International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

EDUCATION POLICY AND PRACTICE WHITE PAPER

Developing and Disseminating a Scalable Inclusive Transition and Communication Support Framework

For Secondary Students With Disabilities in Underserved U.S. Public Schools

A District Implementation, Evaluation, and National-Scale Dissemination Model

Charmaigne D. Canete, MAEd

Special Education Educator
Inclusive Transition and Communication Specialist

Framework Purpose

To develop, pilot, evaluate, refine, and disseminate a transferable instructional and transition-support framework that strengthens implementation quality, communication access, educator capacity, and postsecondary preparation for secondary students with disabilities across diverse and underserved U.S. public-school settings.

September 2026

Prepared for school district leaders, special education administrators and teams, instructional leaders, related-service professionals, transition specialists, vocational rehabilitation partners, and education stakeholders.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

Executive Summary

Secondary transition is not a single meeting, form, or course. It is a coordinated educational process through which academic learning, communication access, self-determination, functional competence, career preparation, and interagency support are connected to a student's movement from school into postsecondary education, employment, independent living, and community participation. The national scale of this responsibility is substantial. The U.S. Department of Education reported that more than eight million children were served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 2024, and more than 15 percent of public-school students were served under IDEA in the 2022-23 school year. In 2023, 67.8 percent of school-aged students with disabilities spent at least 80 percent of the school day in the regular classroom, while 75.8 percent of students with disabilities exiting school in 2022-23 did so with a regular high school diploma.1

These national indicators show both progress and an implementation challenge. As more students with disabilities participate in inclusive settings, the quality of transition preparation increasingly depends on whether individualized supports travel with students across classrooms, staff members, community experiences, and work-based learning settings. A transition plan can be technically complete while remaining disconnected from daily instruction; an augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) system can exist without being consistently available across settings; and postsecondary goals can appear in an IEP without being translated into repeated opportunities to practice self-advocacy, functional communication, transportation, work habits, or other skills needed after high school.

The Inclusive Transition and Communication Support Framework (ITCSF) is proposed as a district-oriented response to this implementation gap. ITCSF would organize seven connected domains: IEP implementation and progress monitoring; accessible and differentiated instruction; AAC and communication access; positive behavior and trauma-responsive safeguards; functional independence and self-determination; postsecondary and vocational preparation; and school-to-work and interagency transition. Rather than functioning as a stand-alone curriculum, the framework would operate as an implementation

1U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, 47th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2025 (released 2026). The report states that more than eight million children were served under IDEA in 2024; more than 15 percent of public-school students were served under IDEA in 2022-23; 67.8 percent of school-aged students with disabilities spent at least 80 percent of the school day in the regular classroom in 2023; and 75.8 percent of students with disabilities exiting school in 2022-23 did so with a regular high school diploma.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

infrastructure composed of educator-training modules, model instructional tools, communication profiles, progress-monitoring routines, transition-planning protocols, professional learning structures, fidelity measures, and outcome dashboards.

The framework is deliberately prospective. It is not presented as a validated intervention, nor does this paper claim completed pilots, district adoption, or measured effects. Its proposed value lies in a testable theory of change: stronger educator capacity should support more consistent implementation; more consistent implementation should increase the likelihood that students experience accessible, individualized, and coordinated instruction; and better coordinated instruction should strengthen communication, self-determination, functional competence, and preparation for adult life. Those proximal improvements may, over time, contribute to stronger graduation, postsecondary participation, employment, and independent-living outcomes. Each step in that pathway would require measurement rather than assumption.

ITCSF is therefore designed around four public-value principles: educational importance, prospective impact, transferability, and responsible scale. Its significance does not depend on the number of students one educator can directly serve. Instead, the framework seeks to convert effective instructional and transition practices into codified methods that can be taught to other educators, adopted by professional learning communities, adapted by districts, evaluated with shared measures, and improved through repeated implementation. Its national relevance arises from the combination of a widespread educational need and a delivery model designed for replication across varied school contexts.

1. National Need and Federal Policy Context

IDEA establishes special education as both an individualized service system and a national educational responsibility. Federal law requires that eligible students receive a free appropriate public education, while federal regulations define transition services as a coordinated, results-oriented set of activities designed to improve academic and functional achievement and facilitate movement from school to post-school activities. Those activities can include postsecondary education, vocational education, integrated employment, adult services, independent living, and community participation. Beginning no later than the first IEP in effect when a student turns 16, unless state policy requires an earlier age, the IEP must include measurable postsecondary goals based on age-appropriate transition assessment

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

and the transition services, including courses of study, needed to assist the student in reaching those goals.2

Federal accountability reinforces the distinction between procedural completion and meaningful transition planning. IDEA Part B Indicator 13 requires states to report the percentage of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above whose IEPs contain annually updated, measurable postsecondary goals based on age-appropriate transition assessment, appropriate transition services and courses of study, related annual IEP goals, and evidence of required student and participating-agency involvement. Indicator 14 then looks beyond the IEP itself by examining post-school outcomes within one year of leaving secondary school, including higher education, competitive employment, other postsecondary education or training, and other employment.3

The January 2025 guidance issued by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services further emphasizes coordination among state educational agencies, local educational agencies, and state vocational rehabilitation agencies. The guidance identifies transition planning, pre-employment transition services, postsecondary opportunity, work-based learning, workplace readiness, and self-advocacy as areas in which educational and vocational rehabilitation systems can work together. This interagency expectation is directly relevant to district implementation: no single classroom, provider, or annual meeting can independently deliver the full range of experiences that effective transition preparation may require.4

Research on secondary transition similarly points toward a multidimensional model. Mazzotti and colleagues' updated review identified evidence supporting established predictors of post-school success such as career and technical education, inclusion in general education, paid employment and work experience, parent expectations, program of study, self-care and independent-living skills, self-determination and self-advocacy, social skills, student

---

234 C.F.R. §§ 300.43 and 300.320(b). Section 300.43 defines transition services as a coordinated, results-oriented process; § 300.320(b) requires measurable postsecondary goals and transition services beginning no later than the first IEP in effect when the student turns 16, unless applicable state policy requires an earlier age.

3U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Part B SPP/APR Indicator 13: Secondary Transition; Part B SPP/APR Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes. Indicator 13 addresses required transition components in IEPs for youth aged 16 and above; Indicator 14 addresses specified post-school education and employment outcomes within one year of leaving secondary school.

4U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Coordinating Transition Services and Postsecondary Access: Guidance on Requirements Under IDEA and the Rehabilitation Act (January 2025).

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

support, transition programming, work-study participation, goal-setting, and youth autonomy and decision-making. These findings should not be interpreted as guarantees that any single activity causes a particular adult outcome. They do, however, support the design of a framework that deliberately coordinates multiple school experiences rather than treating transition as a narrow compliance exercise.5

The need for stronger transition systems is also visible in national labor-market data. In 2025, labor-force participation among youth ages 16-19 with disabilities was 29.7 percent, compared with 36.6 percent among peers without disabilities; unemployment was 25.6 percent and 13.5 percent, respectively. Among young adults ages 20-24, labor-force participation was 50.2 percent for those with disabilities and 72.7 percent for those without disabilities, while unemployment was 15.7 percent and 8.0 percent. These figures reflect many factors beyond school quality and should not be treated as causal measures of transition programming. They nevertheless underscore the continuing importance of preparing students with disabilities for post-secondary education, competitive integrated employment, and adult participation.6

Capacity constraints make consistent implementation more difficult. In October 2024, 50 percent of public-school leaders reported that their schools felt understaffed overall, and 34 percent reported understaffing in special education. Schools serving 1,000 or more students, schools serving student bodies that were at least 76 percent students of color, and schools in cities were more likely than the national average to report multiple teaching vacancies. ITCSF cannot solve personnel shortages, but a scalable framework can reduce dependence on isolated expertise by providing reusable tools, shared protocols, role-specific training, and professional learning structures that help available staff implement essential practices more consistently.7

5Mazzotti, V. L., et al., 'Secondary Transition Predictors of Postschool Success: An Update to the Research Base,' Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals 44, no. 1 (2021): 47-64, https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143420959793.

6U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Disability Employment Policy, Disability Employment Statistics, 2025 annual youth labor-force participation and unemployment rates. The page reports 29.7% labor-force participation and 25.6% unemployment for youth ages 16-19 with disabilities, and 50.2% participation and 15.7% unemployment for ages 20-24 with disabilities, compared with 36.6%/13.5% and 72.7%/8.0% for peers without disabilities.

7National Center for Education Statistics, School Pulse Panel, October 2024 staffing findings, released December 12, 2024. NCES reported that 50% of public schools felt understaffed overall and 34% felt

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

2. Framework Design: From Fragmented Supports to an Integrated Transition System

ITCSF is conceived as a modular but integrated system. A district could begin with the domain that reflects its most pressing implementation need, but each module would connect to a shared set of principles: student-centered planning, communication access, measurable goals, accessibility, progress monitoring, family participation, interagency coordination, and postsecondary relevance. This architecture is intended to prevent a common systems problem in which specialized supports are individually sound but disconnected from one another.

Table 1. ITCSF domains, implementation products, and illustrative measures

Framework domain	Core implementation products	Illustrative measures
IEP implementation and progress monitoring	Goal-to-instruction maps; data sheets; review protocols; decision rules	Goal progress; fidelity; timely instructional adjustment
Accessible and differentiated instruction	Model lessons; UDL planning templates; accessibility checks	Participation; task access; assessment accessibility
AAC and communication	Communication profiles; partner training; cross-setting access protocols	Independent communication; opportunities to communicate; generalization
Behavior and trauma-responsive safeguards	Prevention routines; behavior-data tools; de-escalation and referral guides	Engagement; instructional time; disciplinary removals
Functional independence and self-determination	Skill inventories; community-based lessons; self-management and choice tools	Task independence; self-advocacy; use of skills across settings
Postsecondary and vocational preparation	Transition assessment; career planning; work-based learning documentation	CTE participation; work experience; postsecondary preparation
School-to-work and systems transition	Family/interagency protocols; employer partnership tools; student-led planning	Transition-plan quality; service connections; post-school participation

understaffed in special education; multiple teaching vacancies were more frequently reported by schools with 1,000 or more students, schools with student bodies at least 76% students of color, and city schools.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

2.1 IEP Implementation as an Instructional Operating System

The first design principle is that an IEP should function as an instructional operating plan rather than a document revisited only at formal meetings. ITCSF would translate each priority goal into a goal-to-instruction-to-data pathway that identifies baseline performance, measurable objective, instructional strategy, responsible personnel, setting and frequency, data-collection method, review interval, decision rule, and adjustment procedure.

For transition-age students, academic and functional goals would be visibly linked to postsecondary ambitions. A student preparing for hospitality employment, for example, may simultaneously need functional reading, money-management instruction, transportation competence, workplace communication, behavioral self-regulation, social interaction, and the ability to request accommodation or clarification. The framework would help educators treat these as connected elements of an adult outcome rather than separate instructional programs.

Progress monitoring would be used for decisions rather than passive recordkeeping. When data show insufficient progress, teams would examine instructional intensity, opportunity to respond, accessibility, communication access, accommodations, competing behavioral barriers, and alignment between the selected goal and the student's current needs. This approach strengthens the connection between individualized planning and daily instruction.

2.2 Accessible and Differentiated Instruction

ITCSF would combine individualized differentiation with principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). CAST's UDL Guidelines 3.0, released in 2024, emphasize designing learning environments that reduce barriers and provide multiple means of engagement, representation, and action and expression. In secondary settings, these principles can support accessible text, explicit vocabulary instruction, alternate response modes, assistive technology, multimodal demonstrations, structured choices, scaffolded task complexity, and accessible digital content.8

UDL would not substitute for specially designed instruction. The framework would distinguish between universal access features that improve the learning environment for many students and individualized instruction, accommodations, technology, and intensity required by a student's IEP. Model lesson plans would therefore identify both a common instructional

8CAST, CAST Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0 (2024). Version 3.0 was released in July 2024 and organizes UDL around multiple means of engagement, representation, and action and expression, with an emphasis on reducing barriers and supporting learner agency.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

objective and an access architecture addressing potential literacy, language, executive-function, sensory, communication, motor, attention, or behavioral barriers.

2.3 Communication Access and AAC Across Natural Settings

The AAC domain is built around a simple principle: communication access should follow the student. A student should not effectively lose the ability to communicate when moving from a specialized classroom to science, physical education, lunch, a vocational placement, public transportation training, or a community worksite.

For students with complex communication needs, ITCSF could use concise communication access profiles describing preferred modes, access methods, vocabulary priorities, response latency, partner strategies, repair strategies, environmental accommodation, and procedures for maintaining low-technology alternatives when high-technology systems are unavailable. Educators, paraprofessionals, peers, and vocational partners could receive role-specific communication partner training.

A 2023 systematic review of AAC interventions in inclusive educational settings identified 17 qualifying studies and reported positive outcomes across those studies, while also noting important limitations, including the predominance of single-case designs and limited assessment of generalization. That limitation is especially relevant to ITCSF. The framework would make cross-setting generalization an explicit implementation question, measuring whether communication opportunities and independent communication occur across people and environments rather than only during isolated instructional sessions.9

2.4 Positive Behavior Support and Trauma-Responsive Safeguards

Behavior support within ITCSF would connect behavior to communication, environment, instruction, and function. Staff tools would prompt consideration of task difficulty, communication access, sensory conditions, unclear expectations, reinforcement, predictability, skill deficits, and other variables before defaulting to punitive responses.

A systematic review of Tier 1 PBIS implementation in high schools found that schoolwide PBIS can be implemented in secondary settings and reported outcomes involving school climate, graduation, and problem behavior, while also identifying contextual challenges associated with school size, organizational culture, developmental fit, and staff perceptions. ITCSF

9Kleinert, J. O., Kearns, J. F., Page, J. L., & Kleinert, H. L., 'Promising Strategies for Teaching Augmentative and Alternative Communication in Inclusive Educational Settings: A Systematic Review,' Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools 54, no. 4 (2023): 1333-1357, https://doi.org/10.1044/2023_LSHSS-22-00178.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

would draw from this implementation lesson: behavioral supports must be adapted to the organizational realities of secondary schools rather than imported without attention to context.10

Trauma-responsive practice would be used cautiously and operationally. A 2019 Campbell systematic review found no studies meeting its inclusion criteria for schoolwide trauma-informed approaches during its search period. Accordingly, ITCSF would emphasize educational safeguards such as predictability, respectful relationships, de-escalation, student dignity, culturally responsive interpretation of behavior, choice where educationally appropriate, and referral pathways. It would not present classroom educators as mental-health clinicians or treat the label 'trauma-informed' as evidence of effectiveness.11

2.5 Functional Independence, Self-Determination, and Adult Preparation

Functional preparation would address skills that often determine whether students can use academic learning effectively after high school: time management, scheduling, personal organization, community navigation, public transportation, financial literacy, digital safety, self-care where appropriate, consumer skills, communicating needs to unfamiliar adults, problem-solving, making appointments, workplace expectations, and seeking assistance.

Student participation would be central. The framework would help students communicate strengths, support needs, accommodations, career interests, education objectives, communication preferences, and priorities using speech, AAC, visual support, structured choices, or other accessible means. Participation would not require fluent speech or independent meeting leadership. The objective is meaningful student agency consistent with the individualized focus of transition planning.

2.6 Career Development, Work-Based Learning, and School-to-Work Pathways

The vocational domain would connect school-based instruction with career and technical education, vocational rehabilitation, work-based learning, community partners, employers,

10Estrapala, S., Rila, A., & Bruhn, A. L., 'A Systematic Review of Tier 1 PBIS Implementation in High Schools,' Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 23, no. 4 (2021): 288-302, https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300720929684. The review synthesized 16 published studies and discussed both outcomes and high-school-specific implementation barriers.

11Maynard, B. R., Farina, A., Dell, N. A., & Kelly, M. S., 'Effects of Trauma-Informed Approaches in Schools: A Systematic Review,' Campbell Systematic Reviews 15, nos. 1-2 (2019): e1018, https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1018. No studies met the review's inclusion criteria during its search period; this finding should not be generalized to all later research.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

and postsecondary institutions. The January 2025 federal transition guidance specifically identifies job exploration counseling, work-based learning experiences, counseling on postsecondary opportunities, workplace readiness training, and instruction in self-advocacy as components of pre-employment transition services.12

ITCSF could use backward planning from a student's postsecondary employment objective to identify experiences needed before exit: career exploration, workplace communication, transportation, job-specific vocabulary, workplace behavior, self-advocacy, resume and interview preparation where appropriate, CTE coursework, job shadowing, internships, paid or unpaid work-based learning, and connections to adult-service systems. The purpose is not to prescribe a single pathway but to make the relationship between postsecondary goals and school experiences explicit and measurable.

2.7 Family, Educator, and Interagency Communication

A transition system is difficult to scale when essential knowledge remains in the memory or personal files of one case manager. ITCSF would therefore establish structured communication among special educators, general educators, related-service providers, paraprofessionals, counselors, families, vocational rehabilitation personnel, and community partners.

Potential tools include concise IEP implementation briefs, family-friendly transition summaries, AAC communication profiles, cross-setting accommodation records, meeting-preparation templates, action logs identifying responsibility and timelines, and consent-sensitive interagency coordination protocols. Materials should be accessible and, where appropriate, linguistically responsive. Professional learning communities would support organizational learning by giving educator teams a structured forum to review implementation data, troubleshoot barriers, rehearse strategies, and document adaptations.

3. District Implementation Architecture

The strongest version of ITCSF would not begin with immediate national dissemination. It would use staged implementation in which the framework earns broader use through progressively more demanding tests of feasibility, transferability, fidelity, sustainability, and

12U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Coordinating Transition Services and Postsecondary Access (January 2025). The guidance discusses pre-employment transition services including job exploration counseling, work-based learning experiences, counseling on postsecondary opportunities, workplace readiness training, and instruction in self-advocacy.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

educational value. This sequence is important because a framework is not scalable merely because it can be uploaded, presented at a conference, or distributed to many educators. Scalability requires evidence that people who did not design the model can understand it, use it with acceptable fidelity, adapt it appropriately, and sustain core practices over time.

Implementation would therefore begin with a district readiness process. Readiness is not a pass-fail label; it is a planning tool that identifies conditions likely to affect adoption. Relevant dimensions include leadership sponsorship, staff capacity, existing transition systems, data infrastructure, family engagement, related-service coordination, vocational rehabilitation relationships, access to AAC expertise, professional-development time, privacy procedures, and the availability of community-based learning or work-based learning opportunities.

The framework would distinguish core components from an adaptable periphery. Core components would include student-centered transition assessment, goal-to-instruction alignment, communication access, routine progress review, functional skill development, family participation, interagency coordination, implementation measurement, and outcome monitoring. Adaptable components could include local lesson examples, employer partnerships, district software, training schedules, specific AAC platforms, and community-based instructional locations. This distinction protects fidelity without imposing unnecessary uniformity.

Table 2. Illustrative district readiness matrix

Readiness domain	Key question	Evidence of readiness	If not yet ready
Leadership and governance	Who owns implementation and decision-making?	Named lead, decision process, protected review time	Establish sponsor, lead, and escalation pathway
Staff capacity	Can staff participate in training, coaching, and PLC review?	Defined roles and realistic time allocation	Phase scope or reduce initial burden
Data infrastructure	Can baseline, fidelity, and outcome data be collected securely?	Existing systems or approved simple measures	Create minimum viable measurement plan
Interagency coordination	Are school, VR, family, and community roles clear?	Consent procedures and contact pathways	Develop partnership and referral protocols
Communication access	Can AAC and accessibility needs be supported across settings?	Specialist access and partner-training plan	Prioritize consultation and low-tech backup systems
Sustainability	Can recurring costs and onboarding be managed?	Budget assumptions, facilitator model, onboarding plan	Pilot at smaller scale and document resource needs

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

3.1 Train-Coach-Measure-Refine

ITCSF would use a train-coach-measure-refine model. Initial training would explain the framework and demonstrate core practices. Coaching would support educators as they apply the model to authentic student situations. Professional learning communities would create peer problem-solving capacity. Fidelity measures would identify whether core components are actually being used, while adaptation logs would document changes made for local conditions. Periodic refinement would improve usability and reduce unnecessary burden.

Implementation research supports the value of ongoing assistance. In a three-year cluster-randomized trial involving 40 rural schools, Calvert and colleagues found that enhanced implementation supports, including leadership and coaching training, individualized technical assistance, and virtual learning collaboratives, increased the likelihood that schools would reach an adequate fidelity threshold for a schoolwide prevention initiative. The intervention studied was not ITCSF, so its results cannot be treated as evidence that ITCSF will be effective. The study does, however, support a general design principle: training alone may be insufficient when schools are attempting to implement complex practices under resource constraints.13

4. Measurement, Evaluation, and Evidence Generation

ITCSF would distinguish implementation success from student success. A toolkit can be easy to use without improving educational outcomes, and favorable satisfaction ratings do not establish gains in communication, independence, or postsecondary participation. Evaluation must therefore operate at multiple levels and connect each claimed benefit to an observable measure.

Before implementation, participating sites would identify baseline measures, data sources, review intervals, responsible personnel, privacy protections, and decision rules. Measures should be limited to information that can reasonably influence decisions. Excessive data collection would undermine sustainability, especially in understaffed settings.

Implementation measures could include educator reach, training completion, knowledge checks, coaching participation, fidelity to core components, perceived usability,

13Calvert, H. G., et al., 'Training and Technical Assistance Increase the Fidelity of Implementation of a Universal Prevention Initiative in Rural Schools: Results from a 3-Year Cluster-Randomized Trial,' Prevention Science 26 (2025): 56-68, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-025-01776-0. The study examined a schoolwide prevention initiative, not ITCSF, and is cited for implementation-support principles rather than as evidence of ITCSF effectiveness.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

implementation burden, frequency of PLC review, school adoption, and sustained use after initial training. Student-level proximal measures could include documented IEP-goal implementation, progress-monitoring frequency, independent functional communication, communication opportunities across settings, student participation in transition planning, functional-skill attainment, career exploration, CTE participation, and work-based learning. System-level measures could include Indicator 13-aligned transition-plan quality, referral and linkage to vocational rehabilitation, cross-school adoption, and the proportion of participating sites sustaining core practices.

Where longitudinal follow-up is feasible, post-school outcomes could be organized using the categories reflected in IDEA Part B Indicator 14: higher education, competitive employment, other postsecondary education or training, and other employment within one year of leaving secondary school. Local evaluation would not replace state reporting requirements. Response rates and missing data should be disclosed so that nonresponse is not silently classified as either success or failure.14

Equity analysis would be incorporated from the beginning. Subject to privacy protections and adequate sample sizes, districts could examine implementation access and outcomes by disability category, race and ethnicity, English-learner status, economic disadvantage, school geography, level of support need, and communication mode. The purpose would be to identify uneven access or implementation barriers, not to rank small student groups or imply that average effects apply uniformly to all students.

Table 3. ITCSF measurement framework

Level	Example measures	Review cycle	Decision use
Implementation	Training, fidelity, coaching, usability, sustained use	Monthly / quarterly	Identify drift, burden, and support needs
Student proximal	Communication, goal progress, participation, functional skill use	Per IEP/data cycle	Adjust instruction and supports
School/system	Transition-plan quality, VR linkage, work-based learning, cross-school use	Semester / annual	Guide resource allocation and scale decisions
Post-school	Higher education, competitive employment, other education/training or	Annual follow-up where feasible	Assess longer-term relevance and

14U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Part B SPP/APR Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes. The indicator includes higher education, competitive employment, other postsecondary education or training, and other employment within one year of leaving secondary school.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

	employment		redesign priorities

5. Scalability, Replication, and National-Scale Relevance

The framework's broader relevance depends on transferability, not rhetoric. National-scale contribution does not require simultaneous implementation in every state. A locally developed model can have broader significance if it produces codified methods, training assets, measurement tools, and implementation knowledge that are useful to similarly situated schools and districts elsewhere.

ITCSF's dissemination strategy would therefore focus on reproducible products: a concise implementation handbook, facilitator guide, educator-training modules, worked examples, fidelity checks, communication-access tools, transition-planning templates, outcome definitions, adaptation logs, and professional learning community packages. Digital resources and virtual coaching could reduce travel barriers and support rural or geographically dispersed districts, but digital distribution would not be equated with adoption. Downloads, webinar attendance, and website traffic measure reach; they do not prove implementation.

The strongest evidence of transferability would come from independent use. A school team that can explain the framework, apply core practices, adapt them appropriately, train new staff, and sustain them without intensive direction from the framework developer provides stronger evidence of scale than a large number of passive recipients. Accordingly, dissemination metrics would distinguish educators introduced to the model, educators actively implementing it, schools using at least one defined module, schools implementing the integrated framework, districts sustaining the model, and students with documented exposure to relevant supports.

Cross-district learning would be structured so that local implementation experience becomes a shared professional resource. Participating sites could document adaptations, barriers, resource requirements, and conditions associated with stronger implementation. Practice briefs and evaluation reports would distinguish descriptive observations from causal findings and would report limitations and unfavorable results. This transparency is essential for responsible scale because later adopters need to know not only where a framework appears promising, but where it is difficult to implement and why.

The national logic is therefore cumulative: a widespread educational challenge creates the need; a transferable framework creates a mechanism for broader influence; staged

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

implementation generates evidence; train-the-trainer and professional learning structures expand educator capacity; common measures make results comparable; and dissemination allows useful practices and implementation lessons to move beyond the original site. The potential population-level effect grows through replication rather than through direct service by a single individual.

6. Resource Stewardship and Sustainability

A district-scale model must be educationally useful and operationally realistic. ITCSF would therefore treat resource stewardship as part of implementation quality. The framework should not assume that downloadable materials are costless or that schools can absorb training, coaching, data collection, and coordination without tradeoffs. Districts would identify recurring costs for professional development, release time, substitute coverage, AAC maintenance, accessible materials, coaching, evaluation, transportation for community-based learning, and partnership coordination.

The framework would seek efficiency through reuse and role clarity. A common training module can reduce repeated reinvention; facilitator guides can support local delivery; concise communication profiles can reduce repeated explanation across settings; and shared progress-monitoring definitions can simplify team review. Potential efficiencies would be tested against actual staff time and implementation burden rather than claimed in advance.

Sustainability would be demonstrated when practices survive staff turnover and no longer depend on constant external prompting. Districts could build the model into staff onboarding, annual professional development, school-improvement review, transition-team meetings, and existing data cycles. A local facilitator or coach model could distribute expertise while maintaining access to specialists for complex decisions. If a component proves too burdensome or does not add educational value, the framework should permit revision or discontinuation. Responsible scale includes the ability to stop doing what does not work.

7. Prospective Five-Year Development and Scale Pathway

A five-year pathway would move from design to feasibility, replication, cross-district use, and broader dissemination. The stages below describe proposed decision points, not completed activities or guaranteed expansion. Advancement would depend on evidence generated at the preceding stage.

Table 4. Illustrative five-year development pathway

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

Stage	Primary work	Required outputs	Decision gate
Year 1: Design	Needs assessment; co-design; prototype tools; measurement plan	Framework handbook; pilot tools; data definitions	Advance if materials are coherent, accessible, and feasible for field testing
Year 2: Feasibility	Limited school/classroom pilot; coaching; baseline and progress review	Feasibility findings; revised tools; burden analysis	Advance if core routines can be implemented with manageable burden
Year 3: Replication	Additional schools; local facilitator development; adaptation logs	Cross-site fidelity and outcome data; facilitator materials	Advance if teams beyond the initial site can use the model reliably
Year 4: Cross-district use	Partner districts; shared learning; cost and support analysis	District comparison reports; scalable training package	Advance if implementation remains acceptable in different contexts
Year 5: Consolidation	Sustained-use review; post-school follow-up where feasible; dissemination	Implementation briefs; evaluation reports; broader professional resources	Continue, redesign, or narrow scope based on evidence

Year 1 would focus on design quality rather than reach. The priority would be to define core components, co-design usable tools with practitioners and stakeholders, establish minimum measurement requirements, and clarify which elements can be adapted locally.

Year 2 would test whether the framework can be used in authentic settings without creating unmanageable burden.

Year 3 would ask the most important scalability question: can teams beyond the original site implement the model with acceptable fidelity?

Year 4would examine cross-district transfer under different staffing, geographic, and community conditions.

Year 5 would emphasize sustainability, transparent reporting, refinement, and dissemination of what has actually been learned.

This staged model protects against premature claims. A framework should not be described as nationally scalable merely because national problems exist. Broader relevance must be supported by evidence that the intervention architecture can travel, the essential practices can be taught, the burden is manageable, and useful outcomes can be observed across more than one local context.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

8. Public Value and Long-Term Contribution

The prospective public value of ITCSF lies in its multiplier mechanism. Direct classroom instruction benefits the students who receive it. A codified instructional framework can influence additional students when other educators are trained to use it, school teams incorporate it into routine practice, districts maintain implementation supports, and professional networks disseminate tested methods and lessons learned.

That multiplier mechanism is particularly relevant in special education because continuity is difficult to achieve when knowledge is fragmented across people, documents, and service settings. ITCSF would seek to make transition and communication supports less dependent on informal memory and more dependent on shared systems. If successful, the framework could improve the consistency with which students encounter accessible instruction, communication opportunities, self-determination practice, functional learning, career preparation, and coordinated transition services across school settings.

The framework's long-term contribution would therefore be judged by prospective impact rather than by title or geographic claims. Important indicators would include whether districts adopt and sustain defined practices, whether educator capacity expands, whether communication and transition supports are implemented more consistently, whether students participate more meaningfully in planning, whether work-based and postsecondary preparation becomes better aligned with individual goals, and whether implementation knowledge is transferred to additional sites.

In this model, national-scale relevance emerges from a chain of evidence: the educational problem is widespread; the proposed response addresses concrete implementation gaps; the intervention is designed to be transferable; the delivery strategy builds capacity beyond one classroom; evaluation measures both fidelity and outcomes; and dissemination is structured to support adoption rather than passive awareness. The framework would succeed only to the extent that this chain can be demonstrated in practice.

Conclusion

Inclusive secondary education requires continuity between what students are promised, what educators implement, and what students can actually do in school, community, postsecondary, and employment settings. ITCSF proposes a practical structure for strengthening that continuity through coordinated planning, accessible instruction, communication support, functional learning, professional capacity building, interagency collaboration, and measurable outcome review.

International Research Journal of Education and Technology (IRJEdT)
‖ ISSN: 2581-7795, Impact Factor 5.007 ‖
‖ Peer-Reviewed | Open Access | International Journal ‖
‖ Volume: 09 | Issue: 09 | Sep- 2026 | www.irjweb.com ‖

The framework is intentionally designed for responsible growth. It begins with a substantial educational need but does not assume that need alone proves the effectiveness of a particular solution. It proposes concrete products, implementation mechanisms, and measurement systems; distinguishes core requirements from local adaptations; uses staged pilots before broader dissemination; and defines scale as sustained, transferable practice rather than simple distribution.

If implementation evidence supports continued development, ITCSF could contribute a reusable district infrastructure for strengthening secondary transition and communication supports in underserved public schools. Its broader value would arise from the ability to convert effective practices into shared systems that can be taught, evaluated, refined, and replicated across diverse educational contexts while preserving individualized decision-making for each student.

About the Author

Charmaigne D. Canete, MAEd, is a special education educator with more than thirteen years of classroom experience spanning the Philippines and the United States. Her Philippine experience included elementary and early-childhood education and service with the Department of Education in Cebu Province. Since 2023, she has worked in special education at Waukegan High School-Washington Campus in Illinois. Educated in the Philippines, she holds graduate education and special-education preparation and an Illinois Professional Educator License with a Learning Behavior Specialist credential. Her professional focus includes inclusive transition, communication access, educator capacity building, differentiated and accessible instruction, and coordinated supports that help secondary students with disabilities prepare for postsecondary education, employment, community participation, and independent living.

References

Calvert, H. G., Fleming, C. M., Lowe, M., Lewis, T., Siebert, C. F., Havlicak, A., Anderson, N., Castleton, T., & Turner, L. (2025). Training and technical assistance increase the fidelity of implementation of a universal prevention initiative in rural schools: Results from a 3-year cluster-randomized trial. Prevention Science, 26, 56-68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-025-01776-0

CAST. (2024). CAST Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0. https://udlguidelines.cast.org/

Estrapala, S., Rila, A., & Bruhn, A. L. (2021). A systematic review of Tier 1 PBIS implementation in high schools. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 23(4), 288-302. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300720929684

Kleinert, J. O., Kearns, J. F., Page, J. L., & Kleinert, H. L. (2023). Promising strategies for teaching augmentative and alternative communication in inclusive educational settings: A systematic review. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 54(4), 1333-1357. https://doi.org/10.1044/2023_LSHSS-22-00178

Maynard, B. R., Farina, A., Dell, N. A., & Kelly, M. S. (2019). Effects of trauma-informed approaches in schools: A systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15(1-2), e1018. https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1018

Mazzotti, V. L., Rowe, D. A., Kwiatek, S., Voggt, A., Chang, W.-H., Fowler, C. H., Poppen, M., Sinclair, J., & Test, D. W. (2021). Secondary transition predictors of postschool success: An update to the research base. Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals, 44(1), 47-64. https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143420959793

National Center for Education Statistics. (2024, December 12). Public school leaders report on staffing and vacancies, October 2024. Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/learn/press-release/public-school-leaders-reports-suggest-no-overall-change-number-teaching-positions-last-school-year

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2026, March 3). People with a disability: Labor force characteristics - 2025. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/disabl.nr0.htm

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. (2026). 47th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2025. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/2025-annual-report-to-congress-on-the-individuals-with-disabilities-education-act-idea/

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. (2025). Part B SPP/APR Indicator 13: Secondary transition. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/part-b-spp-apr-indicator-13/

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. (2025). Part B SPP/APR Indicator 14: Post-school outcomes. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/part-b-spp-apr-indicator-14/

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (2025, January). Coordinating Transition Services and Postsecondary Access: Guidance on Requirements Under IDEA and the Rehabilitation Act. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/idea-files/coordinating-transition-services-and-postsecondary-access-january-2025/

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). IDEA regulations: 34 C.F.R. § 300.43, Transition services. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/regs/b/a/300.43

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). IDEA regulations: 34 C.F.R. § 300.320(b), Transition services in the individualized education program. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/regs/b/d/300.320/b

U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Disability Employment Policy. (2026). Disability employment statistics: 2025 annual youth labor force participation and unemployment rates. https://www.dol.gov/agencies/odep/research-evaluation/statistics