

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

#### 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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2025 on students who left school during 2023-2024, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2023-2024 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).

#### 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 2024 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2024 response rate to the FFY 2023 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.

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
A	2022	Target >=	15.75%	15.75%	15.85%		13.08%
A	13.08%	Data	17.30%	12.72%	12.73%	13.08%	15.33%
B	2022	Target >=	60.75%	60.75%	60.85%		63.76%
B	63.76%	Data	62.87%	59.36%	65.58%	63.76%	62.90%
C	2022	Target >=	79.75%	79.75%	79.85%		79.03%
C	79.83%	Data	78.48%	73.98%	80.52%	79.83%	73.11%

### Targets

FFY	2024	2025
Target A >=	13.18%	13.28%
Target B >=	63.86%	63.96%
Target C >=	79.50%	80.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in Montana has been in existence since 2013. The SEAP is made up of 16 members, seven of whom are parents of students with disabilities. The panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Many of the panel members serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory councils as the voice of students with disabilities. This enables the SEA to draw insight and advice from a diverse group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana’s unique needs and strengths.

In the 2024-25 and 2025-26 school years, the SEA asked for input on Indicators 3, 4, 9, and 10 from the SEAP. The SEA presented information on the SPP/APR as a whole and then dug into the specific indicators for feedback on targets and proposed methodological changes. The SEAP agreed with the SEA’s proposal. Meeting minutes from discussions with SEAP as well as presentation materials have been posted publicly for all stakeholder review.

and input on the state website for SEAP: <https://opi.mt.gov/Educators/School-Climate-Student-Wellness/Special-Education/Regulations-and-Guidance#10965413037-federal-requirements>.

In the spring of every school year, the SEA brings together parents, Montana’s Parent Training and Information center the Montana Empowerment Center (MEC), the SEAP, and other state agencies for a joint partnership meeting. During this meeting the SEA reviews the APR submitted in February. The SEA asks for suggestions on how to potentially improve the outcomes of the indicators along with doing a data drill down of the state data and district level data.

In addition to the above-mentioned stakeholders, the SEA worked with many other stakeholder groups that support students with disabilities. Those groups include but are not limited to:

Monthly Special Education Director’s calls

Montana Council for Exceptional Children (MCEC) – presented on updates at the SEA, national level, and writing compliant special education paperwork

Vocational Rehabilitation and Blind Services – strengthening our secondary transition

Summer Institute

Montana Council of Administrators of Special Education (MCASE)

Higher Education Consortium (HEC)

Dawson Community College – assisted in setting up level 2 of the ParaPathways Program

CSPD Regional Directors

Montana Empowerment Center – Monthly meetings

Disability Rights Montana

**FFY 2024 SPP/APR Data**

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,304
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	857
Response Rate	65.72%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	138
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	373
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)	42
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).	109

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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	138	857	15.33%	13.18%	16.10%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	511	857	62.90%	63.86%	59.63%	Did not meet target	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 2023 Data	FFY 2024 Target	FFY 2024 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	662	857	73.11%	79.50%	77.25%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	<p>The FFY 2024 Indicator 14B data reflects a 3.27 percentage point decrease from the percentage reported in FFY 2023. Through more in-depth data analyses, the state identified some potential reasons for the decline. Specifically, the state focused on the changes in competitive employment, given the overall state increase in the percent of respondents enrolled in higher education (see Indicator 14A). First, the state observed an overall increase in the number of respondents reporting employment that does not meet criteria for competitive employment. From FFY 2023 to FFY 2024, there was a 60.29% increase in the number of respondents reporting “in other employment.” The percent of the respondent population reporting “in other employment” from FFY 2023 to FFY 2024 increased by 4.45 percentage points. Conversely, the percentage of the respondent population reporting “in competitive employment” decreased by 4.04 percentage points. The notable rise in the population of those reporting “in other employment” contributed to the overall decrease in the percentage of those reporting competitive employment. The increase in the percentage for 14C, which includes “in other employment” in the total, demonstrates the increase in other employment across the state.</p> <p>There are likely multiple reasons for increase of respondents reporting “in other employment.” First, due to the large tourism and farming industries in Montana, work can often be seasonal and thus may not meet criteria for competitive employment. Further, the state has observed a rise over the last several years in the number of respondents reporting self-employment and employment in family business. There was a 287.50% increase in the number of respondents reporting self-employment or employment in family business from FFY 2023 to FFY 2024. This is a substantial contributor to the overall decrease in competitive employment and increase in other employment.</p> <p>Finally, the state evaluated individual LEAs to see if any notable year-to-year trends across LEAs might reveal reasons for slippage. For four of the largest LEAs in the state (all four are captured within the 12 largest LEAs, in terms of student population), there was an average decrease of 6.37 percentage points from FFY 2023 to FFY 2024. These LEAs comprised nearly 20% of the total respondent population, meaning their data has a significant impact on the statewide data. The decrease in the percentage of respondents competitively employed was also likely a reason for the overall slippage for Indicator 14B.</p>

**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	2023	2024
Response Rate	67.21%	65.72%

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

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% (state interprets this as 3 percentage points difference).

**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.**

The state assessed the representativeness of respondents to the Indicator 14 post-school survey by comparing data on students reported as exiting special education in the prior year to the respondent data for the demographics categories of race/ethnicity and disability category and applying the

representativeness metric outlined above. The data source used for Indicator 14 is the FS009 ED Facts submission (only includes those students exiting who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time of exit), meaning the state comparison data comes from the FS009 submission for the relevant reporting period and the respondent data comes from responses to surveys that were sent to all students reported as exiting who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time of exit in the FS009 submission for the relevant reporting period (only includes students who exited as graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out).

In FFY 2024, the respondent data for all racial/ethnic groups and disability categories was considered representative of the state population of students no longer in secondary school who had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. None of the racial/ethnic groups or disability categories had rates consistent with those meeting the state's criteria for no representativeness (+/- 3 percentage points). The differences between the respondent groups and the state population in the two demographics categories are provided below.

Race/Ethnicity (respondent group percentage minus state population percentage)

American Indian or Alaska Native: +0.88

Asian: -0.03

Black or African American: -0.34

Hispanic/Latino: -0.54

Two or more races: +0.41

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: -0.08

White: -0.30

Disability Category (respondent group percentage minus state population percentage)

Autism: +0.63

Emotional Disturbance: +0.16

Hearing Impairment: 0.00

Intellectual Disability: +0.10

Multiple Disabilities: +0.50

Other Health Impairments: -0.85

Specific Learning Disabilities: -0.67

Speech or Language Impairments: +0.08

Traumatic Brain Injury: +0.04

Visual Impairment: -0.04

**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)**

YES

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

**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 continues to prioritize ensuring that there is a strong response rate for Indicator 14. By allowing LEAs to collect the data rather than a state or vendor, the hope is that students and/or their families are more inclined to respond given that they are familiar with the people reaching out to them. The state's oversight of the system by which the data are collected allows state staff to monitor responses as they come and ascertain whether there are LEAs in which response rates are low. The state will continue making a concerted effort to monitor the information gathered and maintain contact with LEAs to ensure they are reaching out to students as appropriate. Further, the state will continue providing TA to LEAs related to strategies and mechanisms by which the LEAs could increase the number of responses from students exiting with IEPs the prior year to ensure that the responses are as representative as possible of the population. The success of these efforts is manifest in the increased representativeness of American Indian and white respondents and respondents in the disability categories of OHI and SLD.

**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.**

To analyze nonresponse bias, the state considered multiple factors. First, the state analyzed the Indicator 14 survey response rates, as the best way to limit nonresponse bias is to ensure that the response rate is high. Indeed, high response rates limit the risk of under- or over-representation of particular groups unduly influencing statewide data. Historically, Montana has had a very strong response rate that has resulted in well over a majority of exiters responding to the survey. While the response rate for FFY 2024 decreased slightly from the rate reported in FFY 2023 (1.49 percentage point decrease), the response rate of 65.72% is still commendable and among the highest response rates nationally. The positive results of this substantial response rate are evidenced in the representativeness of the two demographics groups of race/ethnicity and disability category. On point, all demographics categories met the state threshold for representativeness.

After analyzing the response rate and the representativeness of the two demographics groups, the state investigated whether nonresponse bias existed in the levels of engagement for respondents compared to nonrespondents in the two demographics groups. To do this, the state elected to look at the survey responses of any demographic category in which the percentage of the population of the respondents was 0.75+ percentage points less than the statewide percentage of the population. One demographic category met these criteria: the disability category of Other Health Impairments. Students with the disability category of Other Health Impairments who responded to the survey were underrepresented by 0.85 percentage points when compared to the state population of exiting students with Other Health Impairments. When reviewing disaggregated responses to survey questions by disability category, the state determined that exiters identified with Other Health Impairments had percentages for Measures A, B, and C that were all higher than

the state data. This could indicate that if this group of the exiter population was fully representative, the state averages could be slightly higher for each of the indicator measures.

While the state does not perceive the data to indicate nonresponse bias, it recognizes there were differences in responses for groups over- and underrepresented in particular racial/ethnic groups and disability categories. In order to address the possible nonresponse bias identified, the state will continue making concerted efforts to improve the survey response rate, which should in turn address representativeness. The state will look into the possibility of weighting data in future years to control for nonresponse bias and provide post-school outcome rates that may more accurately reflect statewide post-school outcomes. Further, the state will continue assessing the times in which surveys are being submitted to determine if there are any trends or key information that might be relevant to assess whether nonresponse bias might be occurring. If it is determined to possibly be occurring, the state will provide technical assistance and support to LEAs, particularly those most impacted.

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)**

N/A

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**14 - OSEP Response**

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, the State reported "The state assessed the representativeness of respondents to the Indicator 14 post-school survey by comparing statewide population data to the respondent data for the demographics categories of race/ethnicity and disability category." Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative.

**14 - Required Actions**