

Legislation Impact on Transition Services for Youth With Disabilities: An Impact on Interagency Collaboration Between Schools and Vocational Rehabilitation

Emily A. Brinck¹, Katherine B. Friedman², and Matthew E. Sprong³

¹University of North Dakota, ²University of Wisconsin Madison, ³Lock Haven University

Transition for youth with disabilities can be one of the most critical and empowering times in a youth's life. However, many young adults exit high school without a plan for the future or ability to take control of their own lives, and many youth with disabilities are not employed, not living on their own, and not integrated into the community (Harwick et al., 2017). The role of transition is to help youth with disabilities "develop requisite skills and knowledge that will allow them to successfully adapt to and even thrive in new environments" (Akos et al., 2007, p. 273). Various responsibilities are held by both vocational rehabilitation counselors and special education teachers in relation to transition services but there is still a debate on who should assume the leadership role in specific competency areas (Kwiatek, 2017). The purpose of this paper is to provide detail related to the roles and responsibilities of vocational rehabilitation (VR) and special education professionals to assist in the transition collaboration to improve service-delivery outcomes for transition-aged youth with disabilities.

Keywords: Interagency Collaboration, WIOA, IDEA, VR Counselors, Special Education Teachers

Transition for youth with disabilities can be one of the most critical and empowering times in a youth's life. However, many young adults exit high school without a plan for the future or ability to take control of their own lives. Many youth with disabilities are not employed, not living on their own and not integrated into the community (Harwick et al., 2017). While post school outcomes of youth with disabilities have improved moderately over this time period, there continue to be many barriers based upon changes in American society, including the diversity of the population, family structures, legislation, policy, and practice (Newman et al., 2010). The role of transition is to help youth with disabilities "develop requisite skills and knowledge that will allow them to successfully adapt to and even thrive in new environments" (Akos et al., 2007, p. 273). Understanding the roles and responsibilities for vocational rehabilitation (VR) and special education professionals in regard to transition collaboration is the first step to improve transition-aged youth with disabilities.

VR Counselors

VR counselors have many different roles and responsibilities within their field. VR counselors are responsible for helping people with disabilities live fuller, more independent lives by assisting them in gaining impactful employments. They work with clients to overcome and manage the personal, social, or psychological effects of disabilities on employment or independent living (Sundar et al., 2018). This includes working with individuals across the life span. Transition represents a small component of VR counselors

jobs responsibilities, but they are considered a key partner in a youth's transition to postsecondary outcomes (Kaya et al., 2018). VR participation in transition services however have historically been fragmented and inadequate (Agran et al., 2002; Benitez et al., 2009; Oertle & Trach, 2007).

VR counselors have an important role in supporting youth with disabilities in the transition process from school to employment. These roles have typically focused on describing the transition process (Plotner et al., 2012), interagency cooperation (Certo & Luecking, 2006), and the formation of planning councils (Dutta et al., 2016). The unique training, network, relationships, and expertise of VR counselors can contribute to pre-employment transition services (Pre-ETS; Plotner et al., 2012), and under WIOA (2014) include:

- Provide pre-ETS services to any youth with a disability (including applicants);
- Determine eligibility for individual VR services;
- Develop an Individual Plan for Employment (IPE) within 90 days of eligibility; and
- Provide services to support youth in obtaining employment.

VR counselors have these important roles but they are not always recognized (Plotner et al., 2012). For VR counselors to be successful in providing youth with services to achieve success in post-secondary outcomes, interagency collaboration is critical. VR counselors are seldom able to access many curricular activities (Taylor et al., 2016) as well as other transition planning activities.

Special Education Teachers

One of the main responsibilities for special education teachers during the transition process is to provide curriculum that focuses on vocational and technical education through IEP development (Lombardi et al., 2018). It is well documented in literature that having rigorous and relevant curriculum for youth is a critical component of transition (Bouck, 2012; Carter et al., 2013; Mazzotti et al., 2014; Morningstar et al., 2012; Test et al., 2009). Specific roles for special educators include:

- Invite key stakeholders (including VR counselors) to participate in IEP teams,
- Deliver transition services include in IEP;
- Develop curriculum that supports career or postsecondary education and training,
- Provide opportunities to develop employment skills and participate in community experiences;
- Provide student information to assist with VR eligibility determination; and

Assist VR counselor to access the school environment and identify opportunities to work with students (Morningstar et al., 2012; Test et al., 2012).

Interagency Collaboration

Various responsibilities are held by both VR counselors and special education teachers in relation to transition services but there is still a debate on who should assume the leadership role in specific competency areas (Meade, 2017). Working in collaboration instead of isolation will provide better services in the long run (Brown et al., 2013). It is important to determine how interagency collaboration is defined in order to understand the steps that need to be taken from both professionals. However, this may be challenging because literature indicates that there is limited knowledge of how to define and demonstrate collaboration (Schofield & Amodeo, 1999; Drinka & Clark, 2000; Zwarenstein et al., 2004).

There is no commonly used or industry-specific definition of interagency collaboration that can be found across multiple research studies (Plotner et al., 2020). A general definition of collaboration may be the "Process of participation through which people, groups, and organizations form relationships and work together to achieve a set of agreed-upon results" (Kochhar-Bryant et al., 2008, p. 7). Oertle and Trach (2007) have defined interagency collaboration as interactions and activities between spe-

cial educators and rehabilitation professionals working as a team. These activities can include sharing information, attending transition planning meetings, combining resources, and establishing and utilizing effective lines of communication to benefit students with disabilities as they transition from high school to postsecondary life. Morningstar (2018) suggested that there are multiple stages involved in establishing interagency collaboration, including networking, coordination, cooperation, and collaboration. Additionally, Morningstar indicated that regardless of how interagency collaboration is defined, it takes significant dedication and intentionality to develop positive and constructive working relationships.

Networking in Transition

Networking opportunities help improve the transition planning process for youth with disabilities (Francis et al., 2018). Networking is characterized as “awareness of the organization, loosely defined roles, and low levels of communication for the purpose of referral only” (Noonan et al., 2012, p. 145). Networking in a transition context involves the transition coordinator developing contacts within different agencies within the community (Morningstar, 2018). The purpose of networking is to be able to share information with youth and families about specific agency functions, including VR. The transition coordinator should also share general information with agencies about the youths’ needs to make sure that they are a good fit for that agency (Morningstar, 2018).

Transition involves the participation and coordination of school programs, adult services, agencies, and natural supports within the community (Luecking et al., 2008), and is led by a transition coordinator. Transition teams should be collaboratively composed of school personnel and representatives from community agencies, where the expertise of each professional is used to develop new programs to improve outcomes for youth with disabilities, to identify the needs within the community, and to create positive solutions to meet those needs. Coordination has been given a sense of urgency in the context of efforts to improve transition service planning for youth with disabilities (Havlicek et al., 2016). The transition coordinator is responsible for helping youth and families access necessary community resources. The transition coordinator is actively involved in arranging appointments and ensuring that the student receives the intended services (Morningstar, 2018). Coordination of services is important in providing services for youth with disabilities at the federal, state, and local levels (Fabian et al., 2016).

Collaborative Goal-Setting

Best practices in transition planning require the development of individualized transition plans focused on developing student skills linked with desired life outcomes in coordination with adult service agencies (Hirano et al., 2018). However, many schools fail to meet the minimum level of compliance with the federal transition legislation mandated particularly in areas of service coordination and interagency collaboration (Morgan & Risen, 2016). These gaps occur as a result of schools lack of awareness of disability specific resources that may be available to their communities (Blalock et al., 2003). Cooperation is important in how school and agency personnel work together to support a smooth transition process for youth with disabilities. Morningstar (2018) recommends that both schools and outside agencies should interact on a regular basis to share information and expertise, define their roles, schedule meetings, and identify and work toward shared goals. Cooperation among agencies is vital to serving youth, but is consistently under-represented. Barriers of cooperation have been linked to the revise policies and procedures such as the IDEA and WIOA standards in regards to transition collaboration (Saleh & LaWanda, 2020).

Current Outcomes for Youth with Disabilities

Youth with disabilities are more likely to drop out of school, be unemployed or under employed, be unengaged in positive work, continuing education, or school activities, and get into trouble with the law than youth without disabilities (Prince et al., 2018). Interagency collaboration is a fundamental

challenge for educators, and a critical component for promoting better adult outcomes in a time of poor outcomes for youths with disabilities, compounded by a focus on academic school reform (Agran et al., 2002; Benz et al., 1995; Kleinhammer-Tramill et al., 1994; Wehman et al., 1999).

Youth with disabilities are more likely to attain the GED, HiSET, or alternative high school credentials than their nondisabled peers (Horn et al., 2005). Youth with disabilities in high school are also more likely to choose not to attend, or delay college more than a year (Shower et al., 2017) with those who do attend college being less likely to graduate than their peers without disabilities (Fleming et al., 2017). The *National Longitudinal Transition Study -2* (NLTS2) indicated that after completing high school, 72.6% of youth with disabilities lived with their parents, while 7.7% were attending a 4-year college or university, and 12.8% attending a 2-year community college. Post-school employment data also showed that 55.1% of youth with disabilities indicated having a job one year after high school, which was much higher than previous NLTS data (Wagner et al., 2007).

Youths with disabilities are more likely than their nondisabled peers to experience low pay, job dissatisfaction, and underemployment (Dhakal et al., 2018). While there is an increase in employment for youth with disabilities, barriers still stem from the fact that students who receive special education services often have limited to or participation in employment preparation and career development activities (Oertle & Seader, 2015). Research has also shown that youth with disabilities with increased independent living skills were more likely to have a higher quality of life and be involved in post school employment (McDougal et al., 2016). Working age individuals who identified as having an intellectual disability are twice as likely to live below the poverty line as compared to adults without disabilities, (34% and 15% respectively; Butterworth et al., 2013).

The increase of youth having jobs post-high school can be attributed to several factors. The first is the high expectations of youth with disabilities to be successful in adult life (Hirano et al., 2018; National Center on Secondary Education and Transition, 2004; Wagner et al., 2007). The second factor includes increasing emphasis on goals that are student-directed regarding post-school employment or education outcomes (Agran & Hughes, 2008; Benz et al., 2000; Thoma & Wehman, 2010; Wehmeyer et al., 2000). The last is the introduction of practices that reflect collaboration with external partners, community agencies, and organization that might be involved in helping to support students in their post-school environments (Noonan et al., 2008; Repetto et al., 2002; Wehman, 2010).

Barriers

Research in the last decade has indicated that interagency collaboration has heavily focused barriers to building relationships between school districts and community agencies (Agran et al., 2002; Blalock & Benz, 1999; Halpern, 1993; Powers et al., 2005). Interagency collaboration is a fundamental challenge for educators and a critical component for promoting better adult outcomes, and when there is not a direct relationship between schools and community agencies transition outcomes suffer (Leonard et al., 2016). Low employment rates, underemployment, low post-secondary participation, and the increasing amount of adolescents receiving social security benefits remain a challenge for special education teachers and VR counselors (Lindsay et al., 2015). In the transition literature, interagency collaboration is only effective when there is intentionality amongst all stakeholders (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992; Sullivan & Skelcher, 2017).

Inequitable participation and engagement between professionals are barriers that impacts transition collaboration and by extension, impacts outcomes. It is important to note that interpersonal relationships and the relationship between agencies can significantly influence the success or failure of collaborative efforts (Johnson et al., 2003; Mattessich & Monsey, 1992; Noonan et al., 2008). However, research continues to show that commitment to interagency collaboration and secondary transition is essential in order for transition age youth to have positive outcomes (Hasazi et al., 1999; Johnson et al., 2003; Kochhar-Bryant, 2008).

Environmental Barriers

One area that impacts the lack of engagement between each professional are environmental factors. Both special education teachers and VR counselors' demographics, location, and services can be indicators of environmental factors that can either help or hinder successful transition collaboration (Bazzoli et al., 1997; Polivka et al., 1997; Sullivan & Skelcher, 2017). Environmental factors can also include the environment of the youth. When inclusionary efforts are successful in a high school environment, a firm foundation is laid for inclusionary environments to emerge in post-school community environments (Halpern, 1994; Holt, 2017). A study conducted by Polivka et al. (1997) found that environmental factors predicted both interagency processes and outcomes. Creating an environment where professionals can work together to address transition issues and concerns of common interest can help break down the barriers that are often experienced during the transition collaboration process (Epstein et al., 2018; Halpern, 1994).

Agran and colleagues (2002) surveyed special education teachers and asked about how often they invited a VR counselor to serve as a member of a transition team. The majority of the participants (42%) indicated that an invitation was sent less than 25% of the time, with 15% indicated they never invited VR counselors to serve as a member of the transition team. The survey went on to ask how much VR counselors participated in transition related district meetings. Most VR counselors (57%) participated in related district meetings less than 50% of the time. Special education teachers also reported that 44% of youth with disabilities received VR services for less than 3 months (Agran et al., 2002). The overall reaction to how satisfied special education teachers were with rehabilitation counselors indicated a mean of 2.95 out of 5 and that VR counselors were somewhat knowledgeable of students they were serving.

Administrative Barriers

There are many administrative and foundational barriers that hinder effective transition collaboration. First and foremost, agency differences create barriers. For example, the eligibility requirements for special education services and VR services are different (Eliason et al., 2014; Miller, 1990; Rusch et al., 1992). There are differences in preservice training requirements (Beveridge et al., 2015) and differences in basic policy philosophy and values that drive the service provision of each system (Eliason et al., 2014). Agency differences also include cultural barriers. It is important for both professionals to understand and respect other people and organizational culture, values, and beliefs. If there is not cohesive understanding the decision-making process and transition related processes become difficult. Other considerations include industry-specific jargon. These cultural differences can inhibit successful collaboration (Barnett, 1995a; Harley et al., 2017).

Administrative barriers are a key barrier of transition collaboration. Both special education teachers and VR counselors are receiving higher caseloads and much more responsibilities, and thus do not have the time or capacity for the collaboration necessary to produce positive outcomes (Leahy et al., 2003; Sloan & LaPlante Sosnowsky, 2002). Barnett (1995b) also concluded that it takes time for people in professional careers to build trust, to learn operating procedures, and learn how their talents can be used to meet objectives of the group. Transition planning may not be conducive or productive to these needs due to time or capacity demand on both sides.

Working Alliance

Working alliance has mostly been researched in counseling relationships between therapists and clients. There has been a considerable amount of research investigating the impact of the working alliance on counseling outcomes (Lustig et al., 2002) and several meta-analyses including Horvath and Symonds (1991), Martin et al., (2000), Flückiger et al., (2017), and Horvath (2018). The construct of the working alliance was developed and defined by Bordin (1979) as a "collaboration between the client and counselor based on the development of an attachment bond as well as a shared commitment

to the goals and tasks of counseling” (p.16). The conceptualization of the working alliance is based on three independent components, including goals, tasks, and bonds. Goals are the intervention most of the research would be viewed as outcomes in the counseling process (Chan et al., 1997b). To be able to accomplish goals within the counseling process, there needs to be a level of mutuality between client and counselor regarding counseling change goals. Bordin (1979) believed that the client’s understanding of the change goal is therapeutic, and sometimes provides him or her with the motivation to begin to change.

Tasks are the second independent component of the working alliance. Tasks are defined as behaviors and cognitions that the counselor and client engage in during the therapeutic process. According to Bordin (1979) “the effectiveness of the tasks...depends upon the vividness with which the therapist can link the assigned task of the patient’s sense of difficulties wish to change” (p. 254). Similar to goals, for tasks to be successful both the counselor and client must accept responsibility to perform these tasks (Lustig et al., 2002) and it must be evident that goals and tasks are related (Bordin, 1979).

Bonds are the last of the three independent components of the working alliance. Bonds examine the partner compatibility (Bordin, 1994) between the counselor and the client (Lustig et al., 2002). Bonds help develop the interaction between the counselor and client in a shared activity and can be expressed as trust, or a feeling of common purpose and understanding (Bordin, 1994; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989).

Factors Influencing Working Alliance Development

While there is significant evidence in counseling regarding the value of a strong working alliance, (e.g., Al-Darmaki & Kivlighan, 1993; Connors et al., 1997; Goering et al., 1997; Kivlighan & Shaughnessy, 2000; Kokotovic & Tracy, 1990; Mallinckrodt & Nelson, 1991), the development of such a relationship can be impacted by a number of factors. Working alliance between a student and their transition team can be influenced by the amount, extent, and perception of the treatment goals and difficulty in maintaining social relationships. These issues can be compounded by the type and severity of the client’s needs as well as the overall compatibility of the transition team (Chan et al., 1997a; Gelso & Carter, 1985; Horvath, 1994).

To demonstrate the impact of working alliance in a student-teacher context, Toste and colleagues (2014) surveyed 17 teachers and their students in a Montreal classroom using a classroom working alliance inventory adapted from the WAI Short Form (WAI-SF; Tracey & Kokotvic, 1989), looking specifically at discrepancies in working alliance for students with and without disabilities. The study found that disability status significantly predicted teachers’ ratings of working alliance, but not students’ ratings. For example, teachers reported that they had a stronger working alliance with students who were not identified as having disabilities, which is consistent with past research on student teacher relationships (Murray & Greenberg, 2001).

Working alliance has also been studied in educator-parent relationships. Magaldi-Dopman and Conway (2012) looked at the development of parent-teacher partnerships. While the bond of the relationship was deemed to be most important for success of tasks and goals, this area is least likely to be covered in teacher training (professional development) at the postsecondary level (Hiatt- Michael, 2001). Working alliance between educators and parents can be assessed based on the goals and ability to effectively carry out tasks (Larose et al., 2010).

Working alliance has been examined within career counseling as well. Whiston and colleagues (2016) identified specific counselor factors that influence the working alliance, such as counselor demographics, intervention strategies, and prioritizing the working alliance. Elad-Strenger and Littman-Ocadia (2012) found that establishing a working alliance in the first session significantly predicts career exploration. The focus on all three aspects of the working alliance (e.g., agreement on goals, agreement on tasks, and bonds; Whiston et al., 2016) appeared to play a critical role related to outcomes for youth with disabilities (Brown & Ryan Krane, 2000; Masdonati et al., 2009). This type of

research has direct applicability to the collaborative nature of transition planning and further identifies specific individual factors that may impact the overall experience of transition.

Legislation

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

IDEA is the core legislation that was passed that influences transition services for youth with disabilities within the secondary education school system and provides clear guidance of the transition services to which each student is entitled. IDEA was reauthorized in 2004 to contain several changes regarding equity, accountability, and excellence in education for children with disabilities (Strassfeld, 2017). There are two components of the 2004 IDEA that are emphasized: transition planning and collaboration (Burke & Sandman, 2015).

IDEA has stressed the importance of collaboration within the transition services. Schools need to include a statement of interagency responsibilities and linkages as well as documentation that they have invited “a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services” [§34 CFR 300.321(b)(3)]. Having additional representatives can help establish and meet Individualized Education Program (IEP) transition goals. IDEA emphasized the importance of instructional planning, curriculum and instruction, transition planning, assessment, collaboration, and additional cultural and family aspects.

The Workplace Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)

In 2014 the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) increased VR roles in transition services for youth with disabilities (Plotner & Dynmond, 2017). The WIOA aims to provide more opportunities for youth to practice and improve their workplace skills, to consider their career interests, and to get real world experience in the workplace. To be able to implement these career exploration programs, 15 percent of each VR agencies’ is federal program funds are set aside to provide pre-employment transition services to assist students and youth with disabilities to transition from secondary school to postsecondary education programs and competitive integrated employment.

These funding and legislation changes allow VR agencies to prioritize serving students and youth with disabilities. To provide effective services, the WIOA legislation says that there needs to be partnership agreements with other local and state agencies, such as schools, workforce development centers, and other youth and adult organizations to promote and improve youth with disabilities access, utilization and outcomes in transition.

Impact on Transition

Legislation, training programs, and funding have led to a disconnect in services among local education agencies (Agran et al., 2002; Oertle & Trach, 2007). IDEA and WIOA impact the need for transition services for youth with disabilities. Professionals are receiving directives from legislation to work in coordination with both the secondary education and VR systems. However, the legislation leaves it up to the state and local levels to establish how this is executed (Oertle & Seader, 2015). There are three main shifts for schools due to WIOA changes: (1) Strengthen collaboration, (2) provide pre-ETS services, and (3) purchasing transition services. These three shifts help influence and shape where research needs to be conducted in regards to transition planning for youth with disabilities (Bird et al., 2014). With IDEA and WIOA being in the forefront of transition legislation, there are now critical aspects of transition services that will affect both special education teachers and VR counselors. When looking at changes of the legislation changes, it is important to under how cross-agency collaboration, transition services, curriculum alignment, family and student engagement will be impacted.

Transition Collaboration Exemplar Programs

There have been several projects that focus specifically on improvement of interagency collaboration. Due to the increase in VR spending on transition-related programming, collaborative programs continue to be implemented and improved across the United States. Several exemplar programs are outlined below.

The Secondary Transitional Experience Program

The Secondary Transitional Experience Program (STEP), implemented in Illinois, works in collaboration with the Department of Rehabilitation Services (DRS) and public schools. Youth are eligible for the program if they have a disability, are receiving special education services, and meet the DRS eligibility requirements. The goal of this program is promote independence in employment, residential life, social integration, and community participation (Horn et al., 1998). This program requires a lot of collaboration efforts between the STEP contractor (providing school services and accessing all financial resources) and DRS (assigning a rehabilitation counselor to perform such duties as applications, determine eligibility, meeting with parents, students, and school personnel, and assisting with the IEP; Horn et al., 1998). In the Horn and colleagues' study (1998), they found that youth with disabilities that participate in this program have a higher employment rate after high school (78%) than compared to 57.6% (Blackorby & Wagner, 1996), 43% (Hasazi et al., 1985) and 12% (Wehman et al., 1985) of similar youth in other studies using the National Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS).

The Oregon's Youth Transition Program

The Oregon's Youth Transition Program has prepared students and youth with disabilities for employment or career related postsecondary education or training since 1990. This program emphasizes a collaborative partnership between the office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Oregon Department of Education, and the University of Oregon (Poppen et al., 2017). The program started out in seven high school and today serves around 1,500 students in approximately 120 schools. The youth receive services that are typically offered through the general or special education programs to achieve their secondary and post-secondary employment (Poppen et al., 2017). The main components of the program include: individualized planning; instruction in academic, vocational, independent living, and personal social skills; paid employment; support services; and follow up support one year after leaving the program (Johnson, 2002; Poppen et al., 2017).

Project SEARCH

Project SEARCH is a program developed in Cincinnati in 1996 and is now offered at 200 sites nationwide. Participants in this program are young adults between 18-21 with intellectual and developmental disabilities. The critical Project SEARCH requirements include program-wide employment goals, internship model, and collaboration (Christensen & Richardson, 2017). The essential collaborative partners that make this program successful include school staff, host business liaison, rehabilitation services agency staff, developmental and/or intellectual disability agency staff, employment services, organization staff, transition students, and the students' families (Wehman et al., 2012). Out of the 3,733 of youth that were enrolled in the program in 2017-18, 3,511 (94%) participants completed the program with an employment rate of 2,357 (77.3%; Project SEARCH, 2018). These three programs strive to promote and improve transition services and processes. One the main components that is seen across the board is how imperative interagency collaboration is for these programs to be successful. However, interagency collaboration remains a fundamental challenge for educators and VR counselors (Oertle et al., 2020).

Recommendations for Practice

Understanding the foundations of history, legislation, and outcomes for transition age youth with disabilities to positive post-secondary outcomes is essential for effective interagency collaboration for all organizations involved. There are some key recommendations that professionals can take away to help youth be successful.

Recommendations for practice:

- Transition teams should include as many stakeholders as necessary, including the youth, their family, special education teachers, VR counselors, and other providers or representatives as appropriate.
- Transition teams should practice intentionality in group formation to facilitate the trust and mutuality necessary to produce positive outcomes.
- Transition goals should be geared toward a youth's needs and focus on successful integration to postsecondary life through education or employment.
- Specific language identifying the youth as the driving force of transition with the team to advise creates an avenue for the youth to be empowered to empower the youth to make decisions.

Conclusion

Youth with disabilities have historically encountered significant barriers to postsecondary integration, specifically the transition between school and further education and from school to gainful employment. To facilitate this, schools and other stakeholders (including vocational rehabilitation agencies) partner together with youth and their families to create transition plans as a means of mapping a way to success. While this process has been helped by increased state budget spending mandates for transition programs in VR, the collaboration process has been hindered by the availability, awareness, and collaborative strategy of these stakeholders. By increasing the collaboration between educators and VR counselors, transition outcomes for youth with disabilities can continue to improve.

References

- Agran, M., Cain, H. M., & Cavin, M. D. (2002). Enhancing the involvement of rehabilitation counselors in the transition process. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 25(2), 141–155. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.und.edu/10.1177/088572880202500204>
- Agran, M., & Hughes, C. (2008). Students' opinions regarding their individualized education program involvement. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 31(12), 69–76. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.und.edu/10.1177/0885728808317657>
- Akos, P., Lambie, G., Milsom, A., & Gilbert, K. (2007). Early adolescents' aspirations and academic tracking: An exploratory investigation. *Professional School Counseling*, 11(1), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X0701100108>
- Al-Darmaki, F., & Kivlighan, D. M. (1993). Congruence in client counselor expectations for relationship and the working alliance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 40(4), 379–384. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.40.4.379>
- Barnett, B. G. (1995a). Portfolio use in educational leadership preparation programs: From theory to practice. *Innovative Higher Education*, 19(3), 197–206.
- Barnett, W. S. (1995b). Long-term effects of early childhood programs on cognitive and school outcomes. *The future of children*, 5(3), 25–50. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1602366>
- Bazzoli, G. J., Stein, R., Alexander, J. A., Conrad, D. A., Sofaer, S., & Shortell, S. M. (1997). Public-private collaboration in health and human service delivery: Evidence from community partnerships. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 75(4), 533–561. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.00068>

- Benitez, D. T., Morningstar, M. E., & Frey, B. B. (2009). A multistate survey of special education teachers' perceptions of their transition competencies. *Career development for exceptional individuals*, 32(1), 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885728808323945>
- Benz, M., Johnson, D., Mikkelsen, K., & Lindstrom, L. (1995). Improving collaboration between schools and vocational rehabilitation: Stakeholder identified barriers and strategies. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 18(2), 133–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088572889501800207>
- Benz, M., Lindstrom, L., & Yovonoff, P. (2000). Improving graduation and employment outcomes of students with disabilities: Predictive factors and student perspectives. *Exceptional Children*, 66(4), 509–529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290006600405>
- Beveridge, S., Leconte, P., Shaine, M. D., Del Toro, C., & Penrod, J. C. (2015). Application of the knowledge validation inventory-revised to assess current training needs of state-federal rehabilitation counselors. *Rehabilitation Research, Policy, and Education*, 29(3), 241–260. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034355215590770>
- Bird, K., Foster, M., & Ganzglass, E. (2014). New opportunities to improve economic and career success for low-income youth and adults: Key provisions of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy. <http://hdl.voced.edu.au/10707/401202>
- Blackorby, J., & Wagner, M. (1996). Longitudinal postschool outcomes of youth with disabilities: Findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study. *Exceptional children*, 62(5), 399–413. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440299606200502>
- Blalock, G., & Benz, M. R. (1999). *Using community transition teams to improve transition services. PRO-EDsSeries on transition. PRO-ED.*
- Blalock, G., Kochhar-Bryant, C. A., Test, D. W., Kohler, P., White, W., Lehmann, J., . . . & Patton, J. (2003). The need for comprehensive personnel preparation in transition and career development: A position statement of the division on career development and transition. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 26(2), 207–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088572880302600207>
- Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, research & practice*, 16(3), 252–260. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0085885>
- Bordin, E. (1994). Theory and research on the therapeutic working alliance: New directions. In A. Horvath & L. Greenberg (Eds.), *The working alliance: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 13–37). Wiley.
- Bouck, E. C. (2012). Secondary students with moderate/severe intellectual disability: Considerations of curriculum and post-school outcomes from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 56(12), 1175–1186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01517.x>
- Brown, L., Brown, S., & Glaser, S. (2013). Improved transition outcomes for students with visual impairments through interagency collaboration. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness (Online)*, 107(6), 406–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X1310700602>
- Brown, S. D., & Ryan Krane, N. E. (2000). Four (or five) sessions and a cloud of dust: Old assumptions and new observations about career counseling. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 740–766). Wiley.
- Burke, M., & Sandman, L. (2015). In the voices of parents: Suggestions for the next IDEA reauthorization. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40(1), 71–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1540796915585109>
- Butterworth, J., Smith, F. A., Hall, A. C., Migliore, A., Winsor, J., & Domin, D. (2013). *StateData: The national report on employment services and outcomes, 2013*. StateData Book. <http://book.statedata.info/13/>
- Carter, E. W., Harvey, M. N., Taylor, J. L., & Gotham, K. (2013). Connecting youth and young adults with autism spectrum disorders to community life. *Psychology in the Schools*, 50(9), 888–898. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21716>

- Certo, N. J., & Luecking, R. G. (2006). Service integration and school to work transition: Customized employment as an outcome for youth with significant disabilities. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, 37(4), 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0047-2220.37.4.29>
- Chan, F., Shaw, L., McMahon, B., Koch, L., & Strauser, D. (1997a). A model for enhancing rehabilitation counselor-consumer working relationships. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 41(2), 122–134.
- Chan, F., Tansey, T. N., Chronister, J., McMahon, B. T., Iwanaga, K., Wu, J. R., . . . & Flowers, S. (2017b). Rehabilitation counseling practice in state VR and the effect of the workforce innovation and opportunity act (WIOA). *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, 48(3), 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0047-2220.48.3.20>
- Christensen, J. J., & Richardson, K. (2017). Project SEARCH workshop to work: Participant reflections on the journey through career discovery. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 46(3), 341–354. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-170871>
- Connors, G., Carroll, K., DiClemente, C., Longabaugh, R., & Donovan, D. (1997). The therapeutic alliance and its relationship to alcoholism treatment participation and outcome. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65(4), 588–598. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.65.4.588>
- Dhakal, S., Connell, J., & Burgess, J. (2018). Inclusion and work: Addressing the global challenges for youth employment. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion an International Journal*, 37(2), 110–120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-12-2017-0290>
- Drinka, T. J. K., & Clark, P. G. (2000). *Health care teamwork: Interdisciplinary practice and teaching*. Auburn House.
- Dutta, A., Kundu, M., Johnson, E., Chan, F., Trainor, A., Blake, R., & Christy, R. (2016). Community conversations: Engaging stakeholders to improve employment-related transition services for youth with emotional and behavioral disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 45(1), 43–51. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-160809>
- Elad-Strenger, J., & Littman-Ovadia, H. (2012). The contribution of the counselor–client working alliance to career exploration. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20(2), 140–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711420850>
- Eliason, G., Samide, T., & Patrick, J. (2014). *Career Counseling across the lifespan: Community, school, and higher education*. Charlotte Information Age.
- Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Sheldon, S. B., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., . . . & Hutchins, D. J. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Corwin Press.
- Fabian, E., Simonsen, M., Deschamps, A., Dong, S., & Luecking, D. (2016). Service system collaboration in transition: An empirical exploration of its effects on rehabilitation outcomes for students with disabilities. *The Journal of Rehabilitation*, 82(3), 3–10.
- Fleming, A. R., Plotner, A. J., & Oertle, K. M. (2017). College students with disabilities: The relationship between student characteristics, the academic environment, and performance. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 30(3), 209–221.
- Flückiger, C., DelRe, A. C., Wampold, B. E., & Horvath, A. O. (2017). *Alliance meta-analysis 2017: Symptom specificity & alliance outcome correlation*. Paper presented at the Society for Psychotherapy Research, Toronto.
- Francis, G. L., Stride, A., & Reed, S. (2018). Transition strategies and recommendations: Perspectives of parents of young adults with disabilities. *British Journal of Special Education*, 45(3), 277–301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12232>
- Gelso, C. J., & Carter, J. A. (1985). The relationship in counseling and psychotherapy: Components, consequences, and theoretical antecedents. *The counseling psychologist*, 13(2), 155–243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000085132001>
- Goering, P., Wasylenki, D., Lindsay, S., Lemire, D., & Rhodes, A. (1997). Process and outcome in a hostel outreach program for homeless clients with severe mental illness. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 67(4), 607–617. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0080258>

- Halpern, R. (1993). Neighborhood-based initiative to address poverty: Lessons from experience. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 20, 111–135.
- Halpern, A. S. (1994). The transition of youth with disabilities to adult life: A position statement of the division on career development and transition, the council for exceptional children. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 17(2), 115–124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088572889401700201>
- Harley, D. A., Ysasi, N. A., Bishop, M. L., & Fleming, A. R. (Eds.). (2017). *Disability and Vocational Rehabilitation in Rural Settings: Challenges to Service Delivery*. Springer.
- Harwick, R. M., Lindstrom, L., & Unruh, D. (2017). In their own words: Overcoming barriers during the transition to adulthood for youth with disabilities who experienced foster care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 73, 338–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chidyouth.2017.01.011>
- Hasazi, S. B., Finck, K., Gordon, L. R., Roe, C. A., Hull, M., & Salembier, G. (1985). A statewide follow-up on post high school employment and residential status of students labeled, "Mentally Retarded". *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, 20(4), 222–234.
- Hasazi, S. B., Furney, K. S., & DeStefano, L. (1999). Implementing the IDEA transition mandates. *Exceptional Children*, 65(4), 555–566. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440299906500409>
- Havlicek, J., Bilaver, L., & Beldon, M. (2016). Barriers and facilitators of the transition to adulthood for foster youth with autism spectrum disorder: Perspectives of service providers in Illinois. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 60, 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chidyouth.2015.11.025>
- Hiatt-Michael, D. (2001). *Preparing teachers to work with parents*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. <https://www.ericdigests.org/2002-3/parents.htm>
- Hirano, K., Rowe, D., Lindstrom, L., & Chan, P. (2018). Systemic barriers to family involvement in transition planning for youth with disabilities: A qualitative metasynthesis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(11), 3440–3456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1189-y>
- Holt, C. R. (2017). *School bond success: A strategy for building America's schools*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Horn, L., Cataldi, E. F., & Sikora, A. (2005). *Waiting to attend college: Undergraduates who delay their postsecondary enrollment (NCES 2005–152)*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. https://nces.ed.gov/das/epubs/pdf/2005152_es.pdf
- Horn, J. R., Trach, J. S., & Haworth, S. L. (1998). Employment outcomes from a collaborative work study program. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 64(3), 30–35.
- Horvath, A. (1994). Research on the alliance. In A. Horvath & L. Greenberg (Eds.), *The working alliance: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 259–286). Wiley.
- Horvath, A. O. (2018). Research on the alliance: Knowledge in search of a theory. *Psychotherapy Research*, 28(4), 499–516. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2017.1373204>
- Horvath, A. O., & Greenberg, L. S. (1989). Development and validation of the working alliance inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36(2), 223–333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.36.2.223>
- Horvath, A. O., & Symonds, B. D. (1991). Relation between working alliance and outcome in psychotherapy: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38(2), 139–149. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.38.2.139>
- Johnson, D. R., Stodden, R. A., Emanuel, E. J., Luecking, R., & Mack, M. (2002). Current challenges facing secondary education and transition services: What research tells us. *Exceptional children*, 68(4), 519–531. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290206800407>
- Johnson, L. J., Zorn, D., Kai Yung Tam, B., LaMontagne, M., & Johnson, S. A. (2003). Stakeholders' views of factors that impact successful interagency collaboration. *Exceptional Children*, 69(2), 195–209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290306900205>
- Kaya, C., Hanley-Maxwell, C., Chan, F., & Tansey, T. (2018). Differential vocational rehabilitation service patterns and outcomes for transition-age youth with autism. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 31(5), 862–872. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12443>

- Kivlighan, D., & Shaughnessy, P. (2000). Patterns of working alliance development: A typology of client's working alliance ratings. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*(3), 362–371. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.47.3.362>
- Kleinhammer-Tramill, P. J., Rosenkoetter, S. E., & Tramill, J. L. (1994). Early interventions and secondary/transition services: Harbingers of change in education. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 27*(2), 1–14.
- Kochhar-Bryant, C., Bassett, D. S., & Webb, K. W. (2008). *Transition to postsecondary education for students with disabilities*. Corwin Press.
- Kokotovic, A., & Tracey, T. (1990). Working alliance in the early phase of counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*(1), 16–21. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.37.1.16>
- Kwiatek, S. M. (2017). *A qualitative investigation of secondary general education teachers' perspectives on their involvement in transition services*. [Thesis, Illinois State University], ISU ReD: Research and eData. <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1808&context=etd>
- Larose, S., Chaloux, N., Monaghan, D., & Tarabulsy, G. M. (2010). Working alliance as a moderator of the impact of mentoring relationships among academically at-risk students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*, 2656–2686. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00675.x>
- Leahy, M. J., Chan, F., & Saunders, J. L. (2003). Job functions and knowledge requirements of certified rehabilitation counselors in the 21st century. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 46*(2), 66–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00343552030460020101>
- Leonard, H., Foley, K. R., Pikora, T., Bourke, J., Wong, K., McPherson, L., . . . & Downs, J. (2016). Transition to adulthood for young people with intellectual disability: the experiences of their families. *European child & adolescent psychiatry, 25*(12), 1369–1381.
- Lindsay, S., McDougall, C., Menna-Dack, D., Sanford, R., & Adams, T. (2015). An ecological approach to understanding barriers to employment for youth with disabilities compared to their typically developing peers: views of youth, employers, and job counselors. *Disability and rehabilitation, 37*(8), 701–711. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2014.939775>
- Lombardi, A. R., Dougherty, S. M., & Monahan, J. (2018). Students with intellectual disabilities and career and technical education opportunities: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 29*(2), 82–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207318764863>
- Luecking, R. G., Fabian, E. S., Contreary, K., Honeycutt, T. C., & Luecking, D. M. (2018). Vocational rehabilitation outcomes for students participating in a model transition program. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 61*(3), 154–163. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034355217713167>
- Lustig, D. C., Strauser, D. R., Dewaine Rice, N., & Rucker, T. F. (2002). The relationship between working alliance and rehabilitation outcomes. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 46*(1), 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00343552020460010201>
- Magaldi-Dopman, D., & Conway, T. (2012). Allied forces: The working alliance for meaningful parent-educator partnerships in special education. *Journal of Special Education Apprenticeship, 1*(2), 1–15.
- Mallinckrodt, B., & Nelson, M. L. (1991). Counselor training level and the formation of the psychotherapeutic working alliance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(2), 133–138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.38.2.133>
- Martin, D. J., Gerske, J. P., & Davis, M. K. (2000). Relation of the therapeutic alliance with outcome and other variables: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(3), 438–450. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.68.3.438>
- Masdonati, J., Massoudi, K., & Rossier, J. (2009). Effectiveness of career counseling and the impact of the working alliance. *Journal of Career Development, 36*(2), 183–203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845309340798>
- Mattessich, P. W., & Monsey, B. R. (1992). *Collaboration: What makes it work. A review of research literature on factors influencing successful collaboration*. Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 919 Lafond, St. Paul, MN 55104.

- Mazzotti, V. L., Test, D. W., & Mustian, A. L. (2014). Secondary transition evidence-based practices and predictors: Implications for policymakers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 25(1), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207312460888>
- McDougall, J., McDougall, J., Baldwin, P., Baldwin, P., Evans, J., Evans, J., Nichols, M., Nichols, M., Etherington, N., Etherington, N., Wright, V., & Wright, V. (2016). Quality of life and self-determination: Youth with chronic health conditions make the connection. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 11(2), 571–599. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-014-9382-7>
- Meade, S. B. (2017). *Identifying evidence based transition strategies and the barriers to effective transition planning for students with learning disabilities*. Northcentral University.
- Miller, L. (1990). The regular education initiative and school reform: Lessons from the mainstream. *Remedial and Special Education*, 11(3), 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259001100306>
- Morgan, R. L., & Riesen, T. (2016). *Promoting successful transition to adulthood for students with disabilities*. Guilford Publications.
- Morningstar, M. (2018). *How can school and agency personnel work together to support smooth transition for these students?* <https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/tran-ic/cresource/q2/p05/>
- Morningstar, M. E., Bassett, D. S., Kochhar-Bryant, C., Cashman, J., & Wehmeyer, M. L. (2012). Aligning transition services with secondary education reform: A position statement of the division on career development and transition. *Career development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 35(3), 132–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143412454915>
- Murray, C., & Greenberg, M. T. (2001). Relationships with teachers and bonds with school: Social emotional adjustment correlates for children with and without disabilities. *Psychology in the Schools*, 38(1), 25–41. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6807\(200101\)38:1<25::AID-PITS4>3.0.CO;2-C](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6807(200101)38:1<25::AID-PITS4>3.0.CO;2-C)
- National Center on Secondary Education and Transition. (2004). *Current challenges facing secondary education and transition services for youth with disabilities in the United States*. Retrieved from University of Minnesota, National Center on Secondary Education and Transition website: <http://www.ncset.org/publications/discussionpaper/default.asp>
- Newman, L., Wagner, M., Cameto, R., Knokey, A., & Shaver, D. (2010). *Comparisons across time of the outcomes of youth with disabilities up to 4 years after high school. A report of findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS) and the National Longitudinal Transition Study -2 (NLTS2) (NCSE 2010-3008)*. SRI International. Retrieved from http://nlts2.org/reports/2010_09/nlts2_report_2010_09_execsum.pdf
- Noonan, P. M., McCall, Z. A., Zheng, C., & Gaumer Erickson, A. S. (2012). An analysis of collaboration in a state-level interagency transition team. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 35(3), 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143412443083>
- Noonan, P. M., Morningstar, M. E., & Gaumer Erickson, A. (2008). Improving interagency collaboration: Effective strategies used by high-performing local districts and communities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 31(3), 132–143. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08857288080327149>
- Oertle, K., Bobroff, S., & Sax, C. (2020). Organizational policies and personnel factors that are incentives for and challenges to collaboration as identified by statewide transition supervisors. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 104420732094354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207320943544>
- Oertle, K. M., & Seader, K. J. (2015). Research and practical considerations for rehabilitation transition collaboration. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 81(2), 3–18.
- Oertle, K. M., & Trach, J. S. (2007). Interagency collaboration: The importance of rehabilitation professionals' involvement in transition. *The Journal of Rehabilitation*, 73(3), 36–44.
- Plotner, A. J., Mazzotti, V. L., Rose, C. A., & Teasley, K. (2020). Perceptions of interagency collaboration: Relationships between secondary transition roles, communication, and collaboration. *Remedial and Special Education*, 41(1), 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932518778029>
- Plotner, A., & Dymond, S. (2017). How vocational rehabilitation transition specialists influence curricula for students with severe disabilities. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 60(2), 88–97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034355215626699>

- Plotner, A. J., Trach, J. S., & Strauser, D. R. (2012). Vocational rehabilitation counselors' identified transition competencies: Perceived importance, frequency, and preparedness. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 55(3), 135–143. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034355211427950>
- Polivka, B. J., Kennedy, C., & Chaudry, R. (1997). Collaboration between local public health and community mental health agencies. *Research in nursing & health*, 20(2), 153–160. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-240X\(199704\)20:2<153::AID-NUR7>3.0.CO;2-J](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-240X(199704)20:2<153::AID-NUR7>3.0.CO;2-J)
- Poppen, M., Lindstrom, L., Unruh, D., Khurana, A., & Bullis, M. (2017). Preparing youth with disabilities for employment: An analysis of vocational rehabilitation case services data. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 46(2), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-160857>
- Powers, K. M., Gil-Kashiwabara, E., Geenen, S. J., Powers, L. E., Balandran, J., & Palmer, C. (2005). Mandates and effective transition planning practices reflected in IEPs. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 28(1), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08857288050280010701>
- Prince, A., Hodge, J., Bridges, W., & Katsiyannis, A. (2018). Predictors of Postschool Education/Training and Employment Outcomes for Youth With Disabilities. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 41(2), 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143417698122>
- Project SEARCH (2018). *Outcome summary*. Project Search. <https://www.projectsearch.us/outcome-summary/>
- Repetto, J. B., Webb, K. W., Garvan, C. W., & Washington, T. (2002). Connecting student outcomes with transition practices in Florida. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 25(2), 123–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088572880202500203>
- Rusch, F. R., Kohler, P. D., & Hughes, C. (1992). An analysis of OSERS-sponsored secondary special education and transitional services research. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 15(1), 121–143. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088572889201500110>
- Saleh, M. C., & Cook, L. (2020). Serving justice-involved youth with disabilities. *Vocational Rehabilitation Youth Technical Assistance Center*. https://ecommons.cornell.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1813/90130/YTAC_Serving_Justice_Involved_Youth_with_Disabilities.pdf?sequence=1
- Schofield, F. R., & Amodeo, M. (1999). Interdisciplinary teams in health care and human services settings: Are they effective? *Health & Social Work*, 24(3), 203–219. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hsw/24.3.210>
- Showers, A., & Kinsman, J. (2017). Factors that contribute to college success for students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 40(2), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731948717690115>
- Sloan N., A., & LaPlante Sosnowsky, F. (2002). Burnout among special education teachers in self-contained cross-categorical classrooms. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 25(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088840640202500108>
- Strassfeld, N. (2017). The future of idea: Monitoring disproportionate representation of minority students in special education and intentional discrimination claims. *Case Western Reserve Law Review*, 67(4), 1121–1151.
- Sullivan, H., & Skelcher, C. (2017). *Working across boundaries: Collaboration in public services*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Sundar, V., O'Neill, J., Houtenville, A., Phillips, K., Keirns, T., Smith, A., & Katz, E. (2018). Striving to work and overcoming barriers: Employment strategies and successes of people with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 48(1), 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-170918>
- Taylor, D., Morgan, R., & Callow-Heusser, C. (2016). A survey of vocational rehabilitation counselors and special education teachers on collaboration in transition planning. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 44(2), 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-150788>
- Test, D. W., & Cease-Cook, J. (2012). Evidence-based secondary transition practices for rehabilitation counselors. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 78(2), 30–38.
- Test, D. W., Mazzotti, V. L., Mustian, A. L., Fowler, C. H., Kortering, L., & Kohler, P. (2009). Evidence-based secondary transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes for students with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 32(3), 160–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885728809346960>

- Thoma, C., & Wehman, P. (2010). *Getting the most IEPs: An educator's guide to student-directed approach*. Paul H. Brookes.
- Toste, J. R., Bloom, E. L., & Heath, N. L. (2014). The differential role of classroom working alliance in predicting school-related outcomes for students with and without high-incidence disabilities. *Journal of Special Education*, 48(2), 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466912458156>
- Tracey, T. J., & Kokotovic, A. M. (1989). Factor structure of the working alliance inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 1(3), 207–210. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.1.3.207>
- Wagner, M., Newman, L., Cameto, R., Levine, P., & Marder, C. (2007). *Perceptions and expectations of youth with disabilities: A special topic report of findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2)* (NCSE 2007-3006). SRI International
- Wehman, P. (2010). *Essentials of transition planning*. Paul H. Brookes
- Wehman, P., Kregel, J., & Barcus, J. M. (1985). From school to work: A vocational transition model for handicapped students. *Exceptional children*, 52(1), 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440298505200103>
- Wehman, P., Lau, S., Molinelli, A., Brooke, V., Thompson, K., Moore, C., & West, M. (2012). Supported employment for young adults with autism spectrum disorder: Preliminary data. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 37(3), 160–169. <https://doi.org/10.2511/027494812804153606>
- Wehman, P., West, M., & Kregel, J. (1999). Supported employment program development and research needs: Looking ahead to the year 2000. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 34(1), 3–19.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., Agran, M., & Hughes, C. A. (2000). A national survey of teachers' promotion on self-determination and students directed learning. *Journal of Special Education*, 34(2), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002246690003400201>
- Whiston, S., Rossier, J., & Barón, P. (2016). The working alliance in career counseling: A systematic overview. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 24(4), 591–604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072715615849>
- Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (2014). *WIOA, P.L. 113-128, U.S. Department of Education, 2014*. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-113publ128/pdf/PLAW-113publ128.pdf>
- Zwarenstein, M., Reeves, S., & Perrier, L. (2004). Effectiveness of pre-licensure interdisciplinary education and post-licensure interprofessional collaboration interventions. In I. Oandasan, D. D'Amour, M. Zwarenstein, K. Barker, M. Purden, M. D. Beaulieu (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary education for collaborative patient-centered practice* (pp. 38–50). Health Canada.

Author Notes

- Dr. Emily Brinck, PhD is an Assistant Professor and Director of Rehabilitation and Human Services at University of North Dakota. She earned her PhD in Rehabilitation Counselor Education from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, MS in Management from Indiana University, and BS in Education from Miami University.
- Katherine B. Friedman is a Rehabilitation Counselor Education doctoral candidate in the Department of Rehabilitation Psychology & Special Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her research interests are primarily in professional issues in rehabilitation counseling including rehabilitation counselor identity, counselor supervision, counseling leadership, and rehabilitation counseling pedagogy.
- Dr. Matthew E. Sprong, PhD, CRC, CLPC, CADC, LCPC, CVE is an Assistant Professor in the Clinical Mental Health Counseling program at Lock Haven University and is co-founder and Rehabilitation Consultant of Oak Leaf Consulting Group, LLC. He earned his PhD in Rehabilitation at Southern Illinois University Carbondale, MS in Rehabilitation Counseling & Administration (specialty: Addiction Studies), and BS in Psychology (minor in Speech Communication) from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville.