parent Meeting</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau, AK</td>
<td>March 15, 1991</td>
<td>Southeast Alaska Early</td>
<td>Playing together</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, KS</td>
<td>March 9, 1991</td>
<td>Kansas Division for Early</td>
<td>The state coordinating council and local interagency councils</td>
<td>Fowler/Shotts</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, KS</td>
<td>March 8, 1991</td>
<td>Kansas Division For Early</td>
<td>&quot;But my students aren't ready to read&quot;</td>
<td>Rosenkoetter/Shotts</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organizers</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eau Claire, WI (Hains)</td>
<td>March 7-8, 1991</td>
<td>Wisconsin Personnel Development Project <em>Catch the Spirit</em> workshop</td>
<td>Toward parent and professional partnerships: Family-centered strategies for developing individualized family service plans</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney, NE (Rosenkoetter/Woods)</td>
<td>March 4-5, 1991</td>
<td>Nebraska Early Childhood Training System</td>
<td>Building effective transition for young children and their families</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI (Hains)</td>
<td>March 1-2, 1991</td>
<td>Wisconsin Personnel Development Project <em>Catch the Spirit</em> workshop</td>
<td>Toward parent and professional partnerships: Family-centered strategies for developing individualized family service plans</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson, KS</td>
<td>February 21-22, 1991</td>
<td>Educational Service and Staff Development Across Central Kansas</td>
<td>Assessment of young children</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>N.t evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wausau, WI (Hains)</td>
<td>February 14-15, 1991</td>
<td>Wisconsin Personnel Development Project <em>Catch the Spirit</em> workshop</td>
<td>Toward parent and professional partnerships: Family-centered strategies for developing individualized family service plans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, ID (Fowler)</td>
<td>February 11, 1991</td>
<td>Idaho State Department of Education</td>
<td>Planning transition between early intervention programs and preschool programs: administrative and policy concerns</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeCompton, KS (Fowler/Rosenkoetter/Woods)</td>
<td>February 11, 1991</td>
<td>Northeast Kansas Regional Service Center</td>
<td>Transition planning for young children</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay, WI (Hains)</td>
<td>January 17-18, 1991</td>
<td>Wisconsin Personnel Development Project <em>Catch the Spirit</em> workshop</td>
<td>Toward parent and professional partnerships: Family-centered strategies for developing individualized family service plans</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS (Rosenkoetter)</td>
<td>October 13, 1990</td>
<td>Kansas Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
<td>Critical skills for transition to kindergarten</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>October 13, 1991</td>
<td>Kansas Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
<td>IEP's and IFSP's: From the early childhood perspective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign, IL</td>
<td>September, 1990</td>
<td>Carle Hospital</td>
<td>The impact of social policy on infants with special needs and their families</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moline, KS</td>
<td>August 13, 1990</td>
<td>Elk-Chatauqua Special Education Cooperative</td>
<td>Transition: It's a big step</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bridging Early Services

Transition Project and asked to assist the regional educational laboratories (funded by the U.S.D.O.E. Office of Educational Research and Improvement) in their efforts. Materials were developed and shared with all 10 laboratories. Presentations were made at two of their regional conferences and at the Second National Transition Forum. The purpose of the project's participation in these efforts is to include children with special needs in the policies and procedures developed for all children at the age five transition. Transition processes developed under EEPCD sponsorship are useful for the more general conversation about transition to kindergarten because our procedures have been validated over many years.

Dissemination of Materials for Practitioners' Use

Copious handouts have been shared at national, regional, state, and local meetings, and packets of information sent to state leaders, ERIC, and NEC*TAS. Materials available for ordering include compilations of materials on various topics as well as the APPLES videotape and the Missouri trainer of trainer videotape. The project also was successful in getting many short articles printed in various newsletters in the project states.

Several more lengthy items were published for practitioner use. They are listed in Attachment 4. Paramount among them was the 1994 release of Bridging Early Services for Children with Special Needs and Their Families: A Practical Guide for Transition Planning by Sharon Rosenkoetter, Ann Hains, and Susan Fowler, published by Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company of Baltimore, MD.

Dissemination of Scholarly Articles

During the period of this project, nine articles were published in scholarly journals or texts. These are listed in Attachment 5.

Sharing with Personnel Preparation Programs

Systematic planning for transition belongs in every preservice personnel preparation program. BEST has shared project materials with personnel trainers in three states and with attendees at the Midwest Consortium for Faculty Development. This project has had the support of the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Committee in each of the target states.

Responses to Requests for Information and Advice

During the period of this grant, the project office received 750 requests for assistance, as shown in Attachment 6. Each one of these was personally answered.
Publication for Practitioners During Outreach Project


Rosenkoetter, S.E. (1990). Transition tip, Rural Special Education Quarterly, 1


services: Interagency transition planning. Video and trainer of trainers manual prepared in cooperation with Missouri First Steps/Department of Education.
Attachment 5

SCHOLARLY ARTICLES AND CHAPTERS DURING OUTREACH PROJECT


Attachment 6

REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION DURING OUTREACH PROJECT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Requests</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>West: Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Upper Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Lower Midwest: Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>South: Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Miscellaneous: Canada, People's Republic of China, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>Total requests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: List includes only those addresses in project files. More requests have been received and answered.
VII. PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED AND THEIR RESOLUTION

The original application envisioned a straight-forward process of negotiating a service contract with leaders in each project state and then carrying out that project according to the agreed upon timeline. We found, however, that this initial plan was naive for three reasons: 1) In 1990, state leaders for Part H and Part B and their interagency coordinating council were not necessarily working together (in some cases, they hardly communicated), so it was not always possible at the outset to develop a single plan for a state. 2) Some state leaders were justifiably preoccupied with major initiatives apart from transition and did not have time to work with us on our time schedule (e.g., one state leader waited a year to respond, then called and wanted to implement services as soon as possible). 3) State leaders who did not know us or our work well were not inclined to commit in writing to extensive partnerships immediately; they wanted to "try out" the project first in order to determine whether a relationship was worthwhile. We also found that developing relationships within a state and coming to understand its unique issues of identity and politics took longer for project staff than anticipated. In short, preparation had to precede dissemination to a much greater degree than originally anticipated. And services to states tended to develop one step at a time rather than as part of master plan co-signed at the beginning of outreach.

Three objectives were modified. 1) State leaders did not wish us to sponsor a transition conference. They preferred, instead, for the project to present at existing conferences within their states. With permission from USDOE, the project abandoned plans to sponsor a conference in year 2. 2) BEST did not train a single "transition mentor" in each state to be a local coordinator. Rather several people in each state developed some competencies regarding transition to share with people in their state. Without paying local coordinators, the project found that states were not willing to commit major time for one person to assume the mentor role. Also, given the breadth of many of these states, it proved helpful to have more than one local expert available for assistance to communities. 3) Plans to produce a videotape were abandoned due to time constraints; a video will be produced during the 1993-96 outreach project.

Initial personnel times were inadequate, and these were modified in later applications. Nevertheless, nine states is a large number to serve in a project such as this. Use of the sponsoring consortium's existing facilities and support personnel, part-time use of ACCK faculty with modest salaries, and cooperation from the university where Dr. Hains teaches allowed this project to do a great deal with limited funds.

Early in the current outreach project, the staff realized the importance of parent co-leadership in conducting training. For
example, Jo Gwost of Topeka, KS, presented together with project professional staff at the full-day pre-conference workshop for the International Early Childhood Conference on Children with Special Needs. Mrs. Gwost's perspective on transition (she has six children, including two identified as gifted and two with mental retardation) was invaluable in communicating both the rationale and specific strategies for transition planning. However, even after funds to support a parttime parent staff member were obtained, the project was unable to locate a suitable parent who was able to join the project staff long term and commit to the necessary travel. Accordingly, we employed a number of parents in different outreach areas to work with us when training occurred in their locale. These parents needed to share the philosophy embodied in our model but not to be technical experts in its application, as they usually presented together with professional staff. It has also been a BEST policy to have all project products critiqued by parents for reasonableness, for family friendliness, and for multi-ethnic sensitivity.

VIII. EVALUATION FINDINGS

As shown in Attachment 2, the evaluation design for Bridging Early Services Project--Outreach has been an integral part of the overall project plan. It provides for nesting evaluation within each component of project services. It also allows for individualization of evaluation questions and methods according to services provided. Evaluation, thus, has multiple components, just as the project has multi-faceted services. Because the Bridging Early Services Transition Model is a process, not a specific structure or curriculum, it is continually adapted to changing regulations, state guidelines, and local needs. Evaluation data reflect that diversity in implementation.

A. Effectiveness of the Model with Children, Families, Service Providers, and Agencies

The original demonstration project, sponsored by the University of Kansas, showed the efficacy of the transition model, which is illustrated in Attachment 1. Incorporation of the model into state and local service delivery results in a coherent system for transitions between services. This eases the stress of transition for families and professionals and increases the adjustment and the learning of young children with disabilities who move between programs. Additional elements have been validated since the original project, as will be discussed below.

Information concerning the effectiveness of the transition model may be obtained from several sources, including parent opinion and satisfaction with the child's progress and transition; teacher opinion and satisfaction with the child's progress and transition; child placement; and administrator opinion. These types of information have been collected for children who made a

Parent opinion and satisfaction were assessed through a Retrospective Transition Interview (see Johnson, Chandler, Kerns, & Fowler, 1986). Parents indicated satisfaction with their child's preparation for kindergarten and transition into kindergarten using project procedures. They also appreciated opportunities to talk with a Transition Coordinator regarding their own concerns about the transition.

Additional data were gathered on toddlers who moved to special preschool services across the state of Missouri (110 children in 11 regions of the state) in 1992 using the model; analysis indicated very strong family approval of model procedures. Parents especially appreciated advance clarification of transition procedures as well as explanation of school expectations for parent participation. The statistically most significant change post-implementation of the BEST model was in opportunities for discussions with other parents regarding children's transitions.

Parents in Pensacola, FL, developed a parent transition manual based upon the model. The manual is in wide use across Florida and was recently presented at a national conference. A parent manual in Missouri was based upon the BEST Model, and parent groups in Kansas and Wisconsin are in the process of doing the same. Parents who attended BEST workshops in Kansas have also developed a parent training system on transition for the state. A mother in Brown Deer, WI, who attended a BEST workshop, managed her son's transition to a community kindergarten. She then asked the project if she could put her transition experience on videotape for sharing with other parents. BEST supported this effort and has disseminated the videotape.

Teacher opinion and satisfaction were assessed through a follow-up questionnaire concerning child performance, completed once at the end of the preschool year and three times throughout the kindergarten year. The mean and range of teacher satisfaction with children's transition is presented in Attachment 7. Teachers were generally satisfied with the transition plan. The follow-up evaluation also identified emergence of child behaviors of concern, such as particular pre-academic skills or social development. The information concerning teacher satisfaction was then utilized by the project to increase communication and problem solving between service providers at different levels.

The 1987-88 outreach project followed 22 children in their transition from preschool to 10 kindergarten programs. Kindergarten teachers used an entry interview with parents of kindergartners with disabilities (Conversation 3). The majority (80%) indicated that the transition interview was very helpful and that they would use it again next year. Eighty percent of them also indicated that the instrument was easily adaptable to the needs of their individual programs and families; in fact several of the teachers planned to adapt and use the form with all of the
Teacher Satisfaction with BEST Transition Planning during Children's Last Year of Preschool and First Year of Kindergarten

N = 10 children
children and families in their classrooms. Teachers felt the materials and procedures that were used greatly improved the process of transition for themselves, as well as for children and families.

Child placement data are useful short-term in judging the adequacy of the transition process. Prior to the recent push for inclusive placements, both school districts involved in the demonstration project attempted to place children in the least restrictive environment (LRE) possible. Thus it was significant that a year after the kindergarten placement, all 31 children were in their initial placement or a less restrictive one; the transition model apparently functioned well to accomplish LRE for those children.

During 1992–94, Bridging Early Services worked closely with school and community leaders in Lindsborg, KS, to transition all eight of the local preschool children with disabilities (some significant) to the local early childhood center. Previously these children had been riding 35–50 miles per day to attend a special preschool program in another community. This transition was carefully evaluated, using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Data were gathered from children, parents, special educators, therapists, early childhood educators, and administrators. Both typical children and those with special needs continued to develop well in the new placement; most striking was the increase in rate of language development, as evaluated with INREAL analysis, seen in the children with disabilities after their move to the local Children's Center. The transition was accomplished by meetings and introductory visits by children, parents, and teachers, by joint planning for the upcoming transition, and by ongoing Bridging Early Services inservice training of special educators, child care providers, and preschool teachers at the Children's Center to help them develop team collaboration and problem solving skills. After this successful transition, all of the children with special needs entered kindergarten in their neighborhood school; most had been slated for busing to a special education program in a town 18 miles away.

Administrator opinion was gathered in Lawrence, KS, and McPherson, KS, demonstration sites. Transition procedures implemented in 1985 in both areas are still in use and still favorably rated. The three-county area centered by Pensacola, FL, implemented the project model in 1987; its administrators are highly complimentary of the model and its impact on other types of interagency cooperation. Administrators in Eau Claire and Brown Deer, WI, are similarly favorable in their evaluation of the model and its procedures.

State leaders in Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, New Mexico, North Dakota, and Wisconsin (at least) have included the transition procedures and timeline developed by BEST in their state plans because they believe that it serves as a guideline for local programs to satisfy legal requirements and ease transitions for families. Taskforces facilitated by Bridging Early Services in
four of those states have continued to develop transition procedures and resolve issues which arise.

The State of North Dakota is using a preschool-to-kindergarten transition training manual developed by the former project director and, with her cooperation, has adapted the manual for use in transitions from infant programs to preschool programs. Likewise, state transition manuals developed by Bridging Early Services have received wide circulation (300-600 copies each) in Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin.

B. Evaluation of Outreach Efforts

Information about the effectiveness of outreach procedures has been gathered from comments of attendees at project workshops based on the model, by follow-up interviews with consumers to determine model implementation, and by critiques of project materials.

Evidence of effectiveness is available from 165 workshops and other presentations shared by project staff nationwide during this outreach period. During this outreach project, BEST staff have records of addressing 10,840 people. Evaluations of workshop experiences have been extremely favorable concerning the usefulness of the information and materials provided. Evaluations typically rate quality of presentation and effectiveness high (5 to 6 on a 6-point scale; 4 to 5 on a 5-point scale); the quality of materials (audio-visual and handouts) are also typically rated high. See Attachment 3 for a list of workshops and other presentations. According to attendee reports, workshop and inservice presentations to professionals have produced changes in terms of

a. **Awareness** concerning the need for transition programming. Comments such as, "This workshop has given me insight as to what must take place and what my responsibilities are in transition planning," and, "I see now that it's a good idea to carry out (transition planning) throughout the year and to include transition in the IEP" are typical of workshop evaluations;

b. **Interagency collaboration.** Agency personnel typically leave workshops with a plan and an outline for the development of an interagency agreement concerning transition. Comments from interagency teams have included, "We realized we had no written agreements and plan to build one," and "It helped to have agencies together at the same meeting to vent some frustrations and to improve communications. Procedures were started to build an agreement";

c. **Plans to include family collaboration** in transition procedures. Participants often develop a list of activities they can implement with families to involve them meaningfully in transition planning, such as, "Encourage parents to visit receiving programs," "Ask some experienced parents to help us write a parent manual on transition." "Have someone from the
public school talk to our parents." "Include parents on our interagency council," and even "Allow parents to participate in their child's transition."

d. **Program communication and follow-up procedures.** Sending and receiving teachers have indicated they plan to use each other as a resource in curriculum and goal development, to visit each other's programs, and to communicate prior to and after transition. Some areas have scheduled joint inservice sessions. "It will be a new experience for the Head Start and kindergarten teachers to meet together to talk about transition, but we're going to try it." In one city, preschool and kindergarten teachers are meeting monthly to plan how to bridge services for transitioning children.

e. **Teaming.** Special educators and teachers of typically developing children often begin to see how they can work together to provide normalized experiences for children with disabilities after transition. "I'm seeing how we sometimes use the same words but we mean different things by them," said one preschool teacher, "but when we work together we can make the teaching appropriate for all the children in the room."

Workshops conducted for families have reportedly helped parents anticipate their child's growth in the new program, meet other parents and service providers from the new program, develop ways to participate meaningfully in their child's transition, and learn about activities to do with their child at home that might be valuable for transition to the new program.

Followup interviews were conducted with local administrators at the first 12 locations of BEST workshops during the present outreach project. These interviews occurred an average of eight months after the workshop. 92% of respondents reported improved local interagency planning on transition in their region, including increased communication and resulting written products. 92% also reported greater family involvement in planning for their children's transition as a result of project materials and the workshop presentation. Finally, 90% of respondents cited improved transition planning for individual children as a result of BEST training. A summary of these evaluation data appears in Appendix B.

In addition to formal presentations and workshops, project staff conducted hundreds of consultations on-site, by phone and fax, and at conferences. These conversations often helped consumers find ways to overcome barriers which had arisen in their transition planning.

Letters in project files attest to the effectiveness of project materials for use by teachers and intervention programs. The *Bridging Early Services* book published by Paul Brookes Publishers, which contains a comprehensive presentation of project philosophy and materials, has reportedly been selling well.
Evaluation of the Wisconsin manual by its recipients has shown that 78% of the administrators responding have rated the manual "extremely useful" (see Appendix B).

One Missouri Project was comprehensive in nature. Together with the Transition Planning Committee, BEST developed a videotape and a trainer of trainers curriculum and brought together four team members from each of 11 regions of the State for preparation. These teams then returned home to facilitate transition planning with 15-60 leaders (including parents) in each region. Both the trainer of trainers session and the resulting workshops were evaluated highly (see Appendix B), though the videotape was not. Followup surveys eight months after the Community Transition Workshops found significant impact of the BEST effort on Missouri transition planning. 88% reported changes in their transition planning procedures as a result of training. 97% said interagency planning had occurred or was being attempted. 97% had future plans for improving transitions within their own agency and/or between agencies. 92% requested further technical assistance from Bridging Early Services. See data summary in Appendix B.

IX. PROJECT IMPACT

In states where early childhood intervention services are themselves in transition, this outreach project has encouraged transition planning and related curriculum issues to be considered in initial program development. In areas with established services, the project has promoted best practices as exemplified by the model and has assisted personnel with interagency collaboration, family involvement, or child/curriculum support, as needed. Among the states targeted for technical assistance, services have developed in very different patterns. Some states have a coordinated system for technical assistance and personnel development; other states are only beginning to develop such structures. Thus, it is obvious that different types of technical assistance in different formats aimed at different outcomes were needed by various audiences among the states.

In spite of this diversity of demands, this outreach project has impacted children, families, service providers, administrators, state leaders, personnel trainers, and the broad early childhood field, as thoroughly detailed in Section VI, Description of Outreach. Please consult that in-depth analysis.

The project worked in 17 states, providing intensive state and local services to five states and directly influencing formal state-level transition policies in seven. It reached professionals and parents in many parts of the country through presentations, workshops, print media, or technical assistance, as well as through counsel to several of the regional education laboratories. Key facts include the following:

* 18 presentations to international or national conferences
* 8 presentations to regional meetings
* 139 presentations to state and local conferences
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* at least 10,840 persons addressed
* seven transition manuals produced for/with states
* nine scholarly articles published
* one book published
* 750 inquiries answered
* numerous formal and informal consultations
* 2,500 brochures distributed

If transitions are conducted well, young children have an increased chance of school success, a most noteworthy impact (National Association of State Boards of Education, 1988).

In summary, it is demonstrable that this project has had a broad impact, with benefits to multiple groups:

1. **Children with Disabilities.** Children with disabilities gained from this project through an increased likelihood of experiencing success in new educational environments. The emphasis on placement of children in inclusive environments and on sharing strategies for serving them there has begun to increase the frequency of community placements in areas served. Early inclusion and educational success have the potential for spiraling through the students' lives (Salisbury & Vincent, 1990). Because program personnel, state leaders, and personnel trainers have been the primary recipients of outreach training, the number of children benefitting will increase each year, as these personnel work with additional children.

2. **Families of Children with Disabilities.** Partnership in early transition planning directly benefits families by increasing their competence and confidence to engage in future educational planning and service coordination (Hains, Rosenkoetter, & Fowler, 1991; Lazzari & Kilgo, 1989). It helps to ensure that an appropriate setting is selected for the child, that the child begins to develop some of the skills valued in the new environment, that the family knows its legal rights in the new setting, that the receiving teacher is aware of some resources and priorities of the child and the family, and that the family has developed a support system for transition.

3. **Agencies and Their Personnel.** By receiving outreach training, programs are able to improve their transition planning and services. Efforts to implement this model result in improved interagency and interdisciplinary collaboration, which often has benefits beyond transition issues. Another area of assistance in certain local areas has been in the adoption of developmentally appropriate curricula and teaching strategies which allow teachers to serve a greater diversity of children in a single toddler, preschool, or primary classroom.

4. **State Leaders.** State leaders have received assistance in implementing the requirements of P.L. 102-119 for transition planning. This project has provided a source of information and technical support in problem-solving for some of the thorny issues that implementation of the new law has raised in their states, such
as summer services, lack of responsiveness of senders or receivers, funding issues, and differences in eligibility criteria.

5. **Personnel Trainers.** Sharing of materials and scholarly articles with personnel trainers has helped preservice professionals to develop awareness of the need for transition planning with children and families and also to gain some strategies for accomplishing it.

6. **Field of Early Childhood Special Services.** Sharing of best practices, consistent with the Bridging Early Services model and validated during services to the local sites, is assisting the field as a whole. The project's collaboration with several of the U.S.D.O.E.'s regional educational laboratories developing improved transition practices for public schools helps to ensure inclusion of children with disabilities in those plans.

**X. STATEMENT OF FUTURE ACTIVITIES**

As stated above, the Associated Colleges of Central Kansas was funded to provide for another three years (1993-1996) the outreach activities of the Bridging Early Services Transition Project. Eighteen months of that new project have elapsed. The new project works with three states in a significant way (Kansas, Missouri, and Wisconsin) and to a lesser degree with four other states (Alaska, Connecticut, Florida, and Indiana).

In every case, learnings from the 1990-94 project are informing current actions. It appears that project personnel are continuing to be especially useful in helping state and local leaders grapple with thorny issues surrounding the age three transition for children with disabilities (Fowler, Hains, & Rosenkoetter, 1989) and the age five transition for all children, including those with disabilities (Rosenkoetter, 1994). Bridging Early Services is also working in several parts of the nation to foster local community planning for transition and related issues as well as assisting communities in the transition to service provision in more natural environments across the early childhood age span. It is helping to develop a model procedure for hospital to community transition and is pilot-testing a variety of ways to continue the use of IFSPs until age 6. Progress in these areas within target communities will be evaluated. Relevant data will be shared with the field and used to guide future decision-making about transition policy and practices.

**XI. ASSURANCE STATEMENT**

In accord with the request by the U.S. Department of Education, full copies of this report have been sent to the Office of Special Education Programs and ERIC. Abstracts have been sent to all the addresses provided.
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APPENDIX A

BROCHURE, STAFF, NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD
The Associated Colleges of Central Kansas is a consortium of six independent colleges located in rural and urban communities since 1972. The consortium includes Bethany College, McPherson College, Tabor College, Kansas Wesleyan University, Bethel College, and Sterling College. ACCK faculty and students work closely with early childhood programs and school districts across a wide region. ACCK faculty and students work closely with early childhood programs and school districts across a wide region.
BEGINNINGS ARE IMPORTANT ...

A critical need in early childhood services is to help young children with special needs and their families find and adjust to new service settings. Good beginnings require careful planning and cooperation.

WHY PLAN?

Well-coordinated transitions with participation by all relevant parties promote

- placement decisions that meet the needs of children, families, agencies and schools.
- uninterrupted services because parents and professionals have the information and resources they need to continue programming.
- non-confrontational but effective models of advocacy that families can use throughout their children's lives.
- avoidance of duplication in assessment and goal planning.
- reduced stress for children, families, and professionals.

WHAT WE SHARE

Bridging Early Services Transition Project helps professionals and parents learn how to plan and implement successful transitions

- early intervention to preschool services.
- special preschool to kindergarten-level programs.
- special programs to inclusive community-based services.
- Head Start to kindergarten

Our consultation is based on research and implementation conducted since 1976 in diverse areas of the United States.

WHERE TO BEGIN

Four strategies are recommended to assist children and families with transitions: interagency coordination between the sending and receiving programs, establishing written timelines for transition, individualized family involvement, and transition curriculum planning and instruction and environmental modification to help children experience success in their new setting.

Validated procedures and instruments are provided for:

- interagency agreements.
- communication between home and intervention programs.
- family involvement in decision making.
- construction of a program transition timeline.
- development of a transition timeline within the IFSP/AEP for each child and family.
- identification of local agencies for referral.
- support for the child in both the sending and receiving program through curriculum planning, instruction, and environmental modifications.
- ways to welcome the child and family into the new program.
- evaluation of the transition procedures.
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APPENDIX B

EVALUATION DATA
WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Check the category that best describes you:

___ Infant Specialist/Early Interventionist
___ Early Childhood Special Educator
___ Community Preschool/Day Care Teacher
___ Kindergarten-Level Teacher
___ Head Start Teacher
___ Paraprofessional or Aide
___ Nurse
___ Social Worker
___ Therapist (type:_______)
___ Parent
___ Administrator (type:_______)
___ Researcher
___ Psychologist
___ Other (please list)_________

Please rate the following aspects of this presentation which most closely reflects your opinion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of topic discussed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope/breadth of presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of handouts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Please list your favorite part(s) of this workshop.

2. Please list your suggestions for improving this workshop.

3. What from this session will help you do your job better?

4. How might Bridging Early Services assist you in the future?

5. Other comments or questions:

Return to: Associated Colleges of Central Kansas
105 East Kansas Avenue
McPherson, Kansas 67460

Contact: (316) 241-7754 for additional information
OUTCOMES OF BRIDGING EARLY SERVICES TRANSITION (BEST) PROJECT

1. Has interagency planning for improving the transitions of young children and their families occurred as a result of the materials and presentation from the Bridging Early Services Transition project? If so, what benefits to the agencies have resulted from your interagency planning? Have transition procedures been formalized with written products (transition resource manual, timeline, common referral form, common release of information form, written interagency agreement, transfer of records procedure, or other specific procedure)?

2. Have families of young children with disabilities been involved with transition planning for their children as a result of the materials and presentation? If so, what benefits to families have occurred?

3. Has transition planning for individual children as they move between early intervention, early childhood or kindergarten programs occurred as a result of the materials and training provided by the BEST project? If so, what benefits for the children have been observed?
Thank you for taking time to provide information which will help to improve transition planning for Missouri children and their families!

Name____________________________________ Phone______________________________

Please select the term which best describes you:
___Parent  ___Regional Center Program
___Special Health Care Needs    ___Public school early childhood special education

1. What transition planning has occurred in your program as a result of your participation in the Community Transition Workshop? If you are a parent, please answer about transition planning for your child.

2. What interagency transition planning has occurred?

3. What are your plans for future work on transition planning:
   A. within your program?

   B. with an interagency group?

4. Would you like additional technical assistance from Bridging Early Services Transition project staff?
   ___Phone consultation when questions arise
   ___A local or cluster interagency workshop
   ___Additional written materials
   ___Consultation with your local taskforce
   ___Training for family services coordinators/teachers in working with families to plan individual children’s transitions
   ___Workshop with and for parents in planning for their children’s transitions
   ___Other assistance (please explain your individual needs)
Bridging Early Services Transition Project Evaluation Plan

I. Evaluation of training conferences.
   A. Facilitators’ training.
      1. One page evaluation will be completed by participants at the end of the training. (F1)
      2. After the Community Transition Workshops have been held, the facilitator will complete a one page evaluation. (F2)
   B. Community Transition Workshops.
      1. Each participant will complete a one page workshop evaluation. (CTW1)
      2. The facilitators will complete a workshop outcomes evaluation with the participants as part of the last segment of the workshop. (CTW2)

II. Evaluation of change in transition practices using a pretest, post-test design.
   A. Community Transition Workshop participants-group 1.
      1. Pretest:
         a. Each participant will complete a preconference transition self assessment survey with other program staff. These will be mailed to participants with other preconference information approximately three weeks before the workshop. Facilitators will complete the same self assessment before the facilitators’ training. (SA1)
         b. Participants will bring two copies of the self assessment to the Community Transition Workshop. One copy will go to the project staff for analysis. One copy will be used at the workshop and the participant will take it with them. A person at the workshop should be designated to make extra copies if participants have not brought two copies. Large prestamped envelopes will be provided to the facilitators by the project for mailing.
         c. After comparing the list of participants with the returned pretests, project staff will follow-up by phone any persons for which a pretest was not received.
      2. Post-test.
         a. The post-test will be mailed to all participants for which we have a copy of the pretest by the BEST project.
         b. The post-test will be mailed about October 25, 1992 with a return date of November 12, 1992. BEST staff will follow up by phone beginning November 16.
         c. The post-test will be the same self assessment done before the workshops, and will again be completed with other staff within each program or agency.
d. A letter of support from state level agency administrators will be included with the post-test, if administrators agree. This may help to emphasize the need for this follow-up evaluation.

B. Pretest, post-test control--group 2.

1. Selection of control group participants.
   a. Ask state to provide a list of all school districts and a contact person (ECSE coordinator or special education coordinator). Districts which will not be represented at the facilitator or Community Transition Workshops will be marked.
   b. These variables will be identified:
      (1) programs which began ECSE services prior to Fall, 1989.
      (2) rural, mid-size, urban.
      (3) region of the state: Northeast, Northwest, Central, Southeast, Southwest.(or other system already used in the state to identify regions)
   c. Invited programs which do not attend the training will already have received the preconference self assessment.
   d. A stratified sample will be selected from the list of school districts using the factors listed above.
   e. Sample size will be determined by the number of possible districts that can be included. Group 2 and group 3 will be selected from this list. The samples should be as large as possible since return rate may be lower than desired.

2. The pretest will be mailed to Group 2 before the Community Transition Workshops, March, 1992, with a return date of April 15, 1992. Phone follow-up will begin April 20.

3. A letter of support from state level administrators if they agree will help to emphasize the importance of the evaluation. (to be included in evaluation mailing)

4. The post-test will be sent and returned on the same schedule as the post-test for group 1.

5. Programs which complete the pre and post-tests will be offered Interagency Transition Planning Manuals as an incentive.

C. Post-test only control--group 3.

1. Sample selection will be from the same list and using the same stratification variables as in Group 2.

2. Group 3 will receive the post-test on the same schedule as Groups 1 and 2.

3. An incentive gift of Interagency Transition Planning Manuals will be offered to those who complete the evaluation form.
III. Evaluation of change in transition practices using a pre- and post-training parent survey.

A. Pre-training parent survey-Parent group 1.
   1. Sample selection.
      a. Programs selected will be Bureau of Special Health Care Needs and Regional Centers First Steps family service coordinators who will attend the facilitators' training.
         Factors for analysis:
         (1) Geographic region in the state: Northeast, Northwest, Central, Southeast, Southwest.
         (2) Rural, mid-size, and urban areas, total-22 First Steps programs. N = 22 programs.
      b. Selection of individuals within programs: N = 220
         (1) 10 families from BSHCN and 10 families from Regional Center programs will be identified by the service coordinators.
         (2) The first 10 families whose children were transitioned from First Steps into a public school early childhood special education program after August 1, 1991 will be identified to be part of the study. If there are more than 10 who transitioned on that date, the service coordinator will identify the first 10 by alphabetical order.
   2. A Parent Satisfaction Scale will be distributed to the identified parents by the service coordinators. Postage and printing will be done by the BEST project. Parents will return the survey using a stamped envelope attached to their survey. Surveys will be mailed after the facilitators' training. Facilitators who represent selected programs and who agree to participate will be briefed about the selection process during a lunch meeting at the facilitators training. Return date for the survey will be April 20, 1992.
   3. The survey will identify which school district the child attends, so that comparisons between programs which began before 1989 and after 1989 can be made.
   4. No parent information or identification will be included on the survey, so confidentiality will be maintained. Only the demographic information will be identified; region, size, and age of program.

B. Post-training parent evaluation-Parent group 2.
   1. Programs for this group will be the same as those identified for Parent Group 1.
   2. The parent group will be selected in the same way as for Parent Group 1 except this group will be the first 10 who made the transition after August 1, 1992.
SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATOR’S SURVEY

N = 12; written survey mailed with telephone interview. Respondents were administrators who had requested BEST training for their locality or state.

Has interagency planning for improving the transitions of young children and their families occurred as a result of the materials and presentation from the BEST project?

92% --YES

Benefits to the agencies that have resulted that were mentioned were:

- Increased communication and collaboration across agencies. (8)
- Improved team skills and problem solving.
- Regular interagency transition planning meetings.

Written products have resulted: (8)
- Resource directory
- Written timelines
- Interagency transition plan
- Interagency Memorandum of Agreement for transition activities
- Common release form
- Transition procedure section of personnel manual

Have families of young children with disabilities been involved with transition planning for their children as a result of the materials and presentation? What benefits to families have occurred?

92%--YES, (one person said benefits were limited)

Benefits to families mentioned were:

- Reduced stress for families with more communication. (8)
- Parents have more knowledge of program options and are able to participate more effectively in decision-making. (6)
- Parents visit program options. (5)
- Written materials have been developed for parents during transition. (2)

Has transition planning for individual children occurred as a result of the materials and training provided by the BEST project? If so, what benefits for the children have been observed?

90%--YES

Benefits to children that were mentioned:

- Longer timelines for transition activities allow a gradual process with less stress. (8)
Children visit their new placement before starting. (3)
Individual transition plans are used. (3)
More appropriate placements. (3)
Equipment and related services are in place. (2)
The evaluation process is less stressful to children, the programs are flexible in where and how the evaluation will be done. (1)
The process allows for follow-up after the transition. (1)
SUMMARY OF OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS FROM MISSOURI; FALL 1992

Respondents had received training at the Community Transition Workshop the previous spring. This summary is with the first 36 who answered.

N = 36

1. Transition planning occurred in their program as a result of the workshop.

83% said their program had changed their transition planning procedures as a result of the training.
5% said they were in the informal or beginning stages, but were working out details.
5% did not change transition procedures they already had in place.
3% had not had any referrals for preschool special education.
3% did not feel the questions applied to the program.

Changes mentioned:
An individual transition conference for each child and family.
Development of a timeline.
Parent/child visits.
Improved referral process.
Development of a consistent procedure.
Staff visits to possible placements.
Parent participation in developing the transition plan.
Scheduling evaluations one month prior to the 3rd birthday.
Revision of forms.
Preparation of families on a longer timeline.

2. Interagency transition planning has occurred in the community as a result of the transition training.

92% said interagency planning had occurred.
5% said details were being worked on or needed focus.
3% said no planning had occurred.

Interagency planning that was mentioned:
Formation of an interagency committee or focus of existing council with better communication between agencies as a result. (25)
Written policies, timeline, manual, or other written interagency procedures. (12)
(These are in process in most cases)
Planning for coordinated referral and screening. (4)

3. When asked about future plans for improving transitions, 97% of the respondents reported ongoing or planned activities either within their own agency or between agencies.
Activities mentioned:
Integrate transition planning at all levels.
Focus on another transition (age 5).
Complete written transition agreement, procedures, manuals. etc.
Involve parents in identifying future needs for planning.
Provide inservice training.
Improvement of documentation.
Continue interagency communication.
Involve a broader group for planning.

4. 92% of the respondents requested further technical assistance from the BEST project. (materials, consultation, parent training, staff training)
Evaluation of Transition Manuals Requested by Wisconsin BEST Planning Committee and sent to 300 Wisconsin Agencies

32 persons filled out the postcards with many of them answering more than one item in a given section.

Please circle appropriate responses and put card in mailbox within three days.

1. This resource will be useful in our agency's work.
   - very much 25
   - some 5
   - not at all 1
   - don't know 1

2. The section that will be most useful is
   - transition overview 10
   - family participation 10
   - services to children 6
   - interagency issues 15
   - evaluation 2
   - forms/tools for planning 6
   - references 1
   - all sections 4
   - Not sure 1

3. Type of agency:
   - early intervention program 15
   - state interagency council 1 (Local not state)
   - county administrative lead agency 11
   - private agency 2
   - school district 2
   - parent
   - perinatal center 1
   - Head Start 1
   - other 4

4. Comments:
   - Well organized with much useful information
   - Currently working on tools to enhance transition. THANKS!
   - Our agency also transitions children thru 8th grade and this information can apply
   - Thanks for sharing this information
   - Forms used by other agencies helpful
   - Thank you!
   - Since our program is new, all sections will be used. Thank you for this booklet.
   - Thanks!
   - Good resource to guide procedure and practice
   - Entire public law helpful. Hard to choose a best section
   - Thanks for all the hard work
   - Interesting that transitions have been taking place effectively in most cases for 15 years, now we are bombarded with processes and procedures for it.
   - This resource contains much valuable information - it will be a useful tool!
   - Excellent resource!
   - We have used successful transition skills for a number of years.
SUMMARY OF EVALUATION:
MISSOURI COMMUNITY TRANSITION WORKSHOPS

October 23, 1992

Facilitator evaluation of training, March 18, 1992

N = 25  (all ratings are on a six point scale with 1 low) reported as means

Relevance of topic discussed  4.84
Usefulness of information     4.44
Quality of presentation      4.44
Opportunity for participation 4.66
Usefulness of handouts       4.64
Usefulness of video          4.09
Overall rating of training   4.48

Facilitator evaluation of training after CTW

N = 40  (same format as done immediately after training, except starred item)

Relevance of topic discussed  5.03
Usefulness of information     4.82
Opportunity for participation 4.32
Usefulness of handouts       4.53
Usefulness of video          3.68
Format of workshop plan*      4.13
Overall rating of training   4.55

Community Transition Workshop participant evaluation

N = 164  (same format as Facilitators)

Relevance of topic discussed  5.21
Usefulness of information     5.00
Quality of presentation      4.85
Opportunity for participation 5.00
Usefulness of handouts       5.03
Usefulness of video          3.97
Overall rating               4.93