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Agenda

• Introduction and welcome
• National picture of post-school outcomes data collection and analysis
• Methods for collecting Indicator 14 data at the state level
• Using I-1, 2, 13, & 14 to develop an SSIP
National Post-School Outcomes Center: Mission

- Help SEAs establish practical and rigorous data collection systems that will measure and profile the post-school experiences of youth with disabilities (i.e., Indicator 14)

- Build capacity of SEAs to use I-14 data for national, state, and local reporting and, most importantly, to guide and improve transition services to this population
IDEA Data Center: Mission

- Provide technical assistance to build capacity within states for collecting, reporting, and analyzing high-quality IDEA data.
Critical Interrelationships for Achieving PSO

Quality IEPs (Indicator 13)

Staying in school (Indicator 2)

Positive post-school outcomes (Indicator 14)

Graduating (Indicator 1)

Kohler (NSTTAC), 2007
National Picture of PSO Data Collection
(2014 Part B 14 Data Collection; FFY 2012)

• Census or Sample:
  – 36 states used census
  – 18 states used representative sample
  – 6 states did not report method

• Method of Data Collection:
  – 53 states used survey methodology
  – 1 state used survey and SLDS
  – 3 states used administrative records
National Picture of PSO Data Analysis
(2014 Part B 14 Data Collection; FFY 2012)

• Response Rate:
  – 50 states reported response rate
  – Response rates ranged from 9.8%-100% (M=52.4%)
  – Slight increase over FFY 2011 national average of 50.08%

• Representativeness (i.e., disability, gender, race/ethnicity, exit status):
  – 1 state representative in all categories
  – 21 states representative for gender
  – 16 states representative for disability
  – 14 states representative for race/ethnicity
  – 6 states representative by exit status
  – 2 states representative for age
National Picture of PSO Data Analysis
(Median National PSO Data)

Source: Part B SPP/APR 2012 Indicator Analyses

Indicator 14 Measure
Methods for Collecting Indicator 14 Data at the State Level: Kentucky’s Example
Development of a Post-School Outcome Study

2005-2008

- In-school survey of exiters (hard copy/bubble sheet)
- Computer-assisted interview with former students (YOYO)

2009-2014

- Moved from sample to census
- Eliminated in-school survey
- Began exploring collaboration with Kentucky State Longitudinal Data

Annual random sample of LEAs

Implemented log-in credentials to access, complete, submit data
Nagging Questions We Started Asking Ourselves

• How can LEAs make improvement if they only get data once every 6 years?

• How can we make meaningful inferences for low-incidence populations?

• How can we give greater control to local personnel?

• What should KyPSO’s role be in providing transition-related PD?
  – How can KyPSO give LEAs data that will point to strategies to improve post-school outcomes?
  – What does/should such a process look like?
Steps Toward Census

- Presented staff recommendation to Advisory Group
- Recommended KDE adopt a census
- Formally presented to State Director of Special Education in spring of 2009
- Informed Directors of Special Education in spring of 2009 of move to census for 2009-2010 school year
Results

• N=429 to N=1,941 (61% response rate)
• LEAs can track change over time
• Better representation
• More disaggregation
• Ability to develop well-trained cadre of interviewers
• Statewide ownership for student outcomes
Kentucky Post-School Outcome Study (KyPSO) and Kentucky State Longitudinal Education Data System (KySLEDS)
Using existing data

/  
/  
/  

to verify I-14 target group
to answer I-14 questions
Issues When Using Extant Data for Answers to Indicator 14 Questions

- Coverage
  
  *Are they looking at the same things you’re looking at?*

- Granularity
  
  *What is their smallest unit of measurement?*

- Data Integration
  
  *Can you accurately match the records?*

- Timeliness
  
  *Are their reporting periods going to work for you?*

- Confidentiality
  
  *Can they release data to you, and you to them?*

- Control
  
  *You are now relying on them for your data.*
Consider using SLDS to:

- replace survey
- shorten survey
- validate survey
- add to survey data

[be careful]
Trend is toward collecting longitudinal data from preschool through workforce for all students.

So we can:
- compare against control groups
- adjust for status of students at entry
- control for economic and other variables
- look at longer-term outcomes
- ask our own questions
# State Systemic Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 - FFY 2013</th>
<th>Year 2 - FFY 2014</th>
<th>Years 3-6 FFY 2015-18 Feb 2017-Feb 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivered by April 2015</td>
<td>Delivered by Feb 2016</td>
<td>Feb 2017-Feb 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase I Analysis
- Data Analysis
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity
- State-Identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies
- Theory of Action

### Phase II Plan
- Infrastructure Development
- Support for Local Educational Agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices
- Evaluation

### Phase III Implementation & Evaluation
- Results of Ongoing Evaluation
- Revisions to the SPP
SSIP Phase 1: Analysis

### Actions for Phase 1

- **Data Analysis**
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies
- Theory of Action

### Center Supports

- Data analysis tools (NDPC-SD, NPSO)
  - Indicator 13 Checklist (form B)
  - Data Use Toolkit (NPSO – Indicator 14)
  - STEPSS (NPSO, NSTTAC, NDPC-SD – Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14)
  - NDPC-SD Data Tools lite – Indicators 1 and 2
  - www.nsttacplanningtool.org – multiple data sources (qualitative and quantitative)
  - Short Data Probe – Indicator focused
  - District Initiative Inventory – qualitative, broad focus
SSIP Phase 1: Analysis

Actions for Phase 1

• Data Analysis
• **Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**
• State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities
• Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies
• Theory of Action

Center Supports

• Tools for Infrastructure Analysis
  – NDPC-SD Data Tools lite
  – www.nsttacplanningtool.org
  – Predictor Implementation Self-Assessment (nsttac & npso)
  – District (& State) Initiative Inventory (SISEP)
  – State Capacity Assessment (SISEP)
## SSIP Phase 1: Analysis

### Actions for Phase 1

- Data Analysis
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity
- **State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities**
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies
- Theory of Action

### Center Supports

- Based on analyses...
  - TA on intervention strategies (EBPs) and capacity-building strategies
  - TA in developing logic models (Theory of Action)
- Annual Capacity-Building Institute & Mid-Year Check & Connect Cadre Meeting
- Onsite and online strategic planning
## SSIP Phase 2: Plan

### Actions for Phase 2

- Infrastructure development
- Support for LEAs of EBPs
- Evaluation

### Center Supports

- STEPSS and nsttacplanningtool.org
- NDPC tools
- TA on EBPs
- Evaluation tools
SSIP Phase 3: Evaluation

**Actions for Phase 3**

- Reporting and analysis of evaluation results
- Reporting on extent of implementation of strategies
- Progress
- Revisions

**Center Supports**

- Evaluation tools and toolkits (multi-levels) including use of results
  - Progress monitoring
  - Fidelity of implementation
  - Evaluation of impact
Website: www.Psocenter.org
Data Collection Tools

• Sampling Calculator

• Response Calculator

• TA to train district-level data collectors

• Survey protocols aligned with transition outcomes & Strategies for Contacting Hard-to-Find Youth

• TA on supporting using SLDS (administrative records) to collect I-14 data
Tools for Reporting & Use

- Data Display Toolkit Including Not-Engaged
- Trend Data Display Tool
- Predictor School/District Self-Assessment in conjunction with NSTTAC
- State Toolkit for Examining Post-School Success (STEPSS)
- Targeted TA to develop In-School/PSO Data Analyses Plan (a big data dive)
Data Display Templates With Non-Engaged
Trend Data Display

- Trend Data Display for SPP Indicator #14 FFY2012
- SPP #14 Data Entry Worksheet
  - Enter the name of the state or territory you are reporting
  - Enter the Federal Fiscal Year of this Report
  - Follow these directions to create your state's Trend Data Display:
    1. Enter the state's Baseline percent for Measure A in cell E15, for Measure B in cell F15, and for Measure C in cell G15.
    2. Yearly after baseline, enter the percent of Actual Indicator Data achieved for each Measure A & B & C as determined from the year's data collection in cells H18 - J20.
- Trend Data Displays update automatically in the four worksheets that follow this one, as each year's data are added.
What is STEPSS?

- Multi-phase
- Data-based decision making
- Guides use of evidence-based practices
- Web-based application
Purpose of STEPSS

To help state and local educators, in partnership with other stakeholders, use secondary transition indicator data to improve transition programs for youth with disabilities.
Phases of STEPPS

- **Phase 1**: Viewing and Discussing Data
  - Upload transition-related indicator data (SEA)
  - Review STEPSS slideshow with stakeholders

- **Phase 2**: Assessing Outcome Areas

- **Phase 3**: Prioritizing Predictors and Essential Characteristics for Implementation

- **Phase 4**: Developing an Action Plan
State Longitudinal Data Systems

- SLDS grants were awarded to:
  - 14 states in November 2005 (FY 2006 Grantees)
  - 12 additional states and the District of Columbia in June 2007 (FY 2007 Grantees)
  - 27 states in March 2009 (FY 2009 Grantees)
  - 20 states in May 2010 (FY 2009 ARRA Grantees)
  - 21 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in May 2012 (FY 2012 Grantees)
SLDS for Indicator 14

- Three states are using SLDS for Indicator 14
  - Arkansas
  - Maryland
  - Florida

- Potential Barriers:
  - Lack of communication between SPED and Gen Ed
  - Privacy
  - Many states do not realize they have an SLDS
  - Limited access to specific data elements
Predictors of Post-School Success & Alignment With SLDS Data Elements
EBPs & Predictors to Support Post-School Success

Positive Post-School Outcomes

In-School Predictors of Post-School Success

Evidence-Based Practices

School, District, & State Level

Student Level
Predictors of Post-School Success

- A *predictor* is defined as an in-school experience, typically a program (e.g., a work-based learning experience) correlated with improved post-school outcomes.
### In-School Predictors by Outcome Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>I-1</th>
<th>I-2</th>
<th>I-13</th>
<th>I-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Experiences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Exams/High School Diploma Status</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion in General Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Employment/Work Experience</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of Study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Advocacy/Self-Determination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Care/Independent Living</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicators**

- Education
- Employment
SLDS Predictor
Data Elements Table

**Purpose:**

- Build an analysis blueprint that states can use to examine Indicators I, 2, 13, & 14 in relation to the Test et al. (2009) predictors of post-school success

- Identify data elements in CEDS that may be proxy measures to determine if in-school practices/programs are influencing graduation/dropout and post-school outcomes

- Identify additional data elements that states may have access to in SLDS systems that align with predictors
Questions for You About Accessing SLDS?

- How can we identify data elements aligned with predictors that states have access to?
- What are the barriers to accessing SLDS for state SPED departments?
- What can NPSO do to leverage states to include SLDS in data analysis?
- What strategies can SPED data managers use to connect SPED with data managers in charge of SLDS?
- What can NPSO do to encourage states to use SLDS to inform the SSIP?
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