

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2018	Target ≥	26.80%	26.90%	27.00%	15.75%	15.75%
A	15.51%	Data	22.14%	22.85%	15.51%	17.30%	12.72%
B	2018	Target ≥	73.60%	73.70%	73.80%	60.75%	60.75%
B	60.58%	Data	73.86%	75.30%	60.58%	62.87%	59.36%
C	2018	Target ≥	87.20%	87.30%	87.40%	79.75%	79.75%
C	79.57%	Data	86.86%	87.58%	79.57%	78.48%	73.98%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	15.85%	15.95%	16.05%	16.15%	16.25%
Target B ≥	60.85%	60.95%	61.05%	61.15%	61.25%
Target C ≥	79.85%	79.95%	80.05%	80.15%	80.25%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State’s Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana’s unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:

--Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.

--The OPI staff has developed productive working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. OPI staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, developmental disabilities, the state independent living council and the mental health divisions of the DPHHS. These connections have allowed the OPI staff to build strong working relationships with other agencies, which has resulted in multiple collaborative projects that have strengthened the commitments of all involved to working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.

--Working with staff from TAEESE, the OPI has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC) for twenty years. The HEC continues to be a part of CSPD and brings together members of faculty from each of the colleges and universities teacher prep programs in Montana. Participation in the consortium is strong and includes faculty members from each of the public and private colleges in Montana. This group has worked to provide greater standardization of the teacher training programs in Montana and has worked together to improve pre-service training programs.

--The OPI staff is also engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership allows us to respond quickly to needs expressed in the field by school staff. We also provide SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts throughout Montana.

Annually, the State Education Agency (SEA) brings together representatives from these stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAEESE. This meeting gathers over 80 front-line stakeholders together to share up-dates of issues and gather input from a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities. For the past seven years, the topic has been Montana's SSIP and activities have been conducted to solicit both general and specific stakeholder input. During the spring 2022 meeting, the state presented on using data within the state for Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to make decisions. This also included how to interpret the APR data.

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,090
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	770
Response Rate	70.64%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	98
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	407
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	48
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	67

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	98	770	12.72%	15.85%	12.73%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	505	770	59.36%	60.85%	65.58%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other	620	770	73.98%	79.85%	80.52%	Met target	No Slippage

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
employment (1+2+3+4)							

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Response Rate**

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	68.13%	70.64%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

Montana will remove 2 questions from the survey that appear to cause responders confusion and result in surveys not being completed. The answers to these 2 questions can be inferred from the answers to other questions on the survey, providing valid and reliable data for respondents, and hopefully increasing the response rate overall.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Montana worked with the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to beta test their non-response bias tool for the analysis of the FFY2021 Indicator 14 data. In that analysis we reviewed response rates by race/ethnicity (using American Indian, Hispanic, Multi-Racial, White, and grouping the others into one group as there are less than 20 students in each of those categories), disability category (using Autism, Cognitive Disability, Emotional Disturbance, Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disabilities, and grouping all other categories together into one as they all had less than 20 students in the population), gender, and basis of exit. Analysis of representativeness of response rates indicates that there could be nonresponse bias if underrepresented and overrepresented groups differ on the outcome of interest (e.g. post-secondary outcomes).

As described further below, students who had dropped out were identified as underrepresented in the survey compared to students who had graduated, based on Montana’s threshold for representativeness (described below). Montana compared outcomes among respondents for these two groups to assess for nonresponse bias. We found large differences between these two groups in the outcome Measure A (0.83% for students who had dropped out compared to 14.95% for graduates) and for the percent of students not engaged (33.88% compared to 16.80%). Based on this analysis, it appears likely that there was nonresponse bias in our survey estimates for Measure A and for the percent of students not engaged, related to the underrepresentation in the survey of students who had dropped out. No other subgroup analyses indicated underrepresentation based on Montana’s threshold for representativeness.

The collection of post-school outcomes is completed by each LEA, not by the SEA or an outside contractor. The Montana Office of Public Instruction has identified the LEAs that appear to be having the greatest problem with locating dropout and minority youths to survey in prior years. The OPI continues to work with these specific LEAs on strategies to more effectively find and survey these youth. Moving forward, Montana will continue to make TA available to all LEAs as they work to contact students and complete the surveys.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

To assess the representativeness of the respondents, Montana compared the respondents to the target population of leavers that were sent the survey as required. The respondents were not representative with respect to the exit reason. Students who dropped out were underrepresented.

The largest difference between respondents and the population is that students who had dropped out constituted 15.7% of respondents but represented 19.5% of the population (a difference of 3.8 percentage points). The next largest differences are that White students constituted 75.8% of respondents compared to 73.8% of the population (a difference of 2 percentage points), and Hispanic students constituted 5.5% of respondents compared to 6.8% of the population (a difference of 1.3 percentage points). Other differences between respondents and the population for other race/ethnicity categories and for gender or disability categories were no larger than one percentage point.

Response rates were also compared across groups to identify groups that may be systematically less likely to respond to the survey. Since differences in response rates may be attributable to random, non-systematic factors, a Chi-Squared test of independence was used to identify statistically significant differences in likelihood of responding to the survey. Our analysis found statistically significant differences in response rates between different race/ethnicity categories ( $p = 0.047$ ). The Hispanic population had a lower response rate (58.5%), compared to white students (72.3%), American Indian or Alaskan Native students (68.4%), multi-racial students (68.0%), and the small population of persons belonging to other race/ethnicity categories (77.3%). The analysis also found a large, statistically significant difference ( $p < 0.001$ ) in response rates for students who dropped out (63.1%) compared to graduates (72.9%). Our analysis did not identify any statistically significant differences in response rates between male and female students ( $p = 0.551$ ,  $M = 71.4\%$ ,  $F = 69.3\%$ ) or across disability categories ( $p = 0.367$ ).

Montana will remove 2 questions from the survey that appear to cause responders confusion and maybe resulting in surveys not being completed, which lowers the response rate. These answers to these 2 questions can be inferred from other questions on the survey, providing valid and reliable data for respondents, and hopefully increasing the response rate overall.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

As noted above, Montana will continue to make TA available to all LEAs as they work to contact students and complete the surveys. This may include changing the data set to be more accurate of the population intended to be surveyed or providing the survey to LEAs in a manner that is easier for students/parents to complete themselves, rather than having the district required to make direct contact with the student/parent.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

As noted, to assess the representativeness of the respondents with respect to the population, the distribution of population subgroups among respondents was compared to the distribution in the population. Montana's threshold was +/- 3%. Response rates were also compared across groups to identify groups that may be systematically less likely to respond to the survey using a Chi-Squared test of independence to identify statistically significant differences in likelihood of responding to the survey. Montana's threshold was  $p < 0.05$ .

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential non-response bias and identify steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.

### Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The information to satisfy this required action can be found in the "Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school" section of this indicator.

## 14 - OSEP Response

In its description of strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, the State did not specifically address strategies to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State reported "To assess the representativeness of the respondents, Montana compared the respondents to the target population of leavers that were sent the survey as required." The State also indicated that sampling was not used. Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative of the demographics of all youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe strategies which are expected to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.