

ANALYSIS OF 2007-2008 STATE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORTS FOR INDICATOR 13

Indicator 13 requires states to report data on “*The percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the child to meet the post-secondary goals.*” The sections below summarize the 2007-2008 APR data for Indicator 13.


1. Data Reported

For 2007-2008, all 60 states and territories reported data for Indicator 13. Table 1 and Figure 1 compare the number and percent by percentage ranges across years.

Table 1. Summary of Number and Percent of I-13 Scores by Percentage Ranges

Percent	05-06 (Baseline) # (%)	2006-2007 # (%)	2007-2008 # (%)
95-100*	6 (10%)	10 (16.7%)	15 (25.0%)
75-94	17 (28.3%)	15 (25%)	23 (38.3%)
50-74	12 (20%)	16 (26.6%)	12 (20.0%)
25-49	10 (16.7%)	11 (18.3%)	6 (10.0%)
0-24	12 (20%)	8 (13.3%)	4 (6.7%)
No Data	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Median	60%	69%	82.9%
Range	0-100%	3-100%	4.65-100%

Note: * = met compliance




- For 2007-2008, 15 (25%) states and territories met the compliance criteria (an increase of 8.3% from 2006-2007).
- Overall, data ranged from 4.6% to 100% with a median of 83% (an increase of 14% from 2006-2007) with 63.3% of states and territories reporting data between 75% and 100% (an increase of 21.6% from 2006-2007).

2. Progress and Slippage

Table 2 and Figure 2 summarize the progress or slippage across all 60 states and territories, as well as if the progress or slippage was explained.

Table 2. Progress and Slippage Comparisons across 2006-2007 and 2007-2008

Type of Change	2006-2007 # (%)	2007-2008 # (%)
Made Progress	37 (61.7%)	42 (70.0%)
Remained the Same	3 (5.0%)	6 (10.0%)
Had Slippage	17 (28.3%)	12 (20.0%)
Unknown (no baseline data)	3 (5.0%)	0 (0%)
Explained Progress/Slippage	53 (88.3%)	41 (68.3%)



For 2007-2008:

- 48 (80.0%) states and territories made progress or remained the same.
- Of the 12 (20.0%) states and territories who reported slippage, 3 stated that slippage was due to implementing a more rigorous set of criteria for measuring I-13.
- While 41 (68.3%) provided an explanation of what Improvement Activities may have caused their progress or slippage, only 6 (10.0%) provided data on the impact of their Improvement Activities.
- States and territories that did not explain their progress or slippage often discussed their monitoring process or described how comparisons were difficult to make due to procedures that sample different districts from year to year.

Comparisons across years:


- While more states and territories have made progress on I-13 across years and fewer have reported slippage, fewer have provided explanations for their progress or slippage compared to 2006-2007.

3. Type of Checklist Used to Collect Data (Validity and Reliability of Data)

States and territories continued to use a variety of checklists to measure Indicator 13 including the NSTTAC I-13 Checklist, an Adapted NSTTAC I-13 Checklist, or their own checklist. Table 3 and Figure 3 compare the type of checklists used by states and territories to measure Indicator 13 over time.

Table 3. Type of Checklist Used to Collect Indicator 13 Data

Type of Checklist	2005-2006 (Baseline) # (%)	2006-2007 # (%)	2007-2008 # (%)
NSTTAC I-13 Checklist	12 (20%)	22 (36.7%)	29 (48.3%)
Adapted NSTTAC I-13 Checklist	0 (0%)	8 (13.3%)	7 (11.7%)
Own Checklist (requirements stated)	15 (25%)	12 (20%)	10 (16.7%)
Own Checklist (requirements not stated)	30 (50%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
No Checklist Reported	3 (5%)	15 (25%)	14 (23%)



- 46 (76.7%) of states and territories stated the requirements used to measure I-13. Since all the requirements were related to the language used in the Indicator, we concluded that these were *valid* instruments. The percent of states using a valid instrument has increased 6.7% from 2006-2007.


- 14 (23%) of states and territories did not provide the requirements used to measure I-13. Therefore, it is impossible to determine if they used a valid instrument.
- 51 (85%) states and territories described their reliability/verification process in their APR. This typically included training monitors (both SEA and LEA) and/or a state or LEA reviewing data collected via onsite file reviews or by a web-based data collection system.
- The number of states and territories providing an Item-by Item summary of their I-13 data decreased from 18 (30%) in 2006-2007 to 15 (25%) in 2007-2008.

4. Improvement Activities

Of the 60 states and territories reporting I-13 data for 2007-2008, 59 (98.3%) included improvement activities. Table 4 and Figure 4 provide a summary of the Improvement Activities stated in the reports across three years of data collection.

Table 4. Summary of Improvement Activities

Improvement Activity	2005-2006 Baseline # (%)	2006-2007 # (%)	2007-2008 # (%)
(A) Improve data collection and reporting &/or (E) Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures	53 (92.9%)	40 (66.7%)	39 (65.0%)
(B) Improve systems administration and monitoring	15 (25.8%)	38 (63.3%)	34 (56.7%)
(C) Provide training/professional development &/or (D) Provide technical assistance	56 (96.5%)	60 (100%)	58 (96.7%)
(F) Program development	19 (33.3%)	14 (23.3%)	23 (38.3%)
(G) Collaboration/coordination	31 (32.6%)	24 (40%)	37 (61.7%)
(H) Evaluation	5 (8.8%)	4 (6.7%)	5 (8.3%)
(I) Increase/Adjust FTE	4 (7.0%)	2 (3.3%)	5 (8.3%)
(J) Other	N/A	1 (1.7%)	7 (11.7%)
Provided Impact Data on Improvement Activities	N/A	8 (13.3%)	6 (10.0%)



- The two most frequently stated Improvement Activities continued to be provide training/professional development/technical assistance (C/D) and improve data collection and reporting/examine policies and procedures (A/E).
- Although Improvement Activities continue to be written around data collection and monitoring, the largest increase was in collaboration/coordination (G). While it may be too early to call this a trend, this could be explained by the possibility that states and territories are reaching the point where their data collection system is becoming more routine, so they now have time to focus on other Improvement Activities.
- Only 6 (10.3%) states and territories provided data on the impact of their Improvement Activities including:
 - ❖ (A/E) Evaluating effects of technical assistance/professional development (n=3) by collecting pre-post data on content presented (e.g., improved transition components of IEPs) or analyzing survey data to determine training effectiveness.
 - ❖ (B) Improving systems administration and monitoring (n=2) by conducting pre- and post file reviews after the introduction of new checklist (e.g., item by item analysis of transition components).


- ❖ Creating quantitative, systematic evaluation standards (n=1) that were applied against all improvement activities to determine: fidelity, effectiveness, sustainability, and potential of each improvement activity.
- Of the 35 (58.3%) states and territories that explained progress or slippage, but did not provide impact data, nearly all provided some type of *process* data (e.g., # of workshops held, # of attendees, # of materials produced, # of meetings held).

5. TA Center Consulted with State

NSTTAC provided various levels of consultation to all 60 states and territories. Table 5 and Figure 5 compare the types of consultation provided across years.

Table 5. Summary of NSTTAC Consultation to States and Territories

Level of Technical Assistance	2005-2006 (Baseline) # (%)	2006-2007 # (%)	2007-2008 # (%)
Universal/General	11 (18.3%)	11 (18.3%)	19 (31.7%)
Targeted/Specialized	38 (63.3%)	44 (73.3%)	31 (51.7%)
Intensive/Sustained	4 (6.7%)	5 (8.3%)	10 (16.7%)
No Contact	7 (11.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)



- All states and territories received some level of technical assistance from NSTTAC.
- 41 (68.3%) states and territories received Targeted or Intensive technical assistance from NSTTAC.
- The most frequent type of Targeted technical assistance was attending a State Planning Institute, an Indicator 1, 2, 13, & 14 Cross-Indicator Regional Meeting, or participating in IDEA Partnership-Community of Practice on Transition conference calls.

6. Highlights of 2007-2008 APR I-13 Data

- All states and territories provided data for 2007-2008.
- 15 (25%) states and territories met the compliance criteria of 95-100%.
- 63.3% of states and territories reported data between 75% and 100% (an increase of 21.6% from 2006-2007).
- Overall, data ranged from 4.6% to 100% with a median of 83% (an increase of 14% from 2006-2007).
- 48 (80%) states and territories made progress or remained the same.
- 41 (68.3%) states and territories provided an explanation of their slippage or progress (a 20% decrease from 2006-2007).

- 46 (76.7%) states and territories stated the requirements used to measure I-13. Since all the requirements were related to the language used in the Indicator, we concluded that these were *valid* instruments. The percent of states and territories using a valid instrument has increased 6.7% from 2006-2007.
- 14 (23%) of states and territories did not provide the requirements used to measure I-13. Therefore, it was impossible to determine if they used a valid instrument.
- The two most frequently stated Improvement Activities continued to be (C/D) provide training/professional development/technical assistance and (A/E) improve data collection and reporting/examine policies and procedures, however (G) collaboration/coordination showed the biggest increase in use (from 40% in 2006-2007 to 62% in 2007-2008).
- Only 6 (10%) states and territories provided data on the impact of their Improvement Activities.
- All states and territories received some level of technical assistance from NSTTAC, with 41 (68.3%) states and territories receiving Targeted or Intensive technical assistance from NSTTAC.

7. Recommendations for Collecting Future I-13 Data

- In order to ensure data are *valid*, require states and territories to include a copy of their checklist in the APR. This could be done by requiring states to provide an item x item summary of their checklist. This issue should be resolved once states begin collecting and reporting data using the new Indicator 13 language.
- In order to ensure data are *reliable* (accurate), require APRs to describe the process used to collect reliable data. This does not mean just verifying that all data were collected, it means checking to determine that the data entered are accurate (would be agreed upon by a second person).
- Require states and territories to provide data on their Improvement Activities. To assist with this process, provide them with a list of possible methods they can use to determine the impact of their Improvement Activities.
- For ease of reporting and reading, require states and territories to list Improvement Activities in tabular format. When reporting Improvement Activities across indicators (e.g., 1, 2, 13, & 14), make one table and put it with each individual report.