



# NTACT

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition

# B13 DATA TOOLKIT

David Test

Catherine Fowler

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition






*This document was originally produced under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs Grant No. H326J050004 (2010). The original document was created in 2010 by Test, D. W., Fowler, C. H., Schmitz, S., and Dauphinee, J. under the auspices of the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center and the Data Accountability Center.*

This updated toolkit is produced by The National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT), funded by Cooperative Agreement Number H326E140004 with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services H325D14004 (OSEP Project Officer, Dr. Selete Avoke). Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education.

This product is public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be:

Test, D.W., & Fowler, C. H. (2018). *Toolkit for Collecting Quality Data for Indicator B-13: Version 2.0*. Charlotte, NC: National Technical Assistance Center on Transition.

Published and distributed by:  
National Technical Assistance Center on Transition  
University of North Carolina Charlotte  
College of Education, Special Education & Child Development  
9201 University City Boulevard  
Charlotte, NC 28223  
Phone: 704-687-8606  
<http://www.transitionta.org>



# Table of Contents

<i>Part I: Collecting Valid Data</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Part II: Verifying Data</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Part III: Reporting Data to Stakeholders</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Part IV: Moving Beyond Compliance</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Part V: Research on Indicator 13</i>	<i>8</i>

# Toolkit for Collecting Quality Data for Indicator B-13: Version 2.0

*(Originally developed by NSTTAC and DAC, 2010; updated by NTACTION, 2018)*

**Indicator 13:** Percent of youth with Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority [20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)].

**Purpose:** To help state education agencies (SEAs) establish a routine/process for collecting Indicator B-13 data that is both valid and verifiable.

“Indicator 13” will be used to reference Part B Indicator 13 throughout this Toolkit.

## Part I: Collecting Valid Data

### Definitions:

- “Validity has often been understood to refer to the extent to which something ‘measures what it is supposed to measure’” (*Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Common Language Document, 3/09*)
- “Validation” is “the process of checking if something satisfies a certain criterion” (*OSEP Common Language Document, 3/09*).

### Step 1: Evaluate the validity of your measurement tool

Check the instrument used to collect Indicator 13 data. If you use either one of the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center’s (NSTTAC) developed checklists then your measurement tool is valid.

Do you use an NSTTAC Indicator 13 checklist ([Form A](#) or [Form B](#))?

Yes \_\_\_ *If yes, skip to Step 2*

No, we use another checklist to collect data \_\_\_

If NO, use the checklist below to assess if **at least the 8 required data elements** are measured and recorded using your checklist. This review will help you evaluate if

sufficient required data elements are measured for Indicator 13: (Yes=Data recorded; No=Data not recorded)

1. Is there an appropriate measurable postsecondary goal or goals that addresses education, training, employment, and, as needed, independent living? \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)
2. Is (are) the postsecondary goal(s) updated annually? \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)
3. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment? \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)
4. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)? \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)
5. Do the transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s)? \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)
6. Is (are) there annual IEP goal(s) related to the student's transition services needs? \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)
7. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed? \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)
8. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority? \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)
  - a) If student has not met the age of majority, prior consent was obtained from parent \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No) **or**
  - b) If student reached age of majority, prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority was obtained \_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)

Record the total number of data elements collected using "Other" checklist \_\_\_\_\_.

- If your measurement tool contains at least the 8 required items, then it is valid.
- If your measurement tool contains fewer than the 8 required data elements to measure Indicator 13, we suggest you meet with your OSEP/MSIP contact to review your checklist/criteria to ensure it meets sufficient data collection criteria. The contact information for your State's contact with OSEP/ MSIP is accessible at [OSEP/MSIP State Lead Part B and Part C](#).

Sample state tools that are different than the NSTTAC checklist, but deemed valid, using the checklist above are linked below.

[Pennsylvania Indicator 13 IEP Review Checklist](#)

[Virginia's Transition Requirements Checklist](#)

**Step 2: Report on the validity of your measurement tool in your State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports (SPP/APR)**

If you are using the NSTTAC checklist, simply state that in your report. Consider supplementing your total Indicator 13 percentage by reporting your data checklist item-by-checklist item. Not only will this help identify the items in your checklist, but this will also help you identify areas for developing your Improvement Activities. If you are using another measurement tool, include a copy in your SPP/APR and report your data item-by- item.

One way to ensure the validity of measurement is to provide professional development for the individuals collecting the Indicator 13 compliance data. Indicator 13 data are recorded by local, regional, or state level personnel across the States and other entities serving students under IDEA. Just as professional development is provided on the required transition components for individuals engaged in transition planning and IEP development, individuals reviewing the IEPs of transition-age students can benefit from training, as well.

Like many States or entities, the Bureau of Indian Education provides professional development (PD) for staff at the school building level regarding the required components of Indicator 13. Additionally, specific state education agency personnel participate in PD to ensure that IEPs reviewed for Indicator 13 monitoring are reviewed accurately. Prior to confirming data submitted are accurate, three reviewers must reach 80% interrater agreement on 30% of the IEPs reviewed for Indicator 13 compliance.

Below are sample materials from states, relevant to the idea of improving the validity of the data by improving the capacity of the individuals recording and submitting the data.

Bureau of Indian Education I-13 Data Collection Professional Development Materials

- [Compliance Tips](#)
- [PowerPoint with Speaker's Notes](#)

[Utah Compliance Tips](#)

## **Part II: Verifying Data**

*Definition: "Verification" is defined as "to determine or prove something to be correct" (OSEP Common Language Document, 3/09)*

Several states verify data submitted by "spot-checking" a percentage of IEPs reviewed for Indicator 13 compliance. Other states verify the accuracy of a percentage of the IEPs reviewed from each local education agency (LEA) included in the review for that year. Finally, some states calculate interrater reliability among state level reviewers to confirm the data reported are correct. The method by which the data are collected dictates the method for verifying the data. Whether data are collected at the school building, LEA, or state education agency (SEA) level, it is critical to have a process in place that verifies the accuracy of the data reported.

Below are resources used by the Iowa Department of Education to assist those reviewing IEPs for compliance. Iowa and other States require monitors to reach an expected level of interrater agreement on at least three IEPs before initiating official IEP reviews. In States with these procedures, retraining occurs until a pre-defined level of interrater agreement is achieved.

[Iowa Transition IEP Checksheet](#)

[Iowa I-13 Critical Elements Reference Sheet](#)

### **Part III: Reporting Data to Stakeholders**

Part B Indicator 13 results must be reported to OSEP and must be made publically available annually. The data are reported to OSEP through the state's Annual Performance Report on the State's Performance Plan. The measurement table provided by OSEP is used to report these data.

States may also share the results of performance on Indicator 13 with other stakeholders for various purposes including:

- State education agency staff with responsibilities for professional development and technical assistance;
- Local education agency (LEA) superintendents and special education directors to indicate areas for improvement and success;
- Special education teachers to inform areas for improvement and success addressing the transition component of the IEP;
- Parents of transition-age students in recently monitored LEAs;
- Statewide and community level transition advisory councils or boards to identify areas of need and strength; and
- Institutes of higher education special education faculty and others in the state engaged in professional development and pre-service content delivery


For additional guidance on public reporting, view this resource from the IDEA Data Center: [Why, What, Who, and How: Improving State Reporting of Local Performance](#). The toolkit provides useful guidance on simplifying and visualizing data display to inform discussion and improve performance. Because the target for Indicator 13 is always 100% any local education agency, region, or school would always be compared to that benchmark. This resource can assist a State's data team as they make decisions about various formats for dissemination of results to various audiences. This toolkit provides general guidance on reporting of all Part C and Part B Indicators; however, specific guidance on visual displays for each Part B Indicator is also available in the [IDEA Part B Data Display Wizard](#).

Below are two PowerPoint slides from the State Toolkit for Examining Post-School Success (STEPSS), displaying Indicator 13 results. The first demonstrates a display, disaggregated by

component. The second disaggregates each component further, by population subgroup (i.e., gender).


## Example Data Display

### Alverso City Compliance of Transition Component of IEPs Using Indicator 13 Checklist A



## Data Displays by Subgroups

### Percent of IEPs with Compliant Transition Components by Gender



Sharing the results of Indicator 13 performance with stakeholders provides LEAs, schools, educators, and families with markers of progress. Additionally, if the State uses an item by item analysis of performance, the results provide these stakeholders with information that may inform program improvement, focus professional development efforts, and improve the quality

of the transition planning process. For example, data from a region of the state or a cluster of high schools in a district may indicate that IEPs are most commonly noncompliant, due to lack of alignment between the course of study and the postsecondary goal. This provides stakeholders with valuable information regarding a potential knowledge issue for IEP teams or a procedural or policy gap that needs to be addressed. [A sample PowerPoint which could be used to report Indicator 13 results to stakeholders and guide a discussion to improve compliance is available here.](#) Providing feedback to a local district after a review has occurred is a critical way to improve practice.

[Arkansas Transition Services sample local district report.](#)

Involving stakeholders in interpreting and using the results from Indicator 13 data collection can provide a mechanism for improving practice. Sharing Indicator 13 results from the state and local levels with school building level educators may inform practices regarding student engagement in the IEP development process, as well as the importance of quality transition assessment to inform goal development and instruction. When school building personnel include administrators, school counselors, and general education teachers, improvements regarding student access to relevant courses of study and other effective transition services may be addressed. Guiding discussions of the data with district level educators and community partners, such as Vocational Rehabilitation, may lead to creative solutions regarding the structure of IEP meetings, information and data sharing, and the provision of transition services focused on improved outcomes. Including family members and students in a review of data can also serve as a mechanism to improve the overall connectedness of the IEP planning process to a student's future success. Finally, examining the data with policy makers and community leaders at the state and local levels can influence processes regarding such factors as course offerings, graduation pathways, and school-business partnerships. [The State Toolkit for Examining Post-School Success \(STEPSS\) Facilitator's Guide](#), from NTACTION, includes guidance for a discussion with stakeholders of Indicator 13 results in Appendix C of the resource.

#### **Part IV: Moving Beyond Compliance**

Since the first *Tool for Collecting Quality Data for Part B Indicator 13* was developed, some SEAs and LEAs have focused professional development, policies, and procedures on the quality of transition planning and service practices that can improve student outcomes. States, of course, have continued to collect data regarding compliance for Indicator 13. However, some have developed tools and resources to identify practices that are occurring within the transition planning process, documented in a student's IEP move beyond mere compliance. This section of the Toolkit includes sample resources for professional development and data collection regarding the quality of the transition component of the IEP. Finally, we offer suggestions for connecting Indicator 13 performance improvement efforts to the systemic planning associated with Part B Indicator 17 of the State Performance Plan.

#### **Data Collection Tools:**

The tools below provide models from states which incorporate a quality analysis in the data collection for compliance with IDEA as reflected in Part B Indicator 13.

**Arizona:** The Arizona Department of Education is partnering with school districts to use the [Secondary Transition Best Practices Rubric](#) to encourage attention to quality planning practices while developing procedurally compliant IEPs.

**Indiana:** The Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center developed [the Transition IEP Rubric](#) with guidance to assist teachers to consider the quality and student-centered practices associated with the required components of transition planning.

**Rhode Island:** Regional Transition Coordinators (RTCs) provide personnel development and support throughout the state. The RTCs developed and then piloted the use of a rubric to examine not only the compliance, but the depth of quality of the transition components addressed in the IEP during the 2013-2014 school year. Rhode Island continues to use this tool to guide improved practices. The [rubric is available here](#).

### **Professional Development Resources:**

Several states provide resources as well as professional development in person and online which reinforce the connection between compliance and a quality transition-focused IEP. Examples of training materials are available below.

**Arizona:** A [series](#) of six recorded three to six minute webinars describe the various aspects of the transition component of the IEP from a “best practice” perspective. Additionally, the secondary transition team of the Department of Public Instruction has posted [three videos](#) to assist IEP teams in incorporating predictors of post-school success into program implementation.

**Colorado:** The [state's compliance and quality tips](#) provide personnel with guidance on each component of Indicator 13. Additionally, an online module provides real-time instruction and guidance for teachers and others engaged in the secondary transition planning process on managing a comprehensive transition assessment process that leads to IEP development that is compliant with the mandates of transition planning. The [Using Assessment Information for Transition Planning Module](#) provides content and opportunities for practice.

**Connecticut:** Providing teachers and case managers with the reason behind the mandated components of transition planning is the focus of the State’s [Transition Planning IEP Checklist](#). This 25 item checklist provides references to guidance, forms, and resources that connect pre-planning to the IEP meeting, and also connect to Indicator 14 data collection preparation.

**Illinois:** In 2013, Illinois’ legislature mandated Independent Living as a required post-school goal area for all students with disabilities in PA 098-0517 – going beyond the IDEA, 2004 requirements. This legislation was founded on the research that successful postsecondary education, training, and employment outcomes are related to independent living competence in such areas as health and safety, finance, transportation and mobility, social relationships,

leisure, and self-advocacy. A [PowerPoint presentation](#) is available for training around the requirement.

**North Dakota:** [Secondary Transition: Tips for Compliance to Indicator 13](#) provides guidance on exactly what is required for each component of the IEP for a student 16 or older. Additionally, the tips provide suggestions for quality practices that may be documented in the IEP. In response to a noted need in the field for guidance in selecting the most appropriate tools to evaluate a student's strengths, preferences, and interests North Dakota's Secondary Transition Community of Practice Advisory Council developed a [Transition Assessment Matrix](#) to support practitioners, families, and students.

**Washington Goal Sort Activity:** Below are resources for a professional development activity aimed at improving the compliance and quality of the post-school goals developed in the transition component of the IEP.

- [Directions](#)
- [Education and Training Goals](#)
- [Employment Goals](#)
- [Independent Living Goals](#)
- [Answer Sheet](#)

### **Indicator 13 and the State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIP), initially submitted in 2015 each State completed an analysis of its performance and identified a measurable result area in need of improvement. Those State-Identified Measurable Results (SIMR) must focus on a performance indicator. Though Indicator 13 is a compliance indicator for IDEA (2004), some states have articulated the connection between Indicator 13 and the graduation and post-school success of students with disabilities. The State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for Georgia is improved graduation rates for students with disabilities. Through data analysis and stakeholder engagement, the team has continuously examined data for Indicator 13 within the context of improvement discussions. The logic model for Georgia's work displays the theoretical connection between evidence-based practices within the context of quality transition services and school completion strategies. Additionally, the Bureau of Indian Education focused first on data quality – including Indicator 13 – as a major component of its improvement strategies to improve student outcomes. The [BIE Indicator 13 Quality Rubric](#) and [Theory of Action](#) from the first phase of its SSIP work, reflect these efforts.

### **Part V: Research on Indicator 13**

Since Indicator 13 began to be collected and reported in 2006, two dissertations and four published studies have investigated Indicator 13. Each is briefly described below followed by a short summary.

### **Dissertations on Indicator 13**

**1. Compliance and Best Practices in Transition Planning: Effects of Disability and Ethnicity. Leena Jo Landmark, Texas A&M University (December 2009).**

The purposes of this study were to (a) determine the extent to which the transition components of Individualized Education Program (IEP) documents were compliant with the transition requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA), (b) determine the extent to which the transition components of the IEP documents provided evidence of best practices, (c) determine the effects that disability category and ethnicity had on compliance and practices as evidenced in the transition components of the IEP documents, and (d) determine the relationship between overall compliance and best practices. The sample included 212 secondary students who had a developmental disability, an emotional disorder, or a learning disability and who were African American, Caucasian, or Hispanic. The overall level of compliance was 2.03 ( $SD = 1.238$ ). The range of possible scores was 0 – 5, with 0 indicating that none of the components of compliance were 100% compliant, and 5 indicating that all of the components were 100% compliant. The overall level of best practices as evidenced in the IEP documents was 4.89 ( $SD = 1.569$ ). The range of possible scores was 0 – 8, with 0 indicating that there was no evidence of any of the practices in the IEP document, and 8 indicating that evidence of all the practices was found in the IEP document. A student's disability category and ethnicity were found to be influencing characteristics for increasing or decreasing the probability of an IEP document being compliant and/or having evidence of best practices. A statistically significant correlation between the overall levels of compliance and best practices was found, indicating that as the level of compliance increased, so too did the level of best practices evident in the IEP document.

**2. Impact of Transition Education Factors Upon Indicator 13 Transition Plan Quality and Indicator 14 Post-school Engagement Outcomes. Juan L. Portley, James E. Martin and Maeghan N. Hennessey (University of Oklahoma, June, 2010).**

This dissertation found that: (a) districts with moderate levels of *Career Education* completed the Indicator 13 paperwork process more effectively than districts in the low or high categories, but yielded lower Indicator 14 employment and education engagement percentages than did the high and low *Career Education* groups; (b) those districts that taught their students to set their own post-secondary goals had more students employed or engaged in higher education; (c) when students participated during their IEP meetings at a high level they were more likely to engage in employment or further education after graduation, and have higher Indicator 13 compliance percentages; and (d) districts with high to moderate numbers of students who had paid jobs during their school years combined with money management experience had higher Indicator 14 percentages of employment and education outcomes.

**Published Research on Indicator 13**

- 1. Finn, J. E., & Kohler, P. D. (2009). A compliance evaluation of the Transition Outcomes Project. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 32, 17-29. doi:10.1177/0885728808315332**

This study examined the quantitative results of an evaluation to investigate implementing the *Transition Outcomes Project* in a Midwestern state. Data collection and analysis included a preevaluation and postevaluation of students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) using the *Transition Requirements Checklist* and included statistical analyses to evaluate the concept of "compliance" as reflected in the IEP content. Findings indicated (a) an overall increase in the frequency of IEP transition items that meet Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (INDICATOR 13) requirements and (b) improvement between expected and observed frequencies of the 32 items from initial to follow-up review. More than half of the items were "in compliance" at prereview and postreview while others remained missing, changed from missing to present, or from present to missing. These findings raised questions about the complexity of evaluating such a model and the kinds of information states and school districts need to improve the content of IEPs.

**2. Gaumer Erickson, A. S., Noonan, P. M., Brussow, J.A., & Gilpin, B. J. (2014). The impact of IDEA Indicator 13 compliance on postsecondary outcomes. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 37, 161-167. doi:10.1177/2165143413481497**

This study analyzed the relationship between Indicator 13 and Indicator 14 through bivariate linear regression. The sample included student-level secondary transition data from 352 local education agencies (LEAs) in Missouri. A total of 2,123 IEP files were reviewed using a validated checklist for compliance with Indicator 13. Indicator 14 was measured via survey responses from 4,994 high school graduates with IEPs. Results revealed statistically significant linear relationships between LEAs' Indicator 13 compliance data and the percentage of graduates with IEPs who completed a semester of college or a career training program. Findings suggest that alternate approaches and indicators may be needed to improve postsecondary outcomes for students with and without IEPs.

**3. Flannery, K.B., Lombardi, A., & McGrath-Kato, M. (2015). The impact of professional development on the quality of the transition components of IEPs. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, 38, 14-24. doi:10.1177/2165143413489727**

This study examined the impact of professional development (PD) on the transition components in the IEP delivered to 27 secondary teachers on inclusion and quality in 302 IEPs. Teachers participated in a 2-day PD that included (a) content, (b) scenario examples, (c) applied practice with IEPs including samples and participants' own, and (d) discussion related to applying content to teachers' own context. A comparison of teachers pre- and post-IEPs indicated an increased number of required components, as well as an increase number of quality components.

**4. Greene, G. (2017). The emperor has no clothes: Improving the quality and compliance of ITPs. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/2165143417707205**

This article presented suggestions for developing quality transition components of an IEP with a specific focus on transition assessment. Recommendations and resources for conducting transition assessment were provided, as well as examples of quality and Indicator 13 compliant transition components.

### **Brief Summary of Indicator 13 Research**

Based on the dissertations and published manuscripts involving research on Indicator 13, these are six take-aways:

- a. As level of compliance increases, so does the level of best practices evident in the IEP (Landmark, 2009).
- b. High levels of student participation in the IEP meetings resulted in increased Indicator 13 compliance scores (Portley, Martin, & Hennessey, 2010).
- c. While participating in the Transition Outcomes Project led to an increased number of compliant IEPs, improvement varied by item (i.e., some increased, some decreased; Finn & Kohler, 2009).
- d. Compliance with Indicator 13 was positively correlated with completing the first college semester (Gaumer Erikson, Noonan, Brussow, & Gilpin, 2014).
- e. Professional development can improve both compliance and quality of transition IEPs (Flannery, Lombardi, & McGrath Kato, 2015).
- f. Transition assessment was an important part in developing the transition components of the IEPs (Greene, 2017).