

**Transition
Facilitators: Mike Fagbemi, Teresa Coonts, Michelle Clyne**

**Attendees**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Susan Bonner | Missouri |  |  |
| Sherri Nelson | NORTH DAKOTA |  |  |
| Dottie Snyder | North Carolina |  |  |
| Michael Norman | Louisiana |  |  |
| Lisa Poff | Indiana  |  |  |
| Stacy Aguilera | California DB Services |  |  |
| Diane Haynes | Kentucky Deaf-Blind Project |  |  |
| Cathy Kirscher | HKNC |  |  |
| Donna Riccobono | MD and DC |  |  |
| Beth Kennedy | Michigan |  |  |
| Ellen Condon | Montana Deaf-Blind Project |  |  |
| Cathy Lyle  | Minnesota  |  |  |
| Susanne Morrow | NYDBC |  |  |
| Lyn Ayer | Oregon Deafblind Project |  |  |
| Teresa Coonts | Nebraska Deaf-Blind Project |  |  |
| Leanne Parnell | Ohio |  |  |
| Martha Veto | Georgia Sensory Assistance Project |  |  |
| Gretel Sampson | Utah Deaf-Blind Project |  |  |
| Bethany Miller | Coordinator, Deaf-Blind Program |  |  |
| Sue Ruzenski Michelle Ragunan Michelle ClyneBeth Kennedy  | Project Reach IllinoisMichigan  |  |  |

 Jerry Petroff New Jersey

Mike Fagbemi: *provided an introduction: “If you want to go far, go together” The activities that have occurred in the transition network have been collaborative and continues to create an environment in which others are welcomed to join and enrich. He provided a brief overview of the day.*

Diane Haynes: *Young Adult Leadership and Networking has been driven through the multi collaborative efforts of the transition institute. This institute was hosted by the Kentucky DB project as it celebrated its 10th year of network and capacity building training for youth and their families. The great news is that we have expanded it so that it is beyond the southeast states and has stretched to the northwest region. This institute was cohosted with the PTI project of the state and they were responsible for planning the parent strands. The outgrowth of this collaborative effort always requires planning and debriefing. The institute was a success with relationships developed between families, projects and students. The students leave with concrete goals short term and long. There is a Facebook page where you can see the highlights and posts by all. The search words are TIYADB. We have a debriefing meeting tomorrow if anyone is interested in coming.*

Martha Veto: *The next Transition Institute is schedule for June 2016 and it will be held at the University of Georgia in collaboration with the DB project. Recruitment fliers available and soon it will be posted on the NCDB website*

Susie Morgan Morrow: *Susie updated the group on the Interdisciplinary Transition Team Initiative. This initiative began three years ago in NY. This was in response to the big bubble of youth who were not experiencing good transition outcomes. The initiative was developed to provide technical assistance to the student and the team covering the span of an academic year with opportunities for the families and providers to lead. The commitment for the year was to participate in September’s launch and participate in content driven monthly webinars and an online private work space to share resources and drive conversations. This multi collaborative effort went across state lines with 15 of the 17states from the MOU participating initially. There would be 15 teams this this first year and through attrition be reduced to 7 teams. We learned through this first year as a large group that once a month was deemed a bit ambitious, it has since been moved to every 6 weeks. The teams starting with younger students can return the next academic year. I have recruitment fliers for anyone that is interested.*

Jerry Petroff: *OSEP funds national longitudinal study. It is time to get better transition data. He took his old post school outcomes survey and updated it. What was secondary school like, where are they now with jobs and do they have a social network. I could not see a specific link between the two. The new survey is looking for youth 18-25 (will take older) Looking for 200 persons for regressive analysis to make some specific conclusions. In the 1990’s, parents reported no children had friends who were not paid to be with them. None had jobs that were not part-time. Caveats: States not reported. He is asking for parents or young people to fill out survey. Most reliable person should fill it out. Preference is to fill it out online because data comes through Qualtrics a survey mechanism. Questions include: could states pull out their information (yes). Are criteria included? Yes. It will come out on the list serve and be on NCDB’s website. Turnaround will be at least 2 months.*

Mike Fagbemi – Explained the history of how the transition TWG came to be. The technical work group was formed in transition to address an objective requested by OSEP. The effort to address this objective would be of great benefit to the network. The TWG members were sourced from within the DB network, the TA & D placemat and adult services. The focus would be to address college and career readiness and access to the general education curriculum. The scope of work would eventually be identified through the group’s selection process and through it three buckets of work were identified. The first bucket was to review and update the transition rubric an informational tool for families and schools to identify some of the desirable transition behaviors of good transition planning relative to the person’s age at that point in time. The rubric perhaps a self – assessment tool would also need the design to be scaled up so that it would provide links and other things for the end user. The second bucket would be to provide peers review on the Post School Outcomes Survey Jerry was in the process of developing. The third bucket was to write an Information Brief to inform the network and OSEP the strategies projects are using to assure youth are ready for college and or a career including independent living. The transition group in attendance was asked to look at the transition rubric / assessment guide and within the format of table groups discuss and provide feedback. In addition self- selects to join the TWG in either an advisory capacity or as work group members building the product. You will be contacted in September by Mike to gauge your interest and role.

Teresa Coonts – Teresa facilitated the group activity. Using a jigsaw the group could work on one of the four age groups noted in the transition rubric. Using the action plan as a guide each table would complete the plan which helps inform the established TWG members of things to take under consideration to include. The groups would report out from each table

First group report out :

22+ Feels need for a visual. New VR act WIOA language needs to be reflected in rubric.

Second group report out :

18 – 22 yrs. old looked at self-advocacy. This group also looked at families and consumers. No clear definition of advocacy, depending on level of disability, opportunities also different. Interagency collaboration is very important. Communication supports so critical after school. Networking individuals and stakeholders we need to support stakeholders. Communication system must be usable in community.

Third group report out:

14-18yrs old we got hung up on formatting of rubric. We tried a new format but it missed lickart measure. Concern with rubric is its wordiness. Families might do better with bullets and electronic format. Drop down menu might be nice. Examples might help families too.

Fourth group report out:

<14 Transition is a life- long endeavor. It is important to begin early. The state council of VR has a committee to work on transition. Much more is needed than fact sheets and for counselors. To help build this rubric we need to look at all of the partners who have something to contribute.

Diane Haynes – asked HKNC if the affiliate program might be revived. There isn’t any funding for it even though there is a passion for MOU’s.

Tracey Luiselli – would like some help with a systems piece related to transition to address Indicator 13 and 14.

Mike Fagbemi – Wrapped up the meeting reiterating the plan to contact individuals who would like to work on one or more age grouping. The commitment as a member of the TWG could be:

TWG Member – Serves in an advisory capacity only. Can review documents and provide content in needed areas or make recommendations

TWG Member – serves on a work group focusing on one of the age groups. This member will work within a small team updating text and or recommending links to evidence based information

TWG member – need an editor for content

TWG Member – works with NCDB Instructional design person to format rubric’s digital appearance

TWG Member – dissemination and building awareness through supporting an NCDB webinar or webcast.