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Abstract

Despite challenges educators face when assessing needs of students with a significant cognitive disability, providing fair and accurate assessment of skills is crucial to a student’s future success. Dismal outcomes for these students indicate the current transition planning process is weak and not appropriate. Research suggests meaningful transition planning is facilitated by appropriate transition assessment to ensure students with a significant cognitive disability make progress, meet annual transition goals, have individualized supports and services, and receive effective instruction. The purpose of this study was to investigate the nationwide transition assessment process for students with a significant cognitive disability. Results indicated transition assessments are not fully assessing the needs of this population, thereby denying equal participation and access to inclusive environments.
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The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 2004) states the purpose of special education is to provide a free and appropriate public education and related services to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities in order to obtain further postsecondary success in the areas of education/training, employment, and independent living. Thus, the purpose of special education emphasizes the importance of transition education. Currently, IDEA (2004) mandates the transition planning process to begin at the age of 16 and continue through high school graduation; however, many states across the country require transition planning to start sooner (Suk, Martin, McConnell, & Biles, 2019). Transition planning involves developing a coordinated approach to help students attain postsecondary goals including annual goals and transition services. The cornerstone to transition planning is the use of transition assessments to identify students’ needs, strengths, preferences, and interests associated with their postsecondary aspirations (Morningstar & Clavenna-Deane, 2018; Pulos & Martin, 2018).

Transition Assessments

With IDEA’s (2004) reauthorization, the law mandates the use of transition assessments for all students with disabilities. Specifically, transition assessments help to identify students’ needs, strengths, preferences, and interests. As part of the transition planning process, the utilization of transition assessments is an ongoing, annual process of collecting information to support the postsecondary goals of students with disabilities (Neubert & Leconte, 2013). Therefore, transition assessments have a simple rationale—to identify students’ aspirations for the future and to assess the necessary skills and knowledge students have or will need to learn to
reach those aspirations (Test, 2012). Transition assessments inform the Individualized Education Program (IEP), which procures student-level information relative to their needs, strengths, preferences, and interests to develop annual goals (i.e., both academic and non-academic) to help facilitate the attainment of students’ postsecondary goals. In addition, transition assessments provide a means for the IEP team to understand where the student is and where the student wants to be as a future learner, worker, and community member.

Within IDEA (2004), the phrase “transition assessment” refers to the use of two or more transition assessments employed annually (Martin & McConnell, 2017). Annually assessing the postsecondary interests of students with disabilities is important as these students may change their preferences as they mature through middle and high school. A number of transition assessments exist to assess the skills identified in IDEA’s (2004) transition domains—postsecondary education, adult services, employment, independent living, and community participation (Morningstar & Clavenna-Deane, 2018). These assessments vary in the method in how they assess individuals (e.g., interviews, questionnaires, interest surveys, skills assessments) and who assesses the individual (e.g., self-administered, parent, teacher). However, the main difference amongst the transition assessments resides across two arrangements: informal and formal assessments (National Technical Assistance Center on Transition [NTACT], 2016; Morningstar & Clavenna-Deane, 2018; Neubert & Leconte, 2013). Formal transition assessments are standardized instruments for measuring a variety of items and typically include descriptions of administration procedures, norming processes, recommended uses, reliability, and validity. Informal transition assessments lack basic norming processes, reliability, and validity information, therefore, the information gleaned about the student may be inaccurate (NTACT, 2016; Neubert & Leconte, 2013; Pulos & Martin, 2018).
Availability and Quality of Transition Assessments

Despite the availability of transition assessments, for free or purchase, many educators fail to choose valid and reliable transition assessments for transition planning (Prince, Plotner, & Yell, 2014). Prince et al. (2014) reviewed court cases across the country relative to the postsecondary transition planning for students with disabilities and recommended the IEP team (a) use transition assessments that assess across domains (i.e., education/training, employment, and independent living), (b) use at least one formal assessment with reliability and ample validity evidence, and (c) maximize the participation of students with disabilities in the transition planning process. In addition to Prince et al.’s (2014) recommendations, many experts in the field of special education, specifically secondary transition, recommend using a combination of formal and informal transition assessments to accurately assess student strengths, limitations, and interests (Martin & McConnell, 2017; McConnell, 2012; Sitlington, Neubert, Begun, Lombard, & Leconte, 2007).

Students with a Significant Cognitive Disability

Originating before the age of 18, students with a significant cognitive disability demonstrate substantial limitations in intellectual functioning and adaptive behaviors (American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities [AAIDD], 2019a), which covers a variety of domains including everyday communication, daily living, employment, and social skills (Kurth, Gross, Lovinger, & Catalano, 2012). To educate students with a significant cognitive disability, IDEA (2004) and best practice (Agran, Wehmeyer, Cavin, & Palmer, 2010) suggest these students be instructed with high expectations to nurture their development relative to the nation’s four policy goals: (a) equality of opportunity, (b) full participation, (c) independent living, and (d) economic self-sufficiency (AAIDD, 2019b). For this to take place,
annual and postsecondary transition goals highlighting the needs above should be noted within
the IEP; however, marginalizing ideologies about students with a significant cognitive disability
persist, potentially preventing them from achieving their postsecondary aspirations. For example,
Grigal, Hart, and Migliore (2011) conducted a systematic review of the National Longitudinal
Transition Study-2, comparing students with a significant cognitive disability to other students
with disabilities. They found students with a significant cognitive disability were less likely to
have postsecondary education or competitive employment goals on their IEP. In addition, these
students were more likely to have sheltered and supported employment goals in their IEP as
compared to other students with disabilities.

A need exists for students with a significant cognitive disability to engage in the planning
of their postsecondary future, have increased opportunities to access novel education and
employment environments prior to graduation, and access to a variety of agencies to promote
continuing and lasting linkages and support in their community (AAIDD, 2019b; Getzel &
deFur, 1997). However, students with a significant cognitive disability may not know what
opportunities exist in their communities, and their teachers may not know the interests of their
students to afford them the intentional targeted instruction required to cultivate positive
postsecondary outcomes. To gather this information, transition assessments serve as the
foundation and driving force “to identify measurable postsecondary goals and determine
necessary transition services to pursue such goals during the secondary school years” (Neubert &
Leconte, 2013, p.72).

**Transition Assessments for Students with a Significant Cognitive Disability**

Students with a significant cognitive disability may require assistive technology to access
and engage in transition assessments. However, the field of secondary transition, does not
currently have large-scale data in relation to students with a significant cognitive disability and their access requirements to transition assessments. A large majority of transition assessments are now available through online formats. According to Wang, Jiao, Young, Brooks, and Olson (2008), in recent years there has been a shift from paper and pencil assessments to computerized assessments. Computerized assessments allow for more flexibility in testing accommodations, which affords increased student engagement and more accurate assessment of students’ knowledge (Scheuermann & Björnsson, 2009). As students with a significant cognitive disability do not represent “a single IDEA [2004] disability category” (Kleinert et al., 2015); rather, a conglomerate of disabilities (e.g., intellectual disability, autism spectrum disorder, multiple disabilities, deaf-blindness; Cameto et al., 2010; Kearns, Towles-Reeves, Kleinert, Kleinert, & Thomas, 2011; Kleinert et al., 2015), the current literature-base does not provide a clear picture of what teachers are currently using to assist students with a significant cognitive disability in accessing transition assessments or what these students may need to access computerized assessments.

The value of the assessments to the transition planning process regardless of the arrangement they belong to, formal or informal, resides in information generated from them. Therefore, individually choosing specific transition assessments to meet the needs of students with disabilities is vital, particularly for students with a significant cognitive disability. While informal transition assessments are potentially useful and provide information to IEP teams, the need for formal assessments resides in case law and best practice to ensure assessments are measuring the appropriate skills of these students. Although an array of formal transition assessments exist, many are not designed nor validated for students with a significant cognitive
disability. This raises an important question: What transition assessments are teachers using for these students for transition planning when such limited choices are available?

**Purpose and Research Questions**

Across the nation, 52% of states and territories recognize the intense educational needs of students with a significant cognitive disability by broadening the transition-age to include students as young as 13 and as old as 26 (Suk et al., 2019). When considering students with a significant cognitive disability, transition assessments remain elusive, with limited choices in availability, quality (i.e., formal and informal), and accessibility (Martin & McConnell, 2017; Pulos & Martin, 2018). Morningstar and Pearson (2008) identified transition assessments utilized for students with a significant cognitive disability (a) are not developed for these students and the many attributes they possess, (b) lack critical validity and reliability evidence, (c) do not produce results which are easily converted into plans and goals, and (d) do not allow for results to be easily copied into IEP documents.

Without a variety of transition assessments to choose from for students with a significant cognitive disability, the process in which IEP teams evaluate, interpret, and plan future transition activities is in stark contrast to the simple rationale previously stated. The skills identified in transition assessments for these students should come from formal and informal assessments to provide a bridge of instruction on research- and evidence-based practices to promote the likelihood of positive postsecondary outcomes (Odom et al., 2005; Test et al., 2009). Utilizing transition assessments to establish this connection amplifies the impact for all involved—educational stakeholders, parents, and, especially, students with a significant cognitive disability.

The purpose of the present study was to (a) provide a national picture of the current state of the transition assessment process utilized for students with a significant cognitive disability as
currently administered by a variety of educational stakeholders, including special education teachers, district transition program teachers, and other school professionals and (b) explore what is needed to create a transition assessment to fit the unique needs of students with a significant cognitive disability and prepare them for the future. Specifically, we addressed the following research questions:

1. What transition assessments are educators using to assess the needs of students with a significant cognitive disability?

2. How are students with a significant cognitive disability currently accessing transition assessments in schools, and what might they need to better afford them access to transition assessments?

**Method**

This exploratory survey sought to determine which transition assessments educational stakeholders were using and what they needed to appropriately assess transition skills of students with a significant cognitive disability. Prior to recruitment and data collection, the southwest university’s (i.e., where this research took place) office of Human Research Participant Protection Institutional Review Board approved all research logistics.

**Participants**

An online survey was distributed to middle and high school special education teachers, district transition program teachers, and school professionals across the United States. A total of 1,530 responses were collected. Of those, 1,186 respondents consented to participate in the survey. After consent, 938 met the survey’s inclusion criteria (i.e., taught or had taught students with a significant cognitive disability) and completed the survey.

**Recruitment**
Participants were recruited by email: (a) utilizing two listservs housed in a southwest university’s database of active account users across the United States and (b) snowball sampling, where individuals completing the survey through an anonymous link forwarded the link to other participants or contacts. Inclusion criteria for participants included persons over the age of 18 who indicated having taught previously or currently teaching students with a significant cognitive disability. Individuals who indicated not teaching or not having taught this population of students were exited from the survey and not counted as a respondent. Participants contacted through email received up to four emails over a two-month time frame.

**Instrumentation**

We used a researcher-developed survey instrument. The survey was developed and disseminated through Qualtrics© software, an online survey program. Based on our knowledge of current transition assessments, researcher knowledge of students with a significant cognitive disability, and the extant literature related to assessing students with a significant cognitive disability (e.g., Bowen & Rude, 2006; Kellems & Morningstar, 2010; Neubert, 2003; Pulos & Martin, 2018; Shogren & Plotner, 2012), survey questions were developed to provide inclusive choices and opportunities for specific individual input. We utilized an iterative approach when revising and editing the questions before vetting survey questions with two experts in the field of secondary transition, specifically in assessing transition skills of students with a significant cognitive disability. After recommendations were made and changes to the survey were completed, the survey was disseminated to the designated audience of special education personnel. A few ways the researchers addressed threats to validity were (a) obtaining feedback from experts in the field to ensure the appropriateness of the survey questions, (b) using
inclusion criteria to determine participants, and (c) not changing the survey after it was first disseminated to participants (Martella, Nelson, Morgan, & Marchand-Martella, 2013).

The survey consisted of 10 varying response questions, which included multiple choice, fill in the blank, open response, and yes/no questions. All survey responses were stored in a password-protected system and de-identified in an Excel spreadsheet, individually capturing each respondent’s answers. The final survey consisted of four sections: (a) consent (two questions), (b) demographics (two questions), (c) assessing transition skills (three questions), and (d) accessibility of transition assessments (three questions). When participants opened the survey link, they were first asked to answer three questions which allowed them to access the entire survey. First, participants gave their consent to participate. Next, they were asked if they taught or were currently teaching students with a significant cognitive disability. If they answered no, they were exited from the survey. Following consent, two questions gathered demographic information about the students the participants taught, including age range of students and their disability categories.

Three questions focused on the differing types of transition assessments and included questions about assessing the transition skills of students with a significant cognitive disability. Participants chose multiple-choice answers to report which transition assessments they used with these students. Researchers chose ten commonly used transition assessments as indicated in a list of assessments used for students with significant cognitive disabilities with a 6:4 ratio of formal and informal assessments (Pulos & Martin, 2018). In addition, an open-response format was available for survey participants to fill in other transition assessments they used when assessing their students with a significant cognitive disability. Next, we asked the participants what they needed to feel confident in giving a transition assessment (i.e., professional development, time to
read provided manual, instructions given via video/webinar, co-worker support, and website support). This was followed by a yes/no question: “Do you feel the assessments you currently use provide a well-rounded, accurate description of your students?”

We designated three questions to address the accessibility of transition assessments. These questions sought to gain information about the use of assistive technology by students with a significant cognitive disability and the type of assistance these students would need to participate in a computerized transition assessment. The first accessibility question asked what types of technology students were able to access on a daily basis within their school environment. The participants chose from a list of four items and could choose more than one (i.e., computer lab, laptops, tablets, and Internet). The second question allowed for a yes or no response only and asked whether their students with a significant cognitive disability would need assistive technology to access a computerized assessment. The final question inquired about the type of assistive technology used by these students; this required respondents to choose from a menu of items, which allowed multiple choices and the option to input their own response if items were not listed (e.g., sip and puff, touch screen, eye gaze).

It is important to note, not all participants responded to each question as the only forced responses were related to consent. Additionally, some survey questions requested respondents to “check all that apply.” Thus, numbers did not total to 938 (i.e., total respondents) due to checking all that apply for certain questions. We provided the number of survey respondents for each primary finding per each section of the survey in the following results section.

Results

Demographics
Participants identified the age of students with a significant cognitive disability they served. This included middle school students (37.3%, n = 350), high school students (77.8%, n = 730), and district transition program students (i.e., 18-22 years of age; 57%, n = 535). Finally, participants indicated working with students identified as having autism spectrum disorder (91.4%, n = 857) or an intellectual disability (90.5%, n = 849) as the largest population of students they served. For a complete list of results, please refer to Table 1.

Assessing Transition Skills

To assess the needs, strengths, preferences, and interests of their students with a significant cognitive disability, participants responded they used a variety of transition assessments. Respondents reported the *Brigance* (47%, n = 441; Curriculum Associates, Inc., 2010) as the highest ranked transition assessment utilized for these students. In addition, respondents indicated using the *Personal Preference Indicators* (40%, n = 375; Moss, 1997b) “other” transition assessments (38.4%, n = 360), *Picture Interest Career Survey* (21.2%, n = 199; Brady, 2011), *Reading-Free Vocational Interest Inventory: 2* (20.4%, n = 191; Becker, 2000), *Employment Support Indicators* (15.7%, n = 147; Moss, 1997a), *Enderle-Severson Transition Rating Scale* (15%, n = 141; Severson, Enderle, & Hoover, 2006), *Adaptive Behavior Assessment System II* (14.5%, n = 136; Harrison & Oakland, 2015), *Transition Planning Inventory II* (13.3%, n = 125; Patton & Clark, 2014), *Supports Intensity Scale* (8.5%, n = 80; Thompson et al., 2014), and *Autism Spectrum Rating Scales* (2.2%, n = 21; Goldstein & Naglieri, 2010). A large percentage (38.4%, n = 360) of respondents indicated the use of “other” transition assessments.

Furthermore, respondents indicated what they needed to feel confident in administering transition assessments. Participants reported professional development (65%, n = 617) and time to read the provided manual (64.1%, n = 601) as the two highest items needed to feel confident
relative to administering transition assessments. These supports were followed by co-worker support (60.2%, n = 565), website support (54.2%, n = 508), and instructions given via video/webinar (44.7%, n = 419). This was followed up with the question, “Do you feel the assessments you currently use provide a well-rounded, accurate description of your students?” A large number of respondents (72.7%, n = 682) revealed they did not feel the transition assessments they currently used provided a well-rounded, accurate description of their students with a significant cognitive disability, while 27.3% (n = 256) responded favorably the transition assessments they currently used provided a well-rounded, accurate description of their students with a significant cognitive disability.

**Accessibility of Transition Assessments**

When given the opportunity to select all types of access options, participants reported access to the Internet (94.3%, n = 855) and access to computer labs (72.9%, n = 684) as the options most available for students. In addition, participants reported students had access to laptops (68.4%, n = 642) and tablets (67.9%, n = 637). Furthermore, the majority of participants responded at least one of their students with a significant cognitive disability would need assistive technology to access a computerized assessment (77.8%, n = 730), while 22.2% (n = 208) reported their students would not need assistive technology. Participants also reported on what forms of assistive technology their students with a significant cognitive disability currently utilized in their school environments. Participants were provided 11 choices: tablets (69.9%, n = 656), communication device (61.1%, n = 573), laptops (61%, n = 572), software program (e.g., text-to-speech; 53.3%, n = 500), computer lab (52.7%, n = 494), touch screens (49%, n = 460), specialized mouse/keyboard (28.8%, n = 270), joystick/wands/switches (22.9%, n = 215), eye gaze devices (22.8%, n = 214), other (6%, n = 56), and sip and puff switch (2.3%, n = 22).
Twenty-two participants provided additional personalized responses for forms of assistive technology currently used by their students with a significant cognitive disability. These answers were divided between low-tech and high-tech assistive technology. The most popular low-tech assistive technology form respondents noted was the use of pictures \( (n = 6) \). Respondents also noted objects, communication boards, visual supports, overlays, stamps, and enlarged material as forms of low-tech assistive technology. Respondents noted captioning \( (n = 6) \), APEX (i.e., technology assistance for individuals with vision impairments; \( n = 4 \)), Picture Exchange Communication System \( (n = 2) \), telephones \( (n = 2) \), and sound amplifiers \( (n = 2) \) as forms of high-tech assistive technology utilized by their students with a significant cognitive disability. Other responses included the use of a light box, Dragon Dictation\textsuperscript{®}, SMART Board\textsuperscript{©}, digital textbooks, and recorders.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the nationwide transition assessment process for students with a significant cognitive disability. Data were analyzed based on a multistate survey focusing on educators who work with students with a significant cognitive disability relative to the transition assessment process in the areas of (a) assessing transition skills and (b) accessibility of transition assessments. Results suggested transition assessments are not fully assessing the needs of this population, therefore denying equal participation and access to inclusive environments. In addition, results indicated a need for a more robust transition assessment for students with a significant cognitive disability. These results have important implications for practice, policy, and research.

**Research Question 1: Assessing Transition Skills**
With the 2004 reauthorization of IDEA and the introduction of transition assessment, there continues to be a call to action for the utilization of appropriate transition assessments when assessing the interests, needs, preferences, and strengths of students with a significant cognitive disability (Neubert & Leconte, 2013; Prince et al., 2014). However, with many state departments of education and local education agencies in the early stages of establishing policy and providing guidance on transition assessment (Morningstar & Liss, 2008), educators of students with a significant cognitive disability may employ transition assessments not appropriate for their students. Results of this study revealed 21.2% \( (n = 199) \) of respondents reported utilizing the *Picture Interest Career Survey* (Brady, 2011) for their students with a significant cognitive disability. Albeit this assessment has ample reliability and validly evidence to support its use, the intended population includes individuals with (a) limited familiarity with English, (b) a developmental disability or learning disability, (c) limited access to education, and (d) continually unemployed. Based on our understanding of students with a significant cognitive disability, this assessment may not be appropriate. Furthermore, the 36 sets of three pictures to choose from include a variety of pictures depicting a chemist, police officer, veterinarian, psychologist, pilot, doctor, and various other jobs requiring professional degrees and/or training.

Students with a significant cognitive disability demonstrate “significant limitations both in intellectual functioning and in adaptive behavior as expressed in conceptual, social, and practice adaptive skills” (AAIDD, 2019a). Although intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior of students with a significant cognitive disability can improve based on the supports in their environment, it seems unlikely they would possess the highly niche qualifications of the portrayed professions within the *Picture Interest Career Survey* (Brady, 2011). The *Picture Interest Career Survey* (Brady, 2011) may provide teachers and IEP teams, including the student,
with unrealistic goals to work toward; thus, potentially setting up their students with a significant
cognitive disability to fail. Prominent researchers in the field of secondary transition recommend
working toward realistic goals (e.g., Kellems & Morningstar, 2010; Peterson et al., 2013;
Sitlington, 2003)—this sets up both teacher and student for individualized instruction to attain
the necessary behaviors, skills, and agency linkages for success post-high school.

A promising finding from our results was the inclusion of utilizing the *Personal Preference Indicators* (40%, n = 375; Moss, 1997b) to assess the transition needs of students with a significant cognitive disability. Albeit informal, this assessment is used as a guide to access information about a student’s preferences in the areas of favorites, feelings, social world, choices, body clock, health, and role in their family and community. Through a holistic approach, transition educators and parents of students with a significant cognitive disability can dialogue to help determine a baseline from which to begin planning for postsecondary success. However, important to note, the *Personal Preference Indicators* (Moss, 1997b) is a paper and pencil transition assessment filled out by third party individuals (i.e., teacher, parent). Teachers should be cognizant of this when administering this assessment; by employing supports unique to the needs of their students with a significant cognitive disability, student participation can take place. Therefore, this transition assessment can provide a means for teachers of students with a significant cognitive disability to incorporate meaningful participation in the IEP and transition planning process, while also affording appropriate implementation of individualized transition instruction to enhance the postsecondary success of these students (AAIDD, 2019b).

**Research Question 2: Accessibility of Transition Assessments**

Students with a significant cognitive disability often require multiple and various accommodations to participate in learning. Accessibility information is pertinent for developers
of transition assessments to ensure the assessment platform meets the needs of this population of students. Advances in technology have afforded greater access, hence the shift from paper and pencil assessments to computerized assessments (Wang et al., 2008). A large majority of our respondents (77.8%, \( n = 730 \)) noted their students with a significant cognitive disability needed adaptive technology to access a computerized transition assessment, including a variety of assistive technology devices at school: (a) tablets (69.9%, \( n = 656 \)), (b) communication devices (61.1%, \( n = 573 \)), (c) laptops (61%, \( n = 572 \)), and (d) specialized software programs (53.3%, \( n = 494 \)), etc.

The reported percentages are promising and demonstrate many students with a significant cognitive disability have access to or use computers regularly at school. Other devices noted by respondents included sip and puff, specialized mouse/keyboard, joysticks/wands/switches, eye gaze, and touch screen, which, although less common, still indicate a need for test developers to consider these devices for students with a cognitive disability to access transition assessments. This information indicates the demand for transition assessments to be compatible with a multitude of platforms (e.g., online, smart devices, tablets) and accommodate a variety of types of assistive technology to ensure the active participation of students with a significant cognitive disability in the transition planning process (AAIDD, 2019b).

**Implications for Practice**

Transition assessment is a critical component of the transition planning process and thus of the entire IEP. Without valid, reliable, appropriate transition assessments, educators are at a disadvantage to developing the transition plan. The transition plan should then drive the entire IEP. Without this necessary first step (i.e., transition assessment) in the IEP development, the remainder of the IEP has no option but to be less than ideal. Our results indicate a lack of formal
and informal transition assessments designed to provide access and assess the transition needs of students with a significant cognitive disability.

We believe an appropriate transition assessment for this student population needs to (a) provide technical data, including reliability and validity evidence for their use; (b) be accessible to students with differing assistive technology needs and through different modalities; and (c) allow for student input through a variety of means. As educators continue the use of transition assessments which violate the aforementioned criteria, they should use caution when interpreting results from these assessments. Important to note, while using caution is the first step, teachers must acknowledge these assessments may not provide a well-rounded, holistic view of the student’s needs to best prepare them for postsecondary environments (Martin & McConnell, 2017; Pulos & Martin, 2018). Once educators are provided with transition assessments meeting the above recommendations, educators can take the results and build an appropriate transition plan. That transition plan will then translate into meaningful instruction in the classroom environment to help students with a significant cognitive disability reach their full potential.

**Implications for Policy**

As foreseen in our data, the developing identification of the complexity of assessing students with a significant cognitive disability relative to the transition planning process is nuanced in the availability of assessments (i.e., informal and formal) and the means at which those assessments are accessible for this population of students. With state departments of education and local education agencies still grappling with establishing policy and providing specifics on the implementation of transition assessment practices (Morningstar & Liss, 2008), educators of students with a significant cognitive disability are utilizing transition assessments not appropriate for these students. This reflects a need for policymakers at the state and federal
level to explicitly articulate directives about the appropriate use of transition assessment, as part of a comprehensive secondary transition education, for students with a significant cognitive disability. With this approach, the likelihood of discovering the strengths, needs, interests, and preferences through reliable and valid methods increases; thus, promoting participation and access to inclusive postsecondary environments. In addition, these policy directives can catalyze secondary transition researchers to develop accessible formal transition assessments for students with a significant cognitive disability. Without such efforts at the policy level, a disparity will continue to exist for these students achieving their postsecondary aspirations.

Limitations and Implication for Future Research

While our survey results provide a nationwide snapshot of transition assessment practices for students with a significant cognitive disability, there are a few limitations we must note. First, we conducted an anonymous survey that did not allow us to obtain additional feedback or clarification on responses from our participants. Future research should allow respondents to provide personalized comments on the choices they select. In addition, researcher follow-up could ensure accurate responses are portrayed and reported. Second, we did not include two major self-determination assessments, including the AIR Self-Determination Scale (Wolman, Campeau, Dubois, Mithaug, & Stolarski, 1994) and the Arc's Self-Determination Scale (Wehmeyer, 1995), in the pre-populated transition assessment responses from which participants could select. The researchers opted to include the Personal Preference Indicators (Moss, 1997b) as a self-determination assessment for this population. The results produce a more robust description of a student’s behaviors in relation to self-determination and fosters “where to begin planning in a considerate, appropriate and positive manner” (Moss, 1997b, p. 1). Participants could type other assessments in the provided space, but some participants may have neglected to
complete this step of the survey. Therefore, by adding these two assessments for future research, a better understanding of the transition assessments used for students with a significant cognitive disability may occur. Third, we provided the *Brigance* (Curriculum Associates, Inc., 2010) as a pre-populated answer choice; however, we did not indicate the separate components of the plethora of *Brigance* (Curriculum Associates, Inc., 2010) assessments. Participants could be utilizing various forms of the *Brigance* (Curriculum Associates, Inc., 2010). Thus, if a transition assessment has multiple components, including the populations they are meant for and other specific information relative to administration would be important to include as future choices in a survey.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this study reveals students with a significant cognitive disability clearly need an accessible transition assessment that can assess their strengths, needs, interests, and preferences with reliability and validity evidence supporting its use as a transition planning tool. Educators need to have confidence they are building transition plans for the best possible outcomes for their students with a significant cognitive disability based on valid assessment results. Future research on this topic should include creating and validating transition assessments for students with a significant cognitive disability to best fit their unique and individualized needs and abilities, while seeking this information through a variety of modalities and technology to allow for student input.
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Table 1

*Special Educators Teaching Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (n = 938)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Transition Program (18-22 years of age)</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Categories Represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-Blindness</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafness</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disabilities</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or Language Impairment</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment Including Blindness</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Assessments Used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAS II</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ASRS AND TRANSITION ASSESSMENT

### Employment Support Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASRS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigance</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Support Indicators</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTR-S</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Preference Indicators</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICS</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-FVII: 2 Reading-Free Vocational Interest</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personal Preference Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports Intensity Scale</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPI II</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transition Assessment Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Support</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions Given Via Video/Webinar</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Read Provided Manual</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Support</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transition Assessments Used Provide a Well-Rounded and Accurate Description of Your Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to the Following at School
### Computer Lab
- 684 (72.9)

### Internet
- 855 (94.3)

### Laptops
- 642 (68.4)

### Tablets
- 637 (67.9)

#### The Need for Assistive Technology to Access a Computerized Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Forms of Assistive Technology Used at School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Device</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lab</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Gaze</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joystick/Wands/Switches</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptops</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sip and Puff</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Program</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Mouse/Keyboard</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablets</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch Screen</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Not all participants responded to each question as the only forced responses were related to consent. Additionally, some survey questions requested respondents to “check all that apply.” Thus, numbers did not total to 938 (i.e., total respondents) due to checking all that apply.

*Orthopedic impairment was left out due to not meeting the inclusion criteria of the survey.*