

Post-School Outcomes Community of Practice

Call Notes August 23, 2005

Participants:

NPSO: Patti Barkin, Camilla Bayliss, Mike Bullis, Deanne Unruh

NCSET: Jane Fields

SUNY Potsdam: Pat Turbett, Bob Shepard

Ohio: Bob Baer

Indiana: Lynn Holdheide

Oregon: Jackie Burr

Wisconsin: Mary Kampa

Arizona: Steve Mishlove

New Mexico: Ginger Blaylock

Kansas: Wendy Blaauw

North Dakota: Gerry Teevens

Utah: Susan Loving

North Carolina: Dave Test

Topic: Review of SPP/APR (State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report) Materials shared at the OSEP Summer Institute related to the post-school outcome indicator are located at <http://www.psocenter.org/reporting.html>

All of the materials distributed at the OSEP Summer Institute on August 11-12, 2005 can now be found at: www.federalresourcecenter.org/frc/si05.htm

The materials are organized according to the numbered "tabs" of the Institute notebook. In addition to the PSO presentation (Tab 7), Larry Wexler's Power point presentation provides a clear and concise introduction to Sampling (Tab 11).

Patti opened with a review of NPSO checklist and sample case study for indicator #14 (<http://www.psocenter.org/reporting.html>). This is a new indicator, so targets and improvement strategies will not be required until the February 2007 APR.

The checklist specifies what to do when planning for this indicator. There is no longer a requirement for comparison to youth without disabilities. You can go beyond the requirements and do more if you prefer.

Patti repeats the formula from the indicator table. Number of youth assessed means: Those who responded. If you send a questionnaire to 100 students and 35 respond then the denominator is 35. This must be, however, representative of the whole population.

Checklist: Are your measures operationally defined? Examples: Does enrollment mean attended? States must define. Can describe data collection and sampling procedures, or a plan for how those will be put into place. Need source of data, how conducted, and by whom. Describe population and method of collection. Describe sampling procedure and similarity of sample to population. If you choose to sample LEAs, each district has to be in sample once every six years, and every district with ADM over 50,000 annually. Response rate, attrition data must be included. APR Feb 2007 first time data must be reported from collection during April to June 2006 on students who left during the 2004-2005 school year. Future annual targets must be set in this APR.

Questions:

Susan Loving Utah: Do we have to count all who left during 04-05 SY? Answer, yes.

If we come up with a plan, it's possible OSEP won't approve our plan? Yes. For example, must disaggregate by disability category.

Bob Shepard: What's a school leaver? Mike: Anybody who left by graduating, age out, or drop out.

Bob Baer: How do we get more in depth on dropouts. Do we count them even if transferred out? Some schools where as much as 40% transferred. Patti: If transferred, would not be considered a leaver.

Patti: For this SPP, don't need to report baseline data, because indicator is new. Measurable and rigorous target will be provided for fiscal year 2005 APR due Feb 1 2007. If you want, you can indicate that you've already been collecting. Improvement activities: We have provided questions on the checklist to help you plan. You could put this process information into the overview and description of process section.

That completes checklist, intended as a tool.

Next is a sample with some of checklist filled in (<http://www.psocenter.org/reporting.html>. Scroll down to case study). Notice it's just a draft with some suggestions.

Example we gave includes composition of stakeholder groups. Dissemination examples include Web site, conferences. We made this up and you can choose how you will do in your state.

SPP Part B "populated" document. Here's the link to a complete set of Part B SPP forms (www.federalresourcecenter.org/frc/si05.htm) with all the monitoring priorities, indicators, and measures filled in.

Questions?

Bob Baer: Need clarification on population. Patti: "Populated" means "filling in the blanks electronically". The term OSEP uses. Use link above to download and circulate to relevant players.

Patti goes through the case study example. You are asked to describe what you've done so far. Then explain what you've done 2005-2006 and how you will refine the system. This information goes in the "Description of System or Process" section.

On SPP, don't need to fill in baseline data or discussion of baseline data, because a new indicator.

The Power point given by Larry Wexler and Mike Sharpe can be found at the FRC URL at the top of these minutes, Tab 11.

Parallel tracks: State reporting to the public. Set targets and report on them. Also LEA reports. For state reporting you can do sample. For LEA, whole LEA needs to know how it's doing. Don't have to use sampling.

When sampling is used, a description of methodology must be submitted to OSEP. Sampling procedures (random, stratified, census, or cluster), and must describe similarity or differences of sample to population of students with disabilities. Must also include how to address response rates, missing data, and response bias. For example, medically fragile children in Part C. If you did a sample of those, would they represent all the children who are medically fragile? Samples from LEAs must be representative of each LEA sampled. Sample LEAs must represent all LEAs in state. No disclosure of personally ID information.

SPP directions state that you must sample each LEA on each indicator at least once every six years.

Susan Loving: Would it be advisable to pick same districts for all indicators that allow sampling?

NY: We would probably use the same sample for all, because it simplifies your data collection.

Going to be able to do a better job with a smaller number.

Dave Test, NC: If have to sample from every district over six years, have to get everybody at some point.

NY: Going to have to do sampling without replacement, which is a little more complicated but can be done.

Patti: The indicators that allow for sampling in Part B SPP are 7, 8, 14.

Mike: Return to discussion of sampling over six years.

Pat T: Discussing issue of sampling without replacement. It's the only reasonable way.

Mike: What we mean by that, if a district is sampled year 1, would be precluded from being sampled the rest of the times.

Pat: We have 736 districts. We assume a fifth a year. If you select randomly five times, many don't get chosen. Because we have to include them all, it's more reasonable to draw all six samples at once. So samples can be equivalent from year to year.

One of complications is districts left over for year 6.

Patti: In Larry Wexler's powerpoint presentation, a number of sampling options are described.

Remember that you do not have to sample. Some small states follow up on all leavers. Could also sample by high school.

Also, if selected properly, the subset should reflect general characteristics of the population so inferences can be made with some degree of certainty or confidence. A biased sample is not representative, and can lead to erroneous decisions.

Patti quickly summarized rest of presentation, including confidence interval of $\pm 3\%$. Should use people with expertise on sampling. NPSO creating state profiles on how states are collecting this data, and we find that most have contracts with universities or other agencies.

Another point from Larry: A good sampling plan does not compensate for poor data gathering instrument. Reverse also true. Regardless of confidence levels, individuals and families retain IDEA rights.

Questions:

Lynn H: Are we going to get a definition of competitively employed?

Mike: We've developed a standard data collection protocol. We haven't got a clear directive, so have posed 3-4 questions that could be used to define competitive employment.

Bob Baer: Trying to look at NLTS 2 data.

Mike: Yes, the government wants to be able to compare with NLTS 2 data.

Mike: in WA competitively employed is defined as 1-2 hours per week outside of home.
Lynn: Gainfully employed is an issue. Family wage instead of sheltered workshop. Mike: Family wage now higher than minimum wage.
Patti: Important to describe process by which you make those definitions.

Next Call

Jane Fields: **Tuesday Sept 27, 2005---11:00 a.m. PDT, 12:00 p.m. MDT, 1:00 p.m. CDT, 2:00 p.m. EDT.** Topic: Using PSO data for improvement. Would like to invite C of P members to share their experience. Will send e-mail out.

Important Additional Note

On August 23, Ruth Ryder disseminated a series of questions and answers related to the SPP. The following question and answer addressed post-school data collection systems. It is potentially of interest to all states currently collecting those data.

Q.8: My State collects post-school outcomes data for all students six months and 18 months following the year of exit. Can we continue to use that data to report in the SPP and APR?

A.8: If your State has been collecting post-school outcomes data that you believe are comparable to what is required in the SPP and your State would like to continue with its current collection, please send a letter to OSEP Acting Director, Troy Justesen. Explain the details of your post-school data collection in your letter and why you think it's comparable. OSEP will respond to your letter.