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Introduction

High school is a time where most students are involved in activities that “foster independence, promote social integration, and provide vocational preparation” (Cranston-Gingras, Davis, Gonzales, Knollman, Thomas, & Wissner, 2015, p. 62), along with gaining experience and knowledge that help students transition into adulthood (Lipscomb, Haimson, Liu, Burghardt, Johnson, & Thurlow, 2017). For many students, these activities are linked to college campuses. For students with intellectual and developmental disabilities, many are not given the opportunity to be involved in the traditional college setting due to their disabilities and lack of skills. These students typically stay in their high school settings for many years until the age of 22.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if the students who participate in the Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment Initiative (ICEI) program at Bridgewater State University (BSU), Bridgewater, Massachusetts had the same or different interpretations of the level of assistance they required compared to their educational coaches’ observations.

The ICEI program…is a fully inclusive post-secondary program for young adults with intellectual/developmental disabilities. Students in the BSU ICEI program share the same experiences as their college-aged peers in the areas of academics, socialization, career development, and independent living. With supports in place, [the] ICEI students enroll in courses, take part in campus internships, and socialize with peers. (Bridgewater State University: ICEI Program Description, 2019, para.1)

This research was conducted during a regular school day in which the students were involved in the ICEI program. Each participant was asked to complete a self-evaluating form both in March
and again in April 2018. The students had the proper accommodations to complete the evaluations. Each evaluation took approximately 15 minutes to complete. The evaluation topics included campus navigation and travel; time management and organization; classroom and campus; self-advocacy and self-awareness; social and communication; and vocational/internship, along with life skills. Both the students and their education coaches completed this evaluation form. At the conclusion of the study, the students’ and coaches’ responses were analyzed to determine how the level of assistance varied overall from education coach to students and to see which area of the evaluation form had the most significant differential score.

Research Questions

Two questions guided this action research study. These questions were:

- How will the scores be different for the students in the ICEI program and their educational coaches based on the scores obtained from the Inclusive Dual Enrollment Student Evaluation Tool (IDE)?
- Which section of the IDE will have the biggest difference in scores for the students and their education coaches?

Review of Literature

Transitional programs have gained a significant amount of interest over the past 30 years. According to Hart, Grigal, and Weir (2010), more than 250 transition-based programs that work with colleges or universities are offered in the United States. The programs provide students with opportunities to gain experience in the work force, take higher education classes, and use public transportation. Students also learn how to navigate their campus and use resources appropriately. In order for these programs to work efficiently, there must be close collaboration between the school district, college or university, parents, and local employers. Students who are involved in these transition programs demonstrate more self-determination and vocational skills.

With the growing availability of high school to college transition programs, students involved are able to gain more experience in areas that will help them become as independent as possible in the community. When high school students with disabilities have access to and know how to utilize resources on university or college campuses, they have a higher likelihood of attending college and later, sustainable employment (Barber, 2012; National Council on Disability, 2012; Novakovic & Ross, 2015). Novakovic and Ross (2015) discuss a program where students with disabilities participate in various activities around a college campus for a day. One of the purposes of this program is to have students who have disabilities learn how to
advocate for themselves and to teach the students how to ask for and receive appropriate accommodations while they are enrolled in college. Novakovic and Ross found that students with disabilities “are more successful in college when they receive appropriate services” (p. 229) such as having additional time to complete tests and having access to academic supports such as tutoring. Twenty-six high school students participated in the study that focused on the program called College Student for a Day (CSFAD), and these students learned how to navigate the campus, find the offices where their accommodations could be found, and build relationships with current college students. After the study was complete, 85% of the students who participated stated the CSFAD helped change their mind about college, and 80% stated that they would definitely attend college.

Along with the CSFAD program, there are a number of other programs where high school students with disabilities spend multiple days a week on a college campus. According to Cranston-Gingras et al. (2015), there are four main areas that these programs should focus on to develop skills for the students to work towards becoming more independent. The first area is the use of public transportation. The students should learn how to use public transportation to get to and from school, work, or internships. The second area of focus is self-determination. When the students are taught how to make decisions based on their daily needs, it helps them become more successful decision makers. The third area of focus is functional life skills. These skills that are necessary for functional life include knowing how to read, write, and have basic mathematics skills. These skills are necessary for any aspect of life and are taught in many aspects of the programs. The last area of focus is employment. Typically, students in these programs start off by participating in non-paid jobs that provide the training to become a skillful employee. The students can work up to getting a paid job or internship while still enrolled in the transition program.

Students gain independence skills in becoming more independent “by being immersed in an environment where they can interact with same-age peers and participate in typical, age-appropriate activities with a specific focus on vocational outcomes” (Cranston-Gingras et al., 2015, p. 64) along with being provided experiences on and off campus.

Many of these transition programs have college students working with the high school students as “partners” throughout the program. These programs allow the high school students to build a relationship with the college student along with having constant support throughout their experiences. Not only does this partnership benefit the high school student, it also gives the college
student experience working with a student with intellectual or developmental disabilities. Many of the college students who are involved in these transition programs are in the field of education and special education. These programs help the college students gain experience in the field they wish to pursue in the future.

Researchers have noted that federal initiatives play a crucial role in creating policy that supports the interest of students in transition programs (Will, 1984a, 1984b). Halpern (1985) looked at the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) transition model. This model is divided into two sections. The left side of the OSERS model indicates the special education programs that were offered in high school were where transition services begin. The right side of the model is employment. There are three bridges that connect the two sides: No Special Services, Time-Limited Services, and Ongoing Services. The overall goal of the OSERS transition model is to have the students transition from school to working life. Halpern then goes on to discuss a revised version of the transition model, where living successfully in the community is the primary goal for the students. This new revised model has three main pillars: residential environment, employment, and social and interpersonal networks. These pillars support the main goal of being a working member of a community. The new model for transition is structured similarly to many of the college transition programs that are providing special education students with opportunities to become more independent in many aspects of life.

These programs have been very successful in helping special education high school students work towards becoming more independent in their communities, education, and within employment opportunities. By having these students in the transition programs, they are able to interact with peers their own age while gaining skills in becoming an independent member of the community.

**Method**

**Population**

The population selected for this study was 10 students, ages 18-22, who are currently involved in the Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment Initiative (ICEI) program at Bridgewater State University (BSU). Each of these students was at the time of the study taking college-level courses at BSU and was paired with a BSU education coach. Each of the ICEI students had a variety of disabilities and was working towards meeting individual educational goals along with becoming more independent in the community.

**Subject Participation**

In an Informed Consent Form, I stated that no harm would come to any of the students in the
ICEI program who participated in this study. Participation in this study was completely voluntary, and if the participant wished, they could terminate involvement at any time. For the students, a parent or guardian and the student needed to sign the Informed Consent Form before the first day of the study. If a student or their parent or guardian did not wish for their child to participate in the study, I did not collect data, using the data-collection instruments, from that child. The hypothesis, methodology, and the goals of the study were included with the Informed Consent form. An example of the Informed Consent Form that was sent to the parents or guardians and the students can be found in Appendix A. Please note that all names have been changed to protect the students who participated in this study.

**Instrumentation**

The first instrument used was the Inclusive Dual Enrollment Student Evaluation Tool (IDE). Tina Raeke, the ICEI program coordinator, administered this evaluation tool to the BSU education coaches between March 12, 2018 and March 30, 2018. On those days, the education coaches evaluated the level of assistance their students in the ICEI program needed in the following areas: campus navigation and travel, time management and organization, classroom and campus, self-advocacy and self-awareness, social and communication, vocational/internship, and life skills (Appendix B). Every student who had returned the Informed Consent Form had their responses analyzed by Tina and me. If the students’ parents or guardians did not wish to have their child participate in this study, the evaluation sheets were not analyzed for this study.

The second instrument used in this study was a simplified version of the Inclusive Dual Enrollment Student Evaluation Tool (IDE). To accommodate the needs of the students, the IDE was simplified. This evaluation was self-administered by the enrolled students in the ICEI program to fill out regarding themselves. As on the IDE administered to the coaches, on the student IDE, the students reflected on the levels of assistance they believed they had needed in the areas of campus navigation and travel, time management and organization, classroom and campus, self-advocacy and self-awareness, social and communication, vocational and internship, and life skills (Appendix C).

**Procedure**

Through this action research project, I analyzed the education coaches’ responses on the IDE and the students’ responses to determine how the level of assistance varied overall from education coach to student and to see which area of the IDE has the most significant differential score.

Overall, I hoped to determine if the students’
view of the level of assistance needed was the same as the view of the education coaches, and how we could better assist the high school students participating in this study in becoming more independent. The students’ and the education coaches’ responses were entered on to a Google form.

Each of their responses was given a numerical value based on the answer they had chosen. The scores were calculated by using a Likert Scale on both the students’ and the education coaches’ responses. The categories on the Likert Scale were: physical assistance, 1 point; verbal assistance, 2 points; gestural assistance, 3 points; monitored assistance, 4 points; and being independent, 5 points. Each question was weighed equally in the evaluation for both the students and their education coaches. I sat with every student while they complete this evaluation to assist them if needed.

Results

All of the instruments mentioned in the above section were implemented, scored, and analyzed. The results obtained in this research study were broken up and analyzed in several different areas. The main areas of focus were the overall difference in the scores between the students and their education coaches, the different sections of the evaluation, and the average score the students gave themselves compared to the average score the education coaches gave their respective students.

Overview of Entire Evaluation

The results from the entire evaluation, collected from both the students enrolled in the ICEI program and the education coaches working with the students, showed me some very unique suggestions. Figure 1 demonstrates that 90% of the scores obtained by the students were different from their education coaches’ scores. Ten percent of the students received the same score as their education coaches, twenty percent of the students’ scores were below their education coaches’, and seventy
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percent had scores that were higher than their education coaches’.

Figure 1 represents the percentage of students whose scores were the same, above, or below the scores the education coaches gave the students. Out of 10 students, 7 scored higher scores than their education coaches, 2 scores were lower than their education coaches, and 1 student had the exact same score as their education coach.

As shown in Figure 2, there were a wide variety of differences between the student scores and their education coaches’ scores. After students’ and education coaches’ scores were calculated, using the Likert Scale mentioned in the procedure section, the results for each pair of participants were compared. It was found that the lowest difference in the scores was 0 points, and the greatest difference in scores was 54 points.

Figure 2 is a visual representation of the scores the students received on the IDE compared to the scores their education coaches gave them on the IDE. There is a wide range of differences in the scores. Student 3 had the lowest difference in scores, which was zero points, and Student 4 had the highest difference in scores, which was 54 points.

Sections of Evaluation Break Down

After analyzing the results of the evaluation as a whole, the director of the ICEI program and I thought it would be beneficial to break down the scores into the different sections of the evaluation. The different sections of the evaluation were: campus navigation and travel, time management, classroom and campus, self-advocacy and self-awareness, social and communication, vocational/internship, and life-skills.

I broke down the results from the evaluation and compared both the education coaches’ results, and the results of the group of 10 students who participated in this study.
After breaking up all of the results for both the students and the education coaches, I found the sum of each section for all of the students along with all of the education coaches and then analyzed them to decipher which sections had the largest and smallest differences overall.

After completing this analysis, I found that the sections that had the smallest differences in the answers were the vocational/internship, with a 20-point difference, along with a 21-point difference for the campus and navigation section. The sections that had the largest difference between the students’ responses and the education coaches’ responses were the classroom and campus, which had a 43-point difference, and the time management section, which had a 29-point difference. See Figure 3 for a visual representation of the data from all of the sections.

Figure 3 represents the total number of points scored in each section of the IDE. Vocational/internship was the section that had the most similar responses with the education coaches and students. The classroom and campus section had the biggest difference in scores between the education coaches’ and students’ responses.

Average Score Given by Students and Education Coaches

After analyzing the evaluation as a whole and then breaking up the results based on the sections of the survey, I was presently surprised to discover how much disparity existed for the students and their respective education coaches. This information was found by taking the average overall score individually for all the students and all of the education coaches.
Figure 4 represents the average score the students gave themselves on the entire IDE. Eighty percent of the students gave themselves an average score of 4-4.9, and twenty percent of the students gave themselves an average score of 3-3.9.

Once the individual averages of the students’ answers were found, I calculated how many of the students’ results fell in the ranges of 1-1.9, 2-2.9, 3-3.9, 4-4.9, and 5. I found that 20% of the students chose an average score of 3-3.9, and 80% of the students chose an average score of 4-4.9. These results can be found in Figure 4.

Figure 5 represents the average score that the education coaches gave their students throughout the entire IDE. Thirty percent of the education coaches gave their students an average score of 4-4.9, sixty percent of the education coaches gave their students an average score of 3-3.9, and ten percent of the education coaches gave their students an average score of 2-2.9.

The same process was used to find the averages for the education coaches. Once the individual averages of their answers were determined, I calculated how many results from the education coaches fell in the ranges of 1-1.9, 2-2.9, 3-3.9, 4-4.9, and 5. I found that 10% of the education coaches chose an average score of 2-2.9, 60% of the education coaches chose an average score of 3-3.9, and 30% of the education coaches chose an average score of 4-4.9. These results can be found in Figure 5.

**Discussion**

**Overview of Entire Evaluation**

After analyzing the data from the evaluations, it can be concluded that the majority of the students tended to see themselves as being more independent than their educational coaches viewed them. There are a number of potential reasons why the students’ scores and the education coaches’ scores differed so much. None of the following reasons have been proven to be the reason for the large difference in scores. Rather, these are just theories as to why the students’ scores varied so much from their education coaches’ scores.
One reason the scores may have varied so much is that the students did not understand that they were receiving assistance from their education coaches because it was much less structured than it was in their high school setting. Typically, when the students were in their high school settings, they received more frequent, structured assistance in the classroom. When the students were on campus at BSU, the ICEI program is giving the students more opportunities to learn how to become more independent. Since the structure of the level of assistance that is offered is different from high school, the students may have interpreted the level of assistance they received as being less because it was not as noticeable as it was in their high school setting.

Another reason the scores may have been so different may be due to the amount of time the education coaches and the students had known one another. If the education coaches and the students had not been working together very long, the students might not understand the education coaches’ expectations, as well as another pair who had been working together for a longer period of time.

A third reason the scores may have been so different may be due to the students not fully understanding the questions being asked on the IDE. While having the students complete the evaluation, I was present to answer questions, explain a statement, give examples, or read the statements/questions to them, if requested. The students may not have fully understood that they were reflecting on the level of assistance they needed, such as what they believe they can do or not do. This could have led the students to misunderstanding what was being asked of them and therefore, skewed the data.

**Sections of Evaluation Break Down**

After analyzing the data from the evaluations as a whole, the results were broken down into the different sections of the evaluation. This helped me see which areas the students and the education coaches had the greatest difference in perspectives. From this analysis, it was clear that the classroom and campus section has the biggest difference.
between the students’ scores and the education coaches’ scores, while the vocational/internship section had the smallest difference. There are a number of reasons as to why the students’ scores differed from or were similar to their education coaches’ scores in the various areas of the evaluation. None of the following reasons have been proven to be the reason, rather, these are just theories as to why the students’ scores vary so much from their education coaches’ scores.

One reason why the classroom and campus section of the evaluation may have had such a high difference between scores is because the students viewed themselves as being more social and more interactive with their peers than how their education coaches viewed them. While sitting with the students filling out the evaluations, it was clear that a majority of them felt very confident that they were social in the classroom, raised their hands, took notes, and interacted with their peers and teachers. Most of the students automatically said that they were independent in the classroom and campus section of the evaluation without reflecting much. Another reason why the students’ scores were so different from their educational coaches’ in the classroom and campus section may be due to their education coaches having to be more discrete about assisting the students. For example, the education coaches might not have wanted to disturb the other students in the classroom during lessons, so the students may not have been getting as much assistance as they needed. The students may have interpreted the lower level of assistance during the lessons as their ability to be more independent during that time.

The similarities between the students’ scores and their education coaches’ scores in the vocational/internship category could be attributed to most of the education coaches not being present when the students were working during their internship or job. By sitting with the students while they completed the evaluation, many students stated that their education coaches were not present during their internship, and that they have bosses or other adults who supervise them during that time. The education coaches’ scores may be based off of the bosses’ or supervisors’ updates about how the student was doing during that time, or they could have been based on the updates the students gave them about the time they spent in their internships. Without the education coaches being present to observe them, it is hard to conclude how accurate the education coaches’ reflections were for that section of the IDE.

**Average Score Given by Students and Education Coaches**

After analyzing the data from the evaluations as a whole and as independent sections, I broke down the scores of both students and
education coaches. This helped me to see what the average scores the students gave themselves and the average scores the education coaches gave the students. From this analysis, it was clear that the students viewed themselves as being more independent than their education coaches viewed them. There are a number of factors as to why the average students’ scores were so different from their education coaches’ average scores. None of the following reasons have been proven to be the reason. These are just theories as to why the students’ scores varied so much from their education coaches’ scores.

I believe one reason why the average student scores were higher than the education coaches’ average scores is because the students may have wanted to impress the ICEI coordinator and me. The students might have wanted to appear more independent, and they did not want to seem like they needed more help than they actually needed. If this were the case, and the students were not 100% honest, or if they did not fully understand the evaluation, then the data may have been skewed.

Another reason why I believe that the average scores were so different is because the students thought of themselves as being more independent than they actually were. The students may have viewed themselves as very independent and did not recognize the level of assistance they were actually receiving from their education coaches. For example, the students may not have recognized that their education coaches were providing them with assistance. Rather, they may have interpreted this as a friendly reminder or gesture that happened on a daily basis. If that were the case, the students and the education coaches needed to come to a clear understanding of what was considered assistance, and what was considered to be friendly body language.

An additional reason why I believe the average scores between the students and the education coaches were so different is because the students may not have fully understood what the question or statement was saying. I had to give multiple examples to several students while they were completing the evaluation. It is possible that they did not fully understand what was being asked of them and were too embarrassed to ask for further clarification.

**Action Plan**

After completing the analysis of these data from the students’ and their education coaches’ responses on the evaluations, I have created an action plan to better assist the program in getting the students to become more independent, along with helping the students and education coaches recognize the levels of assistance needed during the school day. Below are the suggestions that I have developed to help the students become more independent and to help both the students and the education coaches recognize similar levels of
assistance needed during the school day.

- Have the students complete the evaluation at the beginning of the year, after each quarter, and at the end of the year to accurately chart the students’ growth both from the perspective of the education coaches as well as the students’ perspectives.

- Make sure that both the students and the education coaches understand the definition of physical assistance, verbal assistance, gestural assistance, monitored assistance, and being independent. This will help ensure there is less room for error when completing these evaluations and achieving more accurate data.

- Schedule regular face-to-face meetings to discuss the level of assistance the students need in various areas of the evaluation with the education coaches and a member from the ICEI program.

- After each evaluation has been analyzed, have a meeting with the education coach and student to discuss an action plan to help increase the student’s independence and try to decipher why the scores are so different (if that is the case).
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My name is Carly Markos, and I am a graduate student in the Master of Education for Special Education program at Bridgewater State University (BSU). I am conducting an action research study this semester and am interested in the Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment Initiative (ICEI) program here at BSU. Tina Raeke, ICEI program coordinator, will be overseeing the entire study.

**Introduction:**

I am sending you this letter to ask for your permission to take part in my action research study. The purpose of this study is to determine if the students who participate in the Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment Initiative (ICEI) program at Bridgewater State University have the same or different interpretations of the level of assistance they require, compared to their educational coaches’ observations. I am inviting you to participate in the action research study because you are currently participating in ICEI. Tina Raeke has approved of this research.

Your participation is completely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will have no effect on your grades, academic standing, or any services you might receive at the school. You may choose to withdraw your participation at any time. I, Carly Markos, a graduate student at Bridgewater State University, will be one of the researchers conducting this study. If you have any questions

---

**Appendix A**

**Informed Consent Form**

Dear Students and Parents/Guardians,
about this study or letter, please contact me at 845-913-8397 or at Cmarkos@student.bridgew.edu.

**Procedure:**

The research will be conducted during a regular school day in which you are with the ICEI program. If you give consent and your child agrees, he/she will be asked to complete a self-evaluation form both in March and again in April 2018. Your child will have the proper accommodations to complete the evaluations. It is estimated this evaluation will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The evaluation topics will include: campus navigation and travel, time management and organization, classroom and campus, self-advocacy and self-awareness, social and communication, vocational/internship, along with life skills.

**Risks:**

Involvement in this study will cause no harm to you in any way through the duration of the research.

**Benefits:**

You will gain experience in reflecting on the level of assistance that is required for various aspects of going to school on a college campus. This research will also add to an existing body of literature regarding this topic.

**Confidentiality:**

Your child’s name will not be on the evaluations. Tina Raeke and I will come up with a numerical system to keep track of each evaluation, so we are able to make comparisons from the first evaluation to the second. This Informed Consent Document with your name on it will be kept in a locked cabinet. Only Ms. Markos, her college advisor, and Tina Raeke will have access. This Informed Consent Document will be shredded after the completion of this study.

**Certification:**

I have read and I understand this Informed Consent Document. I understand the purpose of the research project, and what I will be asked to do. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions, and they have been answered satisfactorily.

I understand that I may withdraw my permission at any time.

I have received a copy of this Informed Consent Form for my personal reference.

I have read and understand the involvement this study requires, and I agree to participate in this study.

**Date:**

**Signatures:**
Consent Signature of Student Participant

Printed Name of Student Participant

I understand the requirements for this study and I hereby give my informed consent for my child to be a participant in this study.

Consent Signature of Parent/Guardian

Printed Name of Parent/Guardian & Relationship
Appendix B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social &amp; Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability to access and use college email to communicate with ed coach, professors, program staff, peers, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composes email with greeting, message, closing, signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the names of other program students, professor, peer mentor, classmates, and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in at least one social or club activity on campus each week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joins peers at lunch or free time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informs key people (ed coach, professor, bus driver, program staff, etc.) when going to be absent or late via phone call, text, or email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational/Internship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to follow basic directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends to tasks without distraction or interruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to express need for assistance or need for clarification of directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moves from one task to another independently, OR Asks “What’s next?” OR Follows a checklist of tasks to be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses the Work Based Learning Plan with the ed coach and Employment Specialist to track progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifeskills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dresses appropriately for the weather, or for the situation (internship, special activity, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has enough money for food desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to acquire food in the cafeteria following standard etiquette — waiting in turn, speaking clearly to server to state choices, managing tray, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to pay cashier and wait for change, while managing tray of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleans up table and throws out trash after eating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to use restroom independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers mouth when coughing/sneezing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to match voice loudness to the setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Evaluation for students

Please check off the level of assistance you need for each experience. There are no wrong answers. Your evaluation will be used to monitor your own growth in these areas from March to April 2019. If you no longer wish to participate in this study, you do not have to complete this evaluation.

* Required

Your assigned number *

Your answer

What is the Date? *

[ ] 1/1/2019

[ ] 1/2/2019

[ ] 1/3/2019

[ ] 1/4/2019

[ ] 1/5/2019

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQES5wXoS7bTO6SgwG2noHi0V3xStKDKQ4gL2jBb6.. - 4/23/2019

Evaluation for students

Key:

○ Physical Assistance: My coach provides hands-on help

○ Verbal Assistance: My coach provides spoken help

○ Gestural Assistance: My coach provides facial expression or body language to help

○ Monitor: My coach observes me and if needed will help me

○ Independent: I can do everything by myself

Getting around campus: *

1 - Physical Assistance 2 - Verbal Assistance 3 - Gestural Assistance 4 - Monitored Assistance 5 - I am independent 0 - Not applicable

I can get around campus to many locations

I can travel to college without using school transportation

I can find specific places on campus (cafeteria, library, bookstore, etc)

- [ ]

Page 2 of 10
About the Author

Carly Markos has completed her Master in Special Education, Teacher of Students with Moderate Disabilities (PreK-8) in August 2018. Her research was completed in spring 2018 under the mentorship of Dr. J. Edward Carter and Dr. Jon Cash. Carly plans to pursue a career as an elementary school special education teacher.