ABSTRACT

KRUEGER, D.L. Obstacles adapted physical education specialists encounter when developing transition plans. MS in Exercise and Sport Science - Special Physical Education, August 1997, 48 pp. (P. DiRocco)

Adapted physical education (APE) specialists (N = 207) serving students in Wisconsin were surveyed to determine what obstacles they encountered when developing transition plans. A total of 155 Leisure Transition Questionnaires were returned, representing a 75% return rate. Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) employees returned 24 of 29 questionnaires while specialists employed by school districts returned 131 of 178. Data were analyzed by student population size and employer. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction 1996 - 1997 School Directory and District Ranked Enrollment Statistics were used to establish seven student population sized groupings and to access the phone numbers of schools and CESAs. Results indicated that 13 of the 24 (54%) CESA specialists had written a leisure transition plan (LTP) while only 20 of the 131 (15%) school employees had written an LTP. Sixty-four percent of the 122 APE specialists, not having written an LTP, said that one of the reasons they had not written an LTP was because they had never been asked to be part of transition planning. Another 41% indicated that they were not aware of what the APE specialist's role is in transition planning. Those respondents having written an LTP (33) identified the obstacles that they had encountered and scored how serious an impact the obstacle had on the development of LTPs. Although the same 8 obstacles seem to be identified as serious barriers to transition, by those having written an LTP, analyses of variance showed significant differences in the mean scores of obstacles as rated by CESA and school district employees. Results suggest that CESA employees are encountering barriers when they are planning services for students in the community setting. School district employees seem to find their own lack of experience in writing LTPs a barrier. High percentages of both CESA and school district employed APEs indicated that student social isolation and transportation issues have a severe impact on the development of LTPs.

OBSTACLES ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION SPECIALISTS
ENCOUNTER WHEN DEVELOPING TRANSITION PLANS

A THESIS PRESENTED
TO
THE GRADUATE FACULTY
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
MASTER OF SCIENCE DEGREE

BY
DEBORAH L. KRUEGER
AUGUST 1997

COLLEGE OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - LA CROSSE
THESIS FINAL ORAL DEFENSE FORM

Candidate: Deborah L. Krueger

We recommend acceptance of this thesis in partial fulfillment of this candidate's requirements for the degree:

Master of Science in Special Physical Education

The candidate has successfully completed her final oral defense.

Patrick DiRocco

Thesis Committee Chairperson Signature

7/17/97
Date

Manny Felix

Thesis Committee Member Signature

7/14/97
Date

Susan M. Fall Sullivan

Thesis Committee Member Signature

7-14-97
Date

This thesis is approved by the College of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

Harry Tyson

Associate Dean, College of Health,
Physical Education, and Recreation

7-25-97
Date

W. Fall

Dean of UW-L. Graduate Studies

28 July 1997
Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

If My Rose Could Speak

I know I am but one among your many flowers

But I am the most beautiful - yet fragile

I need special care

A bit more nourishment perhaps than the others need

Though you give unselfishly

My buds do not come without conditions

Sometimes my thorns prick you unwillingly

But in necessity - only to remind you

I need to be handled with more care than the others

When held gently

I allow you to partake of my unique beauty

To reap the aroma of my ultimate success

So be patient, my gardeners

With all your labors, you will soon see

You have contributed to the pride of the garden

A bright, hardy, cheerful rose

D. Krueger

To my three beautiful roses, Katie, Cory, and Stacy. For all the times you needed nourishment in my absence yet stood tall to offer your support, thank you. Mom

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	viii
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Definition of Terms	4
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
Obstacles	6
Negative Attitudes	6
Community Resistance to Inclusion	6
Limited Community Leisure Opportunities	7
Accessibility of Community Leisure Environments	8
Social Isolation of Students	9
Exposure to Leisure Activities	10
Functional Skills	10

CHAPTER	PAGE
Communication Barriers	11
Family Support	11
Transportation	13
Cost	14
Collaboration Between School and Community	15
Legislation	15
The Architectural Barriers Act, P.L. 90-480	16
The Rehabilitation Act, P.L. 93-112	16
The Americans with Disabilities Act, P.L. 101-336 ...	16
The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, P.L. 101-476	18
III. METHODS	20
Subjects	20
Data Collection Procedure	21
Leisure Transition Questionnaire	22
Data Analysis	22
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	23
Subjects	23
Results	24
Discussion	31

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	37
Summary	37
Recommendations	38
REFERENCES	39
APPENDICES	42

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Response Rate According to School Student Population Categories	23
2. Percent and Frequencies of Respondents Having Written LTPs	25
3. Percent of Responses of Specialists Who Had Not Written an LTP ..	26
4. Open Ended Responses for Not Having Written an LTP	27
5. Mean Scores of Obstacles	28
6. Percent and Frequencies of Respondents Identifying Statements as Serious Obstacles	30
7. Most Frequently Sited Responses to the Most Serious Obstacles ...	32

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	PAGE
A. Leisure Transition Questionnaire	42
B. Cover Letter For Questionnaire	47

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), P.L. 101-476, the 1990 reauthorization of P.L. 94-142 (Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975), mandates that a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment be provided for all children with disabilities. This law guarantees public education services for children with disabilities from birth through 21 years of age and requires that all children receiving special education services have an individualized family service plan (IFSP) or an individualized education plan (IEP).

The IEP is a written record of decisions made jointly by parents and school personnel, about the child's needs, what services will be provided to meet those needs, and expected outcomes (Bateman, 1992). For students who are 16 years and older, an IEP must include a transition plan (Moon, 1994). This transition plan includes a statement of services that the student needs to prepare for postsecondary education, adult services, independent living, and community participation (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1990). Since physical education is a direct service, the APE specialist should automatically be included in transition planning for students receiving adapted physical education services. If it is determined that the student is not in need of transition services, in the area of leisure, then the specialist is required to write a statement on the basis for which this determination was made.

Community participation is an area under IDEA in which the APE specialist can address programming needs in leisure skills. The purpose of the leisure transition plan (LTP) is to develop the student's ability to participate in leisure activities. These leisure activities include recreational opportunities. Adapted physical education specialists must be aware of recreational opportunities available in the community, determine the student's activity interests, and include these activities in the student's physical education curricula and LTP.

Leisure is an important part of life and provides many benefits, including physical activity that is so essential for persons with disabilities. During the school age years, students develop the skills and knowledge they need to participate in leisure activities. They become aware of and are exposed to a variety of opportunities to explore and develop new leisure skills. Unfortunately, the opportunities for individuals with disabilities are hindered as a direct result of their disabilities. Often, they lack the experience and skill to participate. Therefore, many are denied the benefits derived from a sense of satisfaction in participating in leisure recreation activities (Employment Opportunities, Inc., 1994).

Adult life should consist of both vocational and leisure recreational community activities. Providing leisure education in adapted physical education programs, as well as within community based programs, can help students with disabilities have a smoother transition from school to adult life (Bedini, Bullock, & Driscoll, 1993). Without the ability to participate in activities within leisure recreation programs, individuals with disabilities cannot fully achieve their right to participate in inclusive community experiences.

The need for leisure training for individuals with disabilities has been frequently cited (Bedini, 1993; Bedini et al., 1993; Dattilo, 1994; Dattilo & St. Peter, 1991; Karge, Patton, & de la Garza, 1992; Korterling & Elrod, 1991; York, Vandercook, & Stave, 1990). Much of the literature focuses on barriers that prevent persons with disabilities from participating successfully in leisure time activities. Little attention has been given to the obstacles that APE specialists encounter when developing LTPs. It is the APE specialist's responsibility to identify these obstacles, devise ways to overcome them, and advocate for the inclusion of the disabled population in community leisure activities.

Need for the Study

Leisure education taught to students with disabilities within a public school system can result in positive changes in behaviors and attitudes such as leisure awareness, activity initiation, and participation (Bedini et al., 1993). Physical education can contribute to these changes by helping each student to develop appropriate physical activities that become part of their leisure life following their public school education. Unfortunately, too few public school systems in Wisconsin invite an APE specialist to be a part of the transition team on a regular basis. Because physical education is a direct service, the APE specialist should assess the need for leisure transition, for those students receiving APE services. Since transition teams make joint decisions regarding transition needs, the APE specialist should be included on the transition team for each student the specialist serves.

Leisure transition initiatives for students with disabilities should result in an increased participation within the community setting. It is important that students become comfortable with community settings and that they learn skills

necessary to participate in those settings. In addition, it is important that community programs are prepared to serve special education students when they exit secondary education. The APE specialist can be an important link in helping students in special education to successfully transition into community leisure activities. A useful first step in facilitating the inclusion of the APE specialist on the transition team would be to identify the barriers that are currently preventing the specialist from contributing to the LTPs of students they service in APE.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to ascertain what obstacles APE specialists have encountered in the development of leisure transition plans and the severity of the impact these obstacles had on LTP development. The study also addressed the reasons why some APE specialists have not written LTPs or been involved in transition planning for the students they service.

Definition of Terms

Adapted Physical Education (APE) Specialist - school district or Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) personnel who hold a Wisconsin #860 certification (Adapted Physical Education). Among this person's responsibilities are identification of students for specially designed physical education, program planning, writing IEPs, providing direct physical education instruction to students with disabilities, and/or providing APE consultation services to the regular physical education teacher.

Obstacle - any barrier or obstruction, natural or man-made, that impedes progress but is not necessarily impassible (Datillo, 1994).

Leisure - integration of activity and time, but more importantly emphasizes the importance of a person's perceptions that he or she is free to choose to participate in meaningful, enjoyable, and satisfying experiences (Dattilo, 1994). Leisure endeavors can include both physical and nonphysical experiences.

Leisure Education - the focus on an educational process to enhance a person's leisure lifestyle. Leisure education provides a vehicle for developing an awareness of recreation activities and resources and for acquiring skills needed for participation throughout the life span (Dattilo & St. Peter, 1991).

Transition Services - a coordinated set of activities for a student, designed within an outcome-oriented process, which promotes movement from school to postschool activities, including postsecondary, vocational training, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, and community participation (Kupper, 1993).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Obstacles

Negative Attitudes

Dattilo (1994) defined an attitudinal barrier as a way of thinking about or perceiving a disability in a restrictive, condescending, or negative manner. Children with a disability, particularly those whose impairments are readily apparent, are many times shunned (Bender, Brannan, & Verhoven, 1984). Of all the barriers to participation in leisure recreational activities, attitudinal barriers are probably the most limiting and also the most difficult to overcome (Smith, Austin, & Kennedy, 1996). As a result of these barriers, children with disabilities often doubt their ability and therefore lower their expectations of themselves (Bender et al., 1984). Schielen, Meyer, Heyne, and Brandt (1995) report that positive, direct, and frequent experiences with people who do not have disabilities can stimulate more positive attitudes for both the disabled and those without disabilities. Through active participation, individuals with disabilities become comfortable and more competent in leisure activities, thereby creating a new acceptance of individual differences by the public.

Community Resistance to Inclusion

Community recreation programs such as those provided by YMCAs, park and recreation departments, and other organizations cannot exclude potential program participants from services, programs, or activities on the basis of disability (Moon, 1994). The Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA), P.L. 101-

336 (1991), defines a potential program participant as a qualified individual with a disability. Persons with a disability that meet eligibility criteria for a program may not be excluded from participation. The ADA requires the consideration of three types of accommodations when a potential participant with a disability meets essential eligibility requirements. As reported by Moon (1994), the agency should: (a) modify rules, policies, or practices, as necessary, to enable the individual to participate; (b) remove architectural, transportation, and communication barriers to enable an individual's participation; and, (c) provide auxiliary aids or services as necessary. It is reasonable to assume, with the accommodations set forth by ADA, that more people with disabilities will participate in leisure recreation programs as time goes on. Therefore, the APE specialist needs to plan for realistic participation in community recreation programs when developing student LTPs.

Participation in inclusive recreation provides an opportunity for individuals with disabilities to meet nondisabled people and to participate in activities that are mutually satisfying (Moon, 1991). Community recreation providers should take steps to ensure that individuals with disabilities feel welcome at the program. Developing an agency philosophy or policy that demonstrates a strong commitment to inclusion and making it as widely known as possible can serve this purpose (Perrin, 1992).

Limited Community Leisure Opportunities

APE specialists are often confronted with the challenge of finding leisure opportunities in communities where few opportunities exist. Moon (1991) suggests that even though it is a challenge to identify and provide opportunities within leisure programs, it is also the responsibility of the specialist to advocate

for choice by students to participate in activities that are popular for their age group. Identifying popular activities is important for facilitating friendship and providing a wide array of age-appropriate recreation options. York et al. (1990) indicate that relying on adults to randomly select an activity on what the adult perceives to be popular may result in the identification of activities that are age inappropriate and not popular. If there are few options in a community, then one must find out what students would like to do and create activities that the student might enjoy (Moon, 1991). Strategies for identifying popular leisure activities may include: (a) formally surveying the leisure preferences of the individual; (b) informally asking individuals what leisure activities they like doing for fun; (c) simply observing what others in a particular age group are doing for fun; and, (d) asking community program directors which activities are most popular for various age groups (Moon, 1991).

Accessibility of Community Leisure Environments

The first federal policy directed toward protecting the rights of people with disabilities was the Architectural Barriers Act, passed in 1968. It stated that all facilities receiving direct or indirect federal funds must provide physical access to all people. In 1973, the Rehabilitation Act addressed program accessibility. It was not until 1990 that the Americans with Disabilities Act mandated access to public accommodations and programs in the private sector (Dattilo, 1994).

When people think of access they often think of physical access. Accessibility requires that not only architectural barriers be removed, but also communication and transportation barriers as well. Provisions for the use of assistive technology devices must also be considered (Moon, 1994).

Some professionals will argue that people with disabilities rarely access their facilities. Therefore, they conclude that even if their facilities and programs were made accessible, people with disabilities would probably not attend (Dattilo, 1994).

We need to provide opportunities for community inclusion of persons with disabilities in recreational pursuits. This cannot be done if we do not provide equal access to them.

Social Isolation of Students

Recreational environments may be one of the most natural places in which to promote friendships and social interactions between people with and without disabilities (Moon, 1994). Recent trends to include children with disabilities into regular recreational activities are providing more and more opportunities for them to develop friendships with their peers without disabilities (Heyne, 1994).

Schleien et al. (1995) asked parents what they perceived to be the barriers to peer relationships between their child with disabilities and his or her nondisabled peers. Responses included: (a) busy family schedules; (b) stereotypic thinking and lack of accurate information about people with disabilities; (c) the distance children live from one another makes it difficult for them to see each other with any regularity; (d) differences in children's ability levels (e.g., social skills, communication skills, and mobility); (e) difficulty in arranging public transportation for children with disabilities so they can get together with their friends; (f) personalities or lifestyles of friend's family are not compatible; and, (g) parents are not acquainted with other families having the same age peers without disabilities.

According to Heyne (1994), awareness of the obstacle is the first step in any process of change. In order for children with disabilities to build relationships through recreational activities, then parents, school personnel, and community recreation leaders must help the children overcome these barriers.

Exposure to Leisure Activities

Determination of which recreation activity skills a person is taught should result from the participant's preferences, their ability to engage in the recreation activity in the near and distant future, the availability of activity involvement within their home or neighboring community, and the individual's available resources (e.g., money, recreation equipment, and clothing) (Dattilo & St. Peter, 1991). Developing leisure transition plans without taking into consideration the aforementioned creates a barrier in and of itself.

Functional Skills

Many individuals with disabilities do not possess skill levels that are appropriate for enjoying a number of leisure pursuits. Frequently, the nature of a particular disability limits skill development. Often times, however, they do not get the opportunity to develop the skills that could enhance participation (Smith et al., 1996).

Dattilo (1994) suggests that the key to adapting recreation programs is to consider the individual needs of the person with the disability. Adaptations should be tailored to the individual. Because many people with disabilities have differing levels of skills and experiences, adaptations should be individualized and continually adjusted to meet their changing skill levels (Dattilo, 1994).

Communication Barriers

Effective communication requires active participation by both the sender and receiver of a message (Smith et al., 1996). For a variety of reasons, some people with disabilities may take more time to formulate communication than their nondisabled peers. However, at times, school personnel and community professionals responding to these individuals do not give them adequate time to initiate their communication. As people engage in reciprocal exchanges stimulated by their ability to initiate interaction, their ability to communicate preferences, make meaningful choices, and subsequently, experience leisure is enhanced (Dattilo, 1994).

People with hearing impairments are probably the most familiar of individuals affected by barriers to communication. To varying degrees, however, most people with disabilities experience communication barriers. Some people with physical disabilities and speech difficulties, may point to letters on a letter board to facilitate a two-way interaction (Smith et al., 1996). Braille, sign language, and facilitated communication devices are also used as forms of communication.

Communication links the individual who has a disability with his or her environment. A two-way dialogue needs to exist between persons with and without disabilities. If this dialogue does not take place, there is little hope of overcoming many other barriers to participation in leisure activities (Smith et al., 1996).

Family Support

Bedini and associates (1993) reported that although both parents and teachers thought leisure education was a good idea, greater emphasis was

placed on work and vocational careers. Data suggest that teachers, parents, and caregivers perceive the importance and positive effects of leisure and often supported it verbally but not behaviorally. This indicates the need for greater collaboration between not only the school and families but also community recreation personnel.

The school system can help children with disabilities learn skills, develop interests, and form positive attitudes toward participation in leisure areas. However, family support of leisure behavior outside of the classroom is essential if children are to have continuing opportunities to use and develop newly acquired skills. Parents need encouragement and information about community resources and how the family unit can reinforce positive attitudes about leisure. This training should involve educators and community recreation personnel. Parental awareness, skills, and involvement with school and community leisure programs are vital to the success of leisure transition programs (Bender et al., 1984).

Communication with families becomes increasingly important as parents and service providers work together to identify needs, solve problems, and write leisure transition plans. The types of leisure choices that are available to the student with a disability are largely determined by the types of leisure activities valued and enjoyed by the people with whom time will be spent (Schleien et al., 1995). Because of this, family support and participation in the transition plan is essential to its success and continuation outside of the school setting.

Transportation

Dattilo (1994) in his response to the American with Disabilities Act states:

People with disabilities who, with or without reasonable accommodations, meet the essential eligibility requirements have the right to participate in a purely integrated setting. Reasonable accommodations which make participation as effective as that enjoyed by people without disabilities shall be provided (p. 122).

When transportation is not provided as part of a program and this results in the inability of a person with a disability to participate, then transportation needs to be considered an obstacle (Dattilo, 1994).

The lack of usable and affordable methods of transportation often becomes an obstacle to individuals who have a disability. It keeps them from benefiting from available community resources and recreation programs. Automobile and van modifications are expensive and mass transportation is often inaccessible or inconvenient. Even when public transportation or special transportation services are available they require considerable advance planning (Smith et al., 1996).

Moon (1992) sights another facet to transportation barriers. In a case study of a 17 year old student with disabilities, the program director was hesitant to alter transportation services so that the student could participate after school on the junior varsity basketball team. The director was nervous that other students would demand the same flexibility. Another barrier was the fact that basketball practice was not always after school. This meant that transportation would be needed to get back to school later in the evening. The issue was solved by the student spending time at school or a friend's home until practice.

Although some recreation programs do offer transportation services, they do not always meet the needs of all people who have disabilities. Too often, the person with a disability must choose between staying home or imposing on family and friends by requesting transportation (Smith et al., 1996).

Cost

Job opportunities are often limited for people who have disabilities. When they are able to find employment, individuals with disabilities frequently find themselves in positions that are low paying and offer limited chance for advancement. These difficulties are compounded by higher than average expenses that people with disabilities encounter, such as special transportation (Smith et al., 1996). Ferrel (1989) found that 44% of the respondents of his study cited the home as their primary location for physical activity. Often, when enough money is available to participate in activities outside of the home, there may not be sufficient funds to fully enjoy the experience. A student in a case study done by Bedini et al. (1993) identified her main barrier to playing basketball as the fear of asking her parents for money (her own) to buy the basketball.

Moon (1994) suggests that when an activity is too expensive, specialists should ask if there are scholarships available, apply to civic organizations for assistance (e.g., Knights of Columbus and Rotary Club), assist the organization in applying for funds to be used for scholarships or subsidized fees, encourage sliding scales for all participants, and encourage schools to offer programs for all children sharing the cost with the recreation departments. Likewise, specialists should encourage the recreation department to offer inclusive programming and share the cost with schools.

It is entirely possible that financial limitations, rather than personal preferences, determine the nature of leisure pursuits for many people who have disabilities (Smith et al., 1996). As Crawford (1989) stated, "For most, the economics of disability determine what life at the sidelines is like" (p. 8).

Collaboration Between School and Community

Students with disabilities need a strong support system to become successful in their transition to the community. It is vital that the APE specialist identifies all possible sources of support within the community. Communication links need to be established. Developing these links between school and community is called networking (Dattilo, 1994). Establishing and maintaining this collaboration ensures that all key players understand the roles and responsibilities each will play in the transition process.

Unfortunately, adapted physical education specialists may find it difficult to schedule a time slot during school hours that allows for adequate time to leave the school site to meet with community personnel. Too few preparation periods, lunch hours and after school hours filled with extra duties, and a lack of willingness by school administration to allocate the minutes necessary for school to community collaboration, all contribute to the dilemma. Nevertheless, it is imperative that communication take place in order for transition plans to be successful.

Legislation

A number of federal laws have been enacted that either directly or indirectly affect the lives of persons with disabilities. It is essential for APE specialists to be knowledgeable of the impact these pieces of legislation have

on the planning and implementation of LTPs. This knowledge will help APE specialists recognize discriminatory practices.

The Architectural Barriers Act, P.L. 90-480

In 1968 the Architectural Barriers Act was enacted, requiring all facilities being built in part or in whole with federal funds to be accessible and usable by individuals with disabilities (Dattilo, 1994). This act had a significant impact on the provision of leisure recreation opportunities for persons with disabilities.

The Rehabilitation Act, P.L. 93-112

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 requires agencies that receive federal funds to make their programs, services, and activities accessible (Dattilo, 1994). Title V (Section 504) of the original Rehabilitation Act contains provisions that safeguard the rights of individuals with disabilities. The law basically protects against discrimination in all federally assisted programs and activities. No person with a disability may be discriminated against, solely on the basis of their disability. Programs must state eligibility criteria. If qualified, persons with disabilities may not be discriminated against and the program must be made accessible to them.

The Americans with Disabilities Act, P.L. 101-336

The Americans Disabilities Act (ADA) was signed into law July of 1990. This civil rights law is a landmark piece of legislation providing the opportunity to eliminate barriers to independence and productivity of people with disabilities who often are unable to secure such basic services as transportation, education, housing, employment counseling, and recreation (Moon, 1994). The requirements of the ADA apply to both public and private employers and service providers.

All individuals with disabilities are protected by ADA. An individual with a disability is defined as one who has a physical or mental impairment that results in a substantial limitation of one or more of the major life activities, such as caring for one's self, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, speaking, hearing, breathing, listening, working, and participating in community activities. There must be a record of such an impairment (e.g., treatment records) or the person must be regarded as having such an impairment (Smith et al., 1996).

The ADA extends the impact of Section 504 P.L. 93-112 requiring that public school programs, including interscholastic athletics and extracurricular activities, allow for participation of qualified students with disabilities. The statute also mandates schools to include students with disabilities in general education settings whenever it is possible, regardless of whether the student has an IEP (Moon, 1994).

The ADA requires three types of accommodations when an individual with a disability meets the above criteria: (a) the agency should modify rules, policies, or practices as necessary to enable an individual's participation; (b) the agency should remove architectural, transportation, and communication barriers to enable an individual's participation; and, (c) the agency should provide auxiliary aids or services as necessary (e.g., interpreters, additional staff, partners, or peer advisors) (Moon, 1994). These accommodations allow businesses and community organizations to provide services in the most appropriate integrated setting, considering the needs of the individual.

Five major areas are addressed in ADA: (a) employment; (b) government services and public transportation; (c) public accommodations by private agencies; (d) communication systems; and, (e) miscellaneous issues that are

related to enforcement. Titles II and III have a direct impact upon community leisure recreation settings. Title II prohibits school districts and park and recreation departments from discriminating against people with disabilities. Title III prohibits discrimination by private entities such as YMCAs, private schools, and health clubs (Moon, 1994).

Compliance with ADA involves four rules: (a) no medical questions on application forms; (b) focus on individual ability, not disability; (c) do not treat persons with disabilities differently from other participants; and, (d) provide reasonable accommodations where it is necessary and does not pose an undue hardship (Smith et al., 1996). Individuals may not be excluded, denied, or otherwise be treated differently from other individuals, unless accommodations made for inclusion would alter the nature of the program or result in undue burden. Community recreation agencies are not allowed to pass on the cost of ADA compliance to a participant with a disability. Costs associated with accessibility must be absorbed by the agency or by cost increases to all participants (Moon, 1994).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, P.L. 101-476

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is the 1990 reauthorization of P.L. 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975). This legislation mandates that all children who have at least 1 of 13 disabling conditions should be provided with a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. In addition, the law guarantees public education services for children from birth through 21 years of age.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act makes an important change to the Education for All Handicapped Children Act for the IEPs of

students with disabilities beginning at 16 years of age, or if deemed appropriate for students younger than 16 years of age. Under IDEA, the IEPs of these students must include a transition statement indicating what services the student needs in order to transition from school to postschool settings. Before the student leaves the school setting, the IEP must include statements of the school's responsibilities, as well as those of community agencies that are providing or paying for needed transition services (IDEA, 1990).

Traditionally, the IEP has been designed to cover a maximum of one year, breaking annual goals into short-term objectives. With the addition of transition services, the IEP expands objectives over several years (Wandry & Repetto, 1993).

Advocates and family members of students with disabilities need to be aware that according to the provisions of IDEA, the IEP process can be used to ensure that students with disabilities are provided with needed leisure transition services. Developing community recreation skills and participating in the community setting can be addressed within the student's educational program (Moon, 1994).

Although IDEA identifies community participation as one of the possible domains of transition planning, not every student's IEP will specifically address the area. The APE specialist's assessment of the student, prior to the IEP meeting, will determine the need for leisure transition to be addressed in the IEP. If the APE specialist, along with the parent/guardian, student and other IEP team members feel that it is a relevant item to address, then leisure transition goals should be addressed in the IEP. It is important to be aware of the mandates set forth in IDEA. Transition plans must be individualized and reflect the student's preferences.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

A Leisure Transition Questionnaire (see Appendix A) was used to collect data. Responses identified the reasons why some APE specialists had never written a leisure transition plan. Those APE specialists that had been involved in leisure transition planning responded to Part II and Part III. These responses identified obstacles the subjects had encountered when developing LTPs.

Subjects

Subjects were physical educators employed by either a public school district or Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) in Wisconsin. Eligibility criteria required the physical educator to hold a current Wisconsin #860 (APE) certification. Information was gathered only on the school district or CESA in which the APE teacher was currently employed.

Recruitment of subjects was done through a random selection of Wisconsin school districts, grouped by total student population size and the identification of all CESAs. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) 1996 - 1997 School Directory and District Ranked Enrollment Statistics were used to establish seven categories according to student population groupings: (a) 999 and under; (b) 1,000 - 1,999; (c) 2,000 - 2,999; (d) 3,000 - 3,999; (e) 4,000 - 5,999; (f) 6,000 - 9,999; and, (g) 10,000 and over. Fifteen school districts were randomly drawn from a pool containing the names of school districts from each of these groups, with the exception of groups (f) and (g). Each of these two groups had a total of 11 school districts within them. The

total population of group (f) and (g) were contacted. Twelve CESAs were identified in Wisconsin. All 12 of the CESAs were contacted.

Phone calls were used to contact the special education directors in each of the 97 school districts and 12 CESAs. The names and school mailing addresses of physical education teachers holding a WI #860 certification were requested. Of the 97 school districts contacted, 8 reported they employed no physical education teachers with a WI #860 certification. The remaining 89 school districts identified a total of 178 APE specialists. Six of the 12 CESAs employed adapted physical education specialists. These six agencies serviced 29 school districts in the area of APE.

Data Collection Procedure

Before data collection began, a pilot study was implemented to establish and refine the questionnaire choices. The questionnaire was administered to three APE specialists, holding a WI #860 certification. Each had written an LTP within the past 24 months. The specialists served three different school size population categories: (a) 999 and under; (b) 2,000 - 2,999; and, (c) 10,000 and over. This allowed a more representative picture of obstacles encountered in various sized communities. The pilot study identified the need to add one obstacle choice. Also confirmed was the predicted amount of time, 10 to 20 minutes, to complete the questionnaire.

A total of 207 questionnaires were mailed to APE specialists. This included 178 questionnaires sent to APE specialists employed by a school district and 29 mailed to CESA APE personnel. A cover letter and a stamped envelope addressed to the researcher were included in the mailing. Questionnaires were number coded for the purpose of follow up to subjects who

did not return them within the initial 2 week allotted time period. Post cards were sent to APE specialists that did not respond within 2 weeks. Responses were confidential with no names of agencies or personnel released without written permission.

Leisure Transition Questionnaire

The Leisure Transition Questionnaire consisted of three parts. Part I was used to develop a brief profile on subjects' employment, certification, and information on experience in IEP and LTP development. A five point Likert scale in Part II required subjects to respond to 19 closed statements on obstacles having a negative impact on the development of LTPs. One open statement allowed the subject an opportunity to include an obstacle that had not been addressed in the previous nineteen statements. The last section of the questionnaire requested subjects to identify the five obstacles, from Part II, that presented the most negative impact on their ability to develop successful leisure transition plans.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analyses were reported as frequencies and percentiles for the following responses: (a) employer; (b) number of IEPs and LTPs written; and, (c) the reasons for not having written an LTP. Questions that required statistical analyses to determine differences used analyses of variance. The alpha level was set at $\leq .05$. Data were analyzed using the SPSS statistical software program.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Subjects

Questionnaires returned were from 155 of the 207 APE specialists. This represented a 75% return rate. School district employees accounted for 131 or 84.5% of the replies, while employees of CESAs returned 24 questionnaires representing 15.5% of the total return. See Table 1 for student population information of the districts serviced by those APE specialists returning a questionnaire.

Table 1. Response Rate According to School Student Population Categories

Student Population in district	<u>n</u> returned <u>n</u> sent *	% response rate per category	% of total respondents	Cum percent
0 - 999	20 (25)	80	13	13
1,000 - 1,999	32 (35)	91	21	34
2,000 - 2,999	20 (26)	77	13	47
3,000 - 3,999	14 (23)	61	9	56
4,000 - 5,999	19 (29)	66	12	68
6,000 - 9,999	19 (27)	70	12	80
+ 10,000	<u>31 (42)</u>	74	<u>20</u>	<u>100</u>
	<u>N</u> = 155 (207)		100	100

* () = n of questionnaires sent in that category

Results

When asked how many IEPs the respondent had written on an average each year in the past 48 months, 66% replied that they had written an average of five or less, 11% averaged between 6 and 10, 8% wrote 11 to 15, 6% indicated 16 to 20, and 9% wrote 20 or more IEPs.

Only 33 responders (21% of the total n) had ever written an LTP. Seventeen subjects had written one to three LTPs in the past 48 months while eight respondents wrote four to six and an additional eight of the respondents had written seven or more.

All of the CESA employees responding to the questionnaire provided APE services to districts having less than 3,000 students. No districts that contracted APE services from a CESA were surveyed. Therefore, there was no overlap of respondents from school district or CESA employees within the same district. Many of the CESA employees completed a questionnaire for each school district in which they provided APE services. Six APE specialists who were employed by a CESA accounted for the total of 24 completed questionnaires. Two CESA specialists did not return the questionnaires sent to them. A considerably higher percent of CESA employed APE specialists had written LTPs in comparison to school district employed APEs. Fifteen percent ($n = 20$) of APE specialists employed by school districts wrote an LTP while 54% ($n = 13$) of all the CESA employees surveyed had written an LTP (see Table 2). As a result only 33 subjects were eligible to complete Parts II and III of the questionnaire. All subsequent reporting of results will refer to a total n of 33 subjects who had written an LTP and a total n of 122 respondents who had not written an LTP.

Table 2. Percent and Frequencies of Respondents Having Written LTPs

Student population of District	<u>n</u> respondents per category	% written LTP *	% School written LTP *	% CESA written LTP *
0 - 999	20	20 (4)	8 (1)	38 (3)
1,000 - 1,999	32	31 (10)	7 (1)	60 (9)
2,000 - 2,999	20	25 (5)	20 (4)	100 (1)
3,000 - 3,999	14	21 (3)	10 (3)	
6,000 - 9,999	19	10 (2)	11 (2)	
+10,000	<u>31</u>	19 (<u>6</u>)	19 (<u>6</u>)	—
Total = 155		Total = (33)	(20)	(13)

* () = Total n of respondents in category that wrote an LTP

Part I of the Leisure Transition Questionnaire allowed the APE specialist to identify four preselected reasons for not having written an LTP. Subjects were asked to place a check next to all of the reasons that represented why they had not written an LTP. Forty-two percent (n = 51) of the respondents indicated that they did not service students in grade nine and above. Sixty-four percent (n = 78) of APE specialists surveyed said they had never been asked to be a part of transition planning, while 41% (n = 50) replied that they were not aware of what role the APE specialist plays in leisure transition. Four percent (n = 5) of the 122 respondents noted that the students they served were not in need of an LTP (see Table 3).

Table 3. Percent of Responses of Specialists Who Had Not Written an LTP

No 9th grade or > students	Not asked to transition	Not aware of APE role	No need for LTP	Other reason
42	64	41	4	28

$n = 122$

Twenty-eight percent ($n = 34$) of the 122 subjects not having written an LTP responded to an open ended question, allowing them an opportunity to explain why they had not written LTPs. Responses were grouped into ten categories (see Table 4).

Part II of the Leisure Transition Questionnaire identified 19 possible obstacles an APE specialist might encounter when developing an LTP. One open ended statement allowed the respondent to reveal an additional obstacle they had encountered. A five point Likert scale was used to rank how serious an impact the barrier posed to the development of LTPs. Analyses of variance (ANOVA) were used to determine if any significant differences existed between the responses of CESA and school district employees. An alpha level of $\leq .05$ was set (see Table 5).

Table 4. Open Ended Responses for Not Having Written an LTP

Response	n Responses
Not aware of what a leisure transition plan is	15
Do not know how to write an LTP or what form to use	1
Students special education case manager or EEN teacher take care of transition	3
Schools physical therapist writes the LTP	1
Have only discussed and made suggestions to the transition team	2
IEP emphasis is on leisure activities / only service students within the school setting	3
Special education staff does not understand the role of APE in the system	1
APE position was cut due to budget restraints / students no longer have IEPs	1
All of our special education students are co-oped with another school district	1
No students are 16 years or older	6

Table 5. Mean Scores of Obstacles

Obstacle	Total $\bar{n}$ mean $\bar{n} = 33$	Mean CESA $\bar{n} = 20$	Mean school $\bar{n} = 13$	p value *
1 Negative attitudes	2.1	1.4	2.6	.00 *
2 Community resists inclusion	2.5	2.4	2.5	.92
3 Too few recreation choices	3.5	4.1	3.1	.01 *
4 Lack of accessibility	2.7	2.4	3.0	.16
5 Social isolation of student	4.0	4.3	3.8	.05 *
6 Lack of exposure to activity	2.3	1.7	2.7	.02 *
7 Lack of functional skill	2.5	1.9	2.9	.04 *
8 Student communication skills	3.4	3.7	3.2	.09
9 Lack of parent/caregiver support	3.2	3.1	3.3	.71
10 Budget restrictions	3.8	4.2	3.6	.11
11 Transportation	4.2	4.8	3.8	.01 *
12 Lack of adapted equipment	3.7	3.8	3.6	.66
13 Activity fee	2.8	2.5	3.0	.27
14 Knowledge of resources	2.8	2.7	2.8	.80
15 Lack of collaboration	3.6	4.5	3.0	.00 *
16 APE lacks knowledge of role	2.7	2.3	3.0	.11
17 Lack of APE's experience in LTP	2.6	2.0	3.0	.03 *
18 Inability to individualize activity	2.5	2.2	2.8	.29
19 Not sufficient time in community	3.4	4.1	2.9	.01 *

* = $\leq .05$ level of significance

Significance between group means were denoted for 9 of the 19 obstacles. CESA personnel scored the following five obstacles to be more severe barriers than school personnel: (a) too few community recreational opportunities to allow for choice; (b) lack of transportation available to students during off-school hours; (c) lack of collaboration between school and community resource personnel; (d) insufficient time allotted in the community setting to allow for successful transition; and, (e) social isolation. School district employed APEs rated the following significantly higher than CESA employees: (a) negative attitudes; (b) lack of prior exposure to leisure transition activity; (c) lack of functional skills necessary to experience success in activity; and, (d) lack of experience in writing leisure transition plans.

Table 6 indicates the percentage of respondents that viewed the obstacle as serious (i.e., scored the obstacle as a four or five on the Likert scale). Social isolation of students was identified as a barrier by 85% of all respondents. Seventy-five percent of the school employed specialists and 100% of the CESA specialists considered it a barrier. Too few recreation choices, transportation, lack of adapted equipment, lack of collaboration, and insufficient time in the community setting were cited as obstacles by a high percentage of CESA specialists. A majority of school district employed APEs considered budget restrictions, transportation, and a lack of adapted equipment to have a negative impact on the development of LTPs.

Table 6. Percent and Frequencies of Respondents Identifying Statements as Serious Obstacles

#	Obstacle	% of total * n = 33	% CESA employees * n = 13	School employees * n = 20
1	Negative attitudes	15 (5)	0	25 (5)
2	Community resists inclusion	18 (6)	0	30 (6)
3	Too few recreation choices	67 (22)	92 (12)	50 (10)
4	Lack of accessibility	36 (12)	23 (3)	45 (9)
5	Social isolation of student	85 (28)	100 (13)	75 (15)
6	Lack of exposure to activity	30 (10)	16 (2)	40 (8)
7	Lack of functional skill	36 (12)	23 (3)	45 (9)
8	Student communication skills	61 (20)	85 (11)	45 (9)
9	Lack of parent/caregiver support	49 (15)	39 (5)	50 (10)
10	Budget restrictions	73 (24)	92 (12)	60 (12)
11	Transportation	79 (26)	100 (13)	65 (13)
12	Lack of adapted equipment	70 (23)	92 (12)	65 (11)
13	Activity fee	30 (10)	15 (2)	40 (8)
14	Knowledge of resources	39 (13)	39 (5)	40 (8)
15	Lack of collaboration	64 (21)	92 (12)	45 (9)
16	APE lacks knowledge of role	33 (11)	16 (2)	45 (9)
18	Inability to individualize activity	36 (12)	39 (5)	35 (7)
19	Not sufficient time in community	61 (20)	92 (12)	40 (8)

* () = n of responses

Four APE specialists completed the open ended statement on obstacles. All statements were ranked by the respondents as serious obstacles to the development of LTPs. Responses stated were: (a) lack of wheelchair

transportation during school hours / not able to go out into the community setting; (b) no school or community swimming pool / no transportation available during the school hours to travel to a larger community; (c) university professors promoting philosophies that do not work (e.g., inclusion); and, (d) vocational transition program is established but little support for recreation transition by administration.

Part III of the Leisure Transition Questionnaire requested APE specialists to list the five obstacles that they considered to have the most negative impact on their ability to develop LTPs. Specialists were instructed to choose from the 20 obstacles in Part II. Each subject identified five obstacles for a total of 165 responses. Table 7 reflects the frequency and percent of responses to the individual obstacles.

The responses of the 33 APE specialists having completed Parts II and III of the questionnaire consistently identify eight barriers; numbers 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 19. When asked to choose the five most serious obstacles (Part III), responses showed obstacle #12 (lack of adapted equipment in the community) dropped down to 14th on the list while obstacle #9 (lack of parent/caregiver support) rose to 7th place in the rankings.

Discussion

The most significant component of IDEA transition legislation is the requirement of a transition statement within the IEP. Although this is not the sole requirement, it is the means by which the special educator initiates the development of a plan to help the student exit from secondary education to the community setting where they will live, recreate, and work alongside their nondisabled peers (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1997). APE

Table 7. Most Frequently Sited Responses to the Most Serious Obstacles

#	Obstacle	% of respondents $n = 33$	Number of responses
11	Transportation	67	22
10	Budget restrictions	58	19
15	Lack of collaboration	52	17
3	Too few recreation choices	42	14
8	Student communication skills	39	13
5	Social isolation of student	33	11
9	Lack of parent/caregiver support	30	10
19	Not sufficient time in community	30	10
16	APE lacks knowledge of their role	21	7
18	Inability to individualize activity	21	7
7	Student's lack of functional skills	18	6
4	Lack of accessibility	15	5
17	Lack of APE's experience in LTP	15	5
12	Lack of adapted equipment	12	4
14	Insufficient knowledge of resources	12	4
6	Student's lack of exposure to activity	9	3
2	Community resists inclusion	9	3
20	Other	9	3
13	Activity Fee	3	1
1	Negative attitudes	3	1

specialists need to consider themselves to be special educators. Every subject surveyed had written IEPs, yet only 21% had ever written an LTP. It is evident from the study data that the role of the APE specialist in transition is misunderstood. Not only were 64% of the APE specialists excluded from transition planning but by their own admission, 41% were not aware of their role. APE specialists need to be knowledgeable of key legislation to better understand their role and responsibilities as special educators.

Considerably more CESA employed APEs (54%) had been involved in transition planning than school district employed specialists (15%). It is not surprising that such a high percentage of CESA APE employees write LTPs. CESA services are often contracted by school districts with small pupil populations. All of the CESA employed APE specialists in the study provided services to districts having less than 3,000 students. These specialists had only students with disabilities on their case loads. None of the APE specialists employed by a CESA indicated that they were unaware of their role in transition.

As reported in Table 6, the following obstacles were cited most frequently by the respondents as serious barriers to the development of transition plans: (a) too few recreation opportunities to allow for choice; (b) social isolation of student; (c) student's lack of communication skills; (d) lack of parent/caregiver support; (e) budget restrictions; (f) transportation; (g) lack of adapted equipment in the community setting; (h) lack of collaboration between school and community resource personnel; and, (i) not sufficient time spent in the community setting. Multiple ANOVAs showed significant differences in mean

response scores on a Likert scale between CESA and school district personnel (see Table 5). The mean scores for social isolation were high for both school APE specialists (3.8) and CESA employed APE specialists (4.3). The p value of .05 suggests that CESA employed APEs find social isolation a more serious obstacle than school APE specialists. CESA specialists scored obstacles that related to working in the community setting more highly than school employed APE specialists. Many CESA employees provide services to more than one school district, therefore, they must identify recreation choices and collaborate with resource personnel in more than one community. Transportation services and options are different in each school district and community. Making these contacts is time consuming and finding a mutual time to collaborate is frustrating. School district employed APE specialists are often familiar with recreational options and community resources, making contact and collaboration less difficult. Arranging activity times in the community setting is more flexible when the specialist only needs to juggle one school district's schedule.

Respondents from school districts found: (a) negative attitudes/anxiety of community resource personnel; (b) student's lack of exposure to the activity; (c) student's lack of functional skill; and, (d) lack of APE's experience in LTPs, to be obstacles. Specialists working within a single community, having few recreational options, may approach the negative attitudes of resource personnel more cautiously. These community resources often are needed for more than just transition activities. Demanding or putting too much pressure on limited community resources could risk the only available options for many school to community activities. APE specialists working in very small

communities may need to be particularly sensitive when developing these working relationships.

Lack of experience working with students having more severe disabilities could also translate into a lack of experience in writing LTPs. Many students with mild or moderate impairments are assessed and found not to be in need of transition programming. It is reasonable that school employed APE specialists might have fewer students with severe disabilities. For these students, transition planning needs to begin well in advance of community experiences. Poor planning and programming within the physical education curriculum can lead to a lack of exposure to activities and the lack of functional skills to participate successfully within them.

The highest percentage of APE specialists (85%) found social isolation of students to be a barrier to successful transition. This may well be the most frustrating obstacle and also the one that specialists have the least control over. With so many barriers to developing and implementing LTPs it seems there is little time to address the social issues. If having a friend to join in leisure activities would enhance continued involvement in the community setting, then we need to look at promoting friendships. With leisure transition first being addressed at 14 to 16 years of age, it appears too late to begin fostering friendships at this time. This is clearly an issue that needs to be addressed throughout the student's school years. School and community settings that are truly dedicated to an inclusive philosophy will naturally promote friendships and experiences between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers. Social isolation is not fostered within inclusive settings.

When given the opportunity to complete an open ended statement, APE specialists shared the following transportation barriers: (a) a lack of wheelchair transportation during the school day and (b) lack of available transportation to travel to a larger community. Specialists need to be knowledgeable of legislation to promote and advocate for rights of students with disabilities. Appropriate transportation must be provided by the school district during school hours. Transportation can also be addressed within the IEP and LTP as necessary services for student success. When transportation issues are questionable it may be necessary to include a statement within the IEP. The IEP is a promise of services and all items included within it must be provided for the length of time the IEP is in effect.

Transportation was also the obstacle that the highest percentage of respondents ranked in the top five obstacles having the most negative impact on leisure transition planning. Transportation was addressed here as the lack of transportation available to the student during off-school hours. This issue may be seen as the most severe obstacle to overcome because there is little control that the specialist has over public transportation or lack of it. This, however, does not mean that it should not be addressed in transition planning. If this is a serious barrier to participation in evening and weekend activities, students must be taught skills to overcome it. Promoting extended family support for student involvement may be one way to overcome the problem. Teaching students to plan activities ahead of time, including planning when and how they will get to the activity will help the student become accountable for their own needs. Developing an awareness of community resources and the services they provide will increase the student's support system beyond the school and family.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

With the rules and regulations for IDEA not being released until late in 1992, transition is a relatively new concept in special education. Much attention has been focused on and progress noted in the development of instruction, employment, and daily living skills. Meanwhile the area of community experiences, in relation to leisure endeavors, is less defined. This is evident in the results of the study. Too few APE specialists are aware of the role of APE in transition, therefore they have not been included in transition planning within Wisconsin schools. Because of this lack of participation, leisure transition is in a very rudimentary stage.

APE specialists need to promote their role as special educators. It is critical that they be more knowledgeable of key special education legislation. Only then can they effectively advocate to be included on transition teams. Once included as a team member, the APE specialist will have the opportunity to collaborate with educators having more experience in transition. This will assist the APE specialist in identifying, prioritizing, and overcoming the barriers to leisure transition planning.

Although the relationship between school APE personnel and the community therapeutic recreation specialist (TRS) has not been mentioned in this study, it is an important issue to address. Successful transition cannot be accomplished without a team effort. IDEA mandates that an interagency

statement be written in the transition plan. This statement includes a service agreement between the school and community agency. The TRS must be invited to the LTP meeting. Together the APE specialist and the TRS can develop strategies to diminish barriers. The APE specialist and the TRS must be team players who understand and respect the roles of all members of the team. Working closely and effectively with families, community personnel, classroom and special education teachers, and administrators is crucial for developing meaningful and successful leisure transition plans.

Recommendations

Although educators in APE have addressed inclusion with a great passion, more focus needs to be directed to its relationship to leisure transition training and instruction within the school and community setting. Our responsibilities and focus, as special educators, do not culminate with a student's projected graduation from secondary education. More studies need to address the effectiveness of APE specialists on promoting inclusion of the disabled population in community based leisure recreational activities. Barriers to successful transition need to be looked at individually, then assessed as to whether they can be prevented. Are some obstacles specific to particular types of disabilities? If preventing the obstacle is not possible, what can the APE specialist do to diminish the negative impact the barrier creates?

University teacher preparation programs must ready future adapted physical educators in the area of transition instruction and programming. State educational agencies need to recognize the importance of leisure transition, promote the involvement of the APE specialist on transition teams, and provide professional development for APE specialists.

REFERENCES

- Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, § 2, 104 Stat. 328 (1991).
- Bateman, B. D. (1992). Better IEPs. Creswell, OR: Otter Ink.
- Bedini, L. A. (1993). Transition and integration with leisure for people with disabilities. Parks and Recreation, 28, (11), 20-24.
- Bedini, L. A., Bullock, C. C., & Driscoll, L. B. (1993). The effects of leisure education on factors contributing to the successful transition of students with mental retardation from school to adult life. Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 27, 70-82.
- Bender, M., Brannan, S., & Verhoven, P. (1984). Leisure education for the handicapped: Curriculum goals, activities, and resources. San Diego, CA: College-Hill.
- Crawford, C. (1989). A view from the sidelines: Disability, poverty, and recreation in Canada. Journal of Leisureability, 16, (2), 3-9.
- Dattilo, J. (1994). Inclusive leisure services: Responding to the rights of people with disabilities. State College, Pa: Venture.
- Dattilo, J., & St. Peter, S. (1991). A model for including leisure education in transition services for young adults with mental retardation. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 26, 420-432.
- Employment Opportunities, Inc. (1994). Leisure education in supported employment (Report No. EC304073). Raleigh, NC: Center for Recreation and Disability Studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 385 040)
- Ferrel, M. (1989). No income: No leisure. Journal of Leisureability, 16, (2), 15-16.
- Heyne, L. A. (1994). Making friends: Using recreation activities to promote friendship between children with and without disabilities (Report No. EC303730). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 379 857)
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990, PL 101-476, 30 October 1990, 104 United States Statutes at Large.

Karge, B. D., Patton, P. L., & de la Garza, B. (1992). Transition services for your students with mild disabilities: Do they exist, are they needed? Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 15, 47-67.

Kortering, L. J., & Elrod, G. F. (1991). Programs for adolescents with mild handicaps: Evaluating where we are and contemplating change. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 14, 145-157.

Kupper, L. (1993). Transition services in the IEP. McLean, VA: Interstate Research Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 700)

Moon, S. M. (1991). Having fun: What's in and what's not (Report No. EC302931). Boston, MA: Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 369 202)

Moon, S. M. (1992). Finding or creating the fun in your community or school: Places and ways to integrate recreation programs. Project Rec. (Report No. EC302932). Boston, MA: Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 369 203)

Moon, S. M. (1994). Making school and community recreation fun for everyone. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Perrin, B. (1992). Community recreation for all: How to include persons with disabilities in regular leisure and recreation. Journal of Leisureability, 19, (4), 28-36.

Schlelen, J. S., Meyer, L. H., Heyne A. L., & Brandt B. B. (1995). Lifelong leisure skills and lifestyles for persons with developmental disabilities. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Smith, W. R., Austin, R. D., & Kennedy, W.D. (1996). Inclusive and special recreation: Opportunities for persons with disabilities (3rd ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Wandry, D., & Repetto, J. (1993, March). NICHOY Transition Summary. (Available from The National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities, P.O. Box 1492, Washington, DC 20013)

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (1997) . Incorporating transition services into the IEP [WWW document] . URL <http://www.state.wi.us/agencies/dpi/een/transiti.html>

York, J., Vandercook, T., & Stave, K. (1990) . Recreation and leisure activities: Determining the favorites for middle school students. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22, (4), 10-13.

APPENDIX A
LEISURE TRANSITION QUESTIONNAIRE

LEISURE TRANSITION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Do not write your name on this questionnaire. Questions should be answered with regard to the school district and/or agency for which you are currently serving as an Adapted Physical Education (APE) specialist. Specialists serving more than one district (e.g. Itinerant or CESA personnel) should complete a questionnaire for each district served.

Part I

Please circle the appropriate response to the following questions.

- 1) I am employed (as an APE specialist) by a a) CESA b) School District
- 2) What is the total school population in the district for which you serve?
 a) 999 and under b) 1,000 - 1,999 c) 2,000 - 2,999
 d) 3,000 - 3,999 e) 4,000 - 5,999 f) 6,000 - 9,999
 g) 10,000 and over
- 3) Do you hold a current #860 (APE) certification? a) Yes b) No
- 4) How many adapted physical education IEP's have you written for students in 9th grade and above, in the past 48 months (average # per year)?
 a) 0-5 b) 6-10 c) 11-15 d) 16-20 e) 20 or more
- 5) Have you ever written a leisure transition plan (in the district/agency where you are currently employed)? a) Yes b) No
- 6) If you answered "Yes" to question #5, how many leisure transition plans have you written in the past 48 months? a) 0 b) 1-3 c) 4-6 d) 7 or more

If you answered "No" to question #5 or circled "a" in question #6 complete the boxed section below. Do not complete parts II and III.

All other responders should continue to Parts II and III of questionnaire.

Please place a check mark (✓) next to all the responses that are applicable as to the reasons why you have not written a leisure transition plan.

- _____ I do not service students in grades 9 and above.
- _____ I have not been asked to be a part of transition planning.
- _____ I am not aware of the APE specialist's role in transition planning.
- _____ It was determined that the students I served were not in need of a leisure transition plan.
- _____ I have never written a leisure transition plan because . . .

Thank you for your responses! If you have any questions, please call Deborah Krueger at (414)731-7798. Use the stamped, self-addressed envelope to return questionnaire to:

Return by May 21st, 1997

Deborah Krueger
1305 E. Byrd St
Appleton, WI 54911

Part II

Please consider the statements carefully. Each statement represents an obstacle/barrier having a negative impact on the development of a leisure transition plan.

Circle the number on the scale that best reflects your response to the statement. The numbers on the scale represent the following:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	No Opinion	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

When developing LTP's, I have found the following to be serious obstacles:

1)	Negative attitudes/anxiety of community resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
2)	Community agencies/programs that resist inclusion of the disabled population.	1	2	3	4	5
3)	Too few community recreation opportunities to allow for choice.	1	2	3	4	5
4)	Lack of accessibility (e.g. ramps, elevators) in community leisure environments.	1	2	3	4	5
5)	Social isolation of student from peers (e.g. lacks companions to recreate with).	1	2	3	4	5
6)	Student's lack of prior exposure to leisure transition activity.	1	2	3	4	5
7)	Student's lack of functional skills necessary to experience success in activity.	1	2	3	4	5
8)	Student's lack of communication skills (e.g. verbal, sign language, facilitated communication) to express interests and choices.	1	2	3	4	5
9)	Lack of parent/caregiver support and involvement in the plan.	1	2	3	4	5
10)	Budget restrictions (e.g. equipment, specialist's support/service time, transportation).	1	2	3	4	5

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly	Somewhat	No	Somewhat	Strongly
Disagree	Disagree	Opinion	Agree	Agree

When developing LTP's, I have found the following to be serious obstacles:

11)	Lack of transportation available to student during off-school hours.	1	2	3	4	5
12)	Lack of adapted equipment in the community sector.	1	2	3	4	5
13)	An activity fee that parents/caregivers are unwilling to pay.	1	2	3	4	5
14)	My insufficient knowledge of community resources.	1	2	3	4	5
15)	Lack of collaboration between school and community resource personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
16)	Lack of knowledge of what my role should be in the transition plan.	1	2	3	4	5
17)	Lack of experience in writing leisure transition plans (having written less than four in the past 48 months).	1	2	3	4	5
18)	Inability to provide individualized instruction based on needs of student. All activities become group (class) activities.	1	2	3	4	5
19)	Student is not allotted sufficient time in the community setting to allow for successful transition.	1	2	3	4	5
20)	Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5
	_____					
	_____					

Part III

Please list the five obstacles having the most negative impact on your ability to develop leisure transition plans (choose from #1-#20 in Part II, the previous section).

1) # _____

2) # _____

3) # _____

4) # _____

5) # _____

Thank you for completing the questionnaire!

If you have any questions, please call Deborah Krueger at (414) 731-7798

Use the stamped, self-addressed envelope to return the questionnaire to:

Deborah Krueger
1305 E. Byrd Street
Appleton, WI 54911

Return by May 21st, 1997

APPENDIX B
COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

May 7, 1997

Dear Adapted Physical Education Specialist,

My name is Deborah Krueger. I am currently doing research through the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse, under the direction of Dr. Patrick DiRocco (608-785-8695). My research involves the study of obstacles that Adapted Physical Education (APE) specialists encounter when developing an individualized leisure transition plan.

I appreciate your participation in the study. The questionnaire will require approximately 10 - 20 minutes of your valuable time. Information you relay will benefit the adapted physical education field by identifying the barriers to leisure transition. Heightened awareness of obstacles will assist the APE specialist in developing more effective leisure transition plans, thereby providing the disabled population with a smoother, more successful transition from school to the community.

Completion of this questionnaire will signify your voluntary informed consent to participate in the study and for the use of data derived from your responses. All data will be dealt with confidentially and no school district, agency or individual will be identified.

Thank you,

Deborah Krueger
1305 E. Byrd Street
Appleton, WI 54911
(414) 731-7798