Predictor Implementation Self-Assessment (PISA) Guide

Purpose

This document provides information about the process for a building-level team to complete the Predictor Implementation Self-Assessment (PISA). The PISA is intended to provide schools, districts or other stakeholders in secondary transition with a framework for determining the degree to which practices that are likely to lead to more positive post-school outcomes for students with disabilities are being implemented.

The term "predictor" refers to in-school activities and factors that research has consistently found to correlate with improved post-school outcomes in the areas of education, employment and independent living, for students with disabilities. (Mazzotti, et al., 2020) The operational definitions and essential program characteristics were derived from experts in the field through a Delphi study. (Rowe et al., 2014)

Through this process, the team should consider the definition of the predictor and each individual program characteristic, as well as the Degree of Implementation and the Evidence of Implementation scales (see Appendix A), to guide decisions regarding program strengths, needs and priorities for change. There are currently 25 different predictors supported by this research that have been grouped into the following clusters to support and facilitate discussion:

- *Student Skills:* Community Experiences, Self-Determination/Self-Advocacy, Goal- Setting, Youth Autonomy/Decision Making, Social Skills, Self-Care/Independent Living, Travel Skills, Psychological Empowerment, Self-Realization, Technology Skills
- *Career Development:* Career Awareness, Occupational Courses, Paid Employment/Work Experiences, Work Study, Career Technical Education
- *Collaborative Systems:* Interagency Collaboration, Parental Involvement, Parent Expectations, Transition Program, Student Support
- *Policy:* Exit Exam Requirements/High School Diploma Status, Inclusion in General Education, Program of Study

The PISA process involves four major steps: identifying team members, establishing a location and time for the meeting, preparing for the meeting and conducting the meeting with the team. It is recommended that teams complete the full self-assessment at least once per year, however, it can be completed more or less often based on comfort and need.

> **Note: This guide and accompanying tool template have been adapted from the NTACT:C (2023) 'Predictor Implementation School/District Self-Assessment Instructions and Action Planning Guide' and NTACT:C (2023) 'Predictor Implementation School/District Self-Assessment' to support implementation in Iowa.**

Step 1: Identifying Team Members

The PISA is best completed collaboratively by members of the SDI Leadership team to represent a thorough perspective on the program (school or district level). It is important to consider who the decision makers are and ensure these individuals are included as part of the team. Consider including the following team members as part of the team:

- Building and District Administrator(s)
- Systems and Practice Coaches
- Special Education Teachers/Chairs
- Transition Specialist/Coordinator
- School Counselor(s)
- CTE Teacher(s) and other General Education Teachers
- Work-Based Learning Coordinator(s)
- Support Staff (Paraprofessionals, Student Advocates, Behavior Specialists, etc.)
- Related Service Providers
- Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor and other service provider agencies
- Students and family members
- Community Partners (business owners, institutions of higher education)

The tool may also be completed regarding practices in a single classroom or program and then may only include a team of teacher(s), paraprofessional(s), family members and students.

Step 2: Establishing a Location and Meeting Time

The meeting location should be accessible to all members of the team. Select a location that can accommodate multiple people. Considerations for meeting space include: (a) meeting spaces that have technology to support use of a computer, LCD projector and screen; (b) access to Wi-Fi for acquiring specific pieces of evidence (e.g., contracts with community partners, meeting notes, assessment data); and (c) chart paper and markers for brainstorming.

Regularly scheduled meetings should be scheduled to monitor progress on efforts made to improve the prioritized critical feature(s) and elements, including collecting data on those efforts, monthly or bi-monthly at minimum. However, it may be necessary to meet more frequently to ensure progress is being made towards goals.

Step 3: Preparing for the Meeting

This section describes the process teams should use in order to ensure all team members are prepared for the meeting. This includes, but is not limited to, collecting data to be shared at the meeting and ensuring all team members have the materials necessary to actively engage in an informed discussion during the meeting. Preparing for the meeting includes:

- **Establishing Documentation Procedures:** Identify who will manage data collected from the PISA, the completed PISA instrument and action steps. Decide if this information will "live" electronically or in hard copy.

- **Sharing Materials:** Distribute a copy of the PISA (or specific groups of predictors with essential characteristics, if not completing the PISA in its entirety) to the team members prior to the meeting.

- **Reviewing Materials:** Ask team members to review and familiarize with the PISA Tool Template and the Taxonomy for Transition Programming prior to the meeting.

- **Collecting Data/Evidence:** Ask team members to gather data and evidence prior to the meeting. This may be done collectively, or specific team members may be tasked with collecting information that is specific to certain programs features or essential characteristics.

Step 4: Convening the Meeting

This section describes the process teams should use when convening the meeting to review the PISA. It is important to remember that completion of the PISA is, ideally, a team process and all stakeholders should have a voice in this process. Convening the meeting includes:

- **Evaluating Implementation:** It is recommended the team complete the PISA in its entirety, across the 20 predictors, the first time it is completed. If the team is completing the PISA in its entirety, work through each cluster and predictor one at a time. The team should be sure to completely assess the "Degree of Implementation" and "Evidence of Implementation" for each predictor in its entirety, considering each of the essential characteristics. This will provide the team an opportunity to prioritize across clusters and then identify one or two predictors to focus on for the school year. A team should consider the definition of the predictor and each individual program characteristic, as well as the Degree of Implementation and the Evidence of Implementation scales (see Appendix A), to assist in guiding decisions regarding program strengths, needs, and priorities for change.

- **Review and Rating:** As implementation of the essential characteristics for each predictor is considered, reference the data or evidence collected for each. Document these data with the numerical rating accordingly. The team may also want to link or reference where to find the evidence.

- **Total Predictor Scores:** Each predictor will receive a raw rating based on decisions by the team. Once a total score for each has been calculated, the team will prioritize across predictors to determine which is in greatest need of improvement.

- **Prioritizing Predictors:** The team should systematically identify one or more predictors that need improvement based on total scores. Once a predictor(s) has been identified as a priority area, it will be necessary for the team to focus efforts on essential characteristics within the predictor to improve secondary programs and services for youth.

- **Develop a Plan and Action Steps:** With the priority predictor(s) and essential characteristics in mind, the team should develop action steps within their plan to guide efforts. The team should include progress monitoring on efforts made to improve the prioritized predictor(s) and essential characteristics, including collecting data on those efforts. This action plan may be built as part of the team's IDEA-DA implementation plan, ESSA plan or other continuous improvement plan effort.

Appendix A

Degree of Implementation Scale

0 - Not Currently Implemented:	1 - Intermittent Implementation:	2 - Emerging Implementation:	3 - Currently Being Implemented:
0 to 25% of students with disabilities experience this program characteristic as described (e.g., in their program of study, on their IEP or in a school-wide program). For example, implemented infrequently and or inconsistently.	25-50% of students with disabilities experience this program characteristic as described (e.g., in their program of study, on their IEP or in a school-wide program). For example, implemented infrequently and or inconsistently.	50-75% of students with disabilities experience this program characteristic as described (e.g., in their program of study, on their IEP or in a school-wide program). For example, this is a priority in the school or district and concerted efforts are being made to make these program characteristics available to many students with disabilities or possibly through recently adopted policies or procedures or district-wide professional development. There is consistent implementation school or district wide.	75-100% of students with disabilities experience this program characteristic as described (e.g., in their program of study, on their IEP or in a school-wide program). There is consistent implementation school or district wide.

Evidence of Implementation Scale

0 - No Evidence	1 - Weak Evidence:	2 - Moderate Evidence:	3 - Strong Evidence:
	• Written policies and/or procedures • Articulated agreements within and across agencies • Curriculum, instructional or training materials • Meeting agenda/note	• Teacher lesson plan/service plan • IEP goal, objective or transition services • Transcripts	• Data collection forms, progress monitoring or service notes, unit/lesson grades • Work product, instructional artifact • Program evaluation data supporting implementation