



INDICATOR 13

Proposed Procedure for Monitoring and Data Collection
To Begin in the 2022-2023 School Year

What does compliance with Indicator 13 mean?



The State Performance Plan (SPP) has data points called Indicators used to determine compliance with IDEA.

**Indicator 13 is
Secondary Transition**

All parts of the **Secondary Transition Plan** must meet federal regulations and state standards to be in 100% Compliance.

The State Performance Plan (SPP) for Indicator 13

According to federal requirements, the SPP must include data for Indicator 13 Compliance that addresses a percent of youth (with IEPs) aged 16 and above. Compliance with the following seven components is the data that must be reported in the SPP:

- Appropriate Measurable Post-Secondary Goals
- Transition Assessment(s)
- Transition Services
- Courses of Study
- Transition Link to Annual IEP Goal(s)
- Student Invite
- Consent of parent or adult student to invite a representative from any outside agency, likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, to the IEP meeting

Revised Indicator 13 Compliance Checklist

New Hampshire Indicator 13 Compliance Checklist Form – Initial Visit

SAU No: _____ School Name: _____ SASID # _____ IEP Date: _____



Indicator 13 Checklist Questions	YES	NO	If No, Explain/Detail Areas of Noncompliance
1. Is there an appropriate measurable postsecondary goal (MPSG) or goals that covers education or training, employment and, as needed, independent living? IDEA and NH Rules Citation: Ed 1109.01(a)(1):34 CFR 300.320 (b)(1)	Y	N	Education or Training: Y N Employment: Y N Independent Living Y N NA Goal must project that it will happen after high school (post-school). Measurable – can the activity be measured/counted; can it be observed, done or accomplished?
2. Is there evidence that the measurable post-secondary goals are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment? IDEA and NH Rules Citation: Ed 1109.01(a)(1):34 CFR 300.320(b)(1)	Y	N	Date of Transition Assessment: _____ Date of IEP Meeting: _____ Area of interest: _____
3. Are there transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her measurable post-secondary goal(s)? IDEA and NH Rules Citation: Ed 1109.01(a)(1); 34 CFR 300.320(b)(2); Ed 1109.01(a)(10); 34 CFR 300.43(a)(1); 34 CFR 300.43(a)(2); 34 CFR 300.43 (b); Ed 1109.03 (i); 34 CFR 300.324(c); Ed 1109.03 (j)	Y	N	Coordinated activities that help support the MGPGs; activities, exposures, opportunities that help to prepare students to get to where they want to go after high school.
4. Do transition services include a course of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her measurable post-secondary goal(s)? IDEA and NH Rules Citation: Ed 1109.01(a):34 CFR 320 (b)(2); Ed 1109.01(a)(10)	Y	N	
5. Is there at least one annual IEP goal related to the student's transition service needs? IDEA and NH Rules Citation: Ed 1109.01(a):34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i)(B); 34 CFR 300.43	Y	N	Annual goals connect to transition services and MPSGs. Annual goals are part of the transition services big picture plan and how they work with the course of study based upon where a student is functioning to get them to where they want to go after high school.
6. Is there evidence that the student was invited to his or her IEP Team meeting where one of the purposes was considering the postsecondary goals and transition services needed to assist in reaching those goals? IDEA and NH Rules Citation: Ed 1103.01(a); 34 CFR 300.321(b)(1); 300.322(2)	Y	N	____ Student was invited to the IEP meeting ____ The consideration of postsecondary goals/transition services was one of the meeting purposes identified on the invitation
7. 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? IDEA and NH Rules Citation: 34 CFR 300.321(b)(3)	Y	N NA	
Does the IEP meet the requirements of Indicator 13? (circle one)			YES (All Ys or NA for each of the items above) NO (One or more N for the items above)

Reviewers Signatures: _____ Date: _____

Calculating Compliance for the SPP

In order for a file to be considered compliant all seven items on the Indicator 13 Compliance Checklist (the items reviewed on the previous slide) must meet compliance criteria.

Calculating Indicator 13 Compliance:

$$\frac{\text{Number of files in 100\% compliance}}{\text{Total number of Indicator 13 files reviewed}} \times 100 = \text{District/LEA Compliance}$$

The data obtained from the initial Indicator 13 Compliance Monitoring is what is reported to the federal government in the APR. This data is also used for LEA determination.

General Information

- Indicator 13 is currently monitored cyclically by high school
- High schools are monitored on 6 year rotation
- During the last 6 year rotation the Bureau monitored a total of 641 IEPs for Indicator 13 Compliance
- Considering the last 6 year rotation, the Bureau monitored approximately 107 files or approximately 1.5% each year
- Over the last six year rotation the average rate of compliance for Indicator 13 was 56%
- There are 81 Public High Schools, Public Academies and JMA (Joint Maintenance Agreement)
- There are 175 LEAs

Change in Practice and Anticipated Benefits

Instead of cyclical monitoring by high school, the Bureau would monitor a predetermined number of files (for students 16 years old or older) in every LEA every year.

- Since student files (and any findings of noncompliance) are the responsibility of the LEA, monitoring and reporting Indicator 13 data by district may be a more sound practice.
- Data collected and reported would be more representative.
- If LEAs are monitored every year, rather than once during a six year cycle, compliance with Indicator 13 should improve.
- As compliance with Indicator 13 improves, LEAs will have more opportunity to cultivate and/or maintain a sound practice for transition planning.

Proposed Breakdowns for Initial File Review

# of Eligible Indicator 13 Students	# of Files to be Reviewed during Initial Monitoring	Percent of Files to be Reviewed	# of LEAs in each bracket 2020-2021	Number of files to be Reviewed (based on 5/2021 data)
1 - 9	1	100%-11%	51	51
10 - 19	2	20% - 10.5%	16	32
20 - 39	4	20% - 10%	32	128
40 - 59	6	15% - 10%	18	108
60 - 79	8	13% - 10%	10	80
80 - 99	10	12.5% - 10%	2	20
100 - 149	12	12% - 8%	8	96
150 - 199	17	11% - 8.5%	6	102
200 - 299	22	11% - 7%	1	22
300 - 399	32	10.6% - 8%	1	32
400 - 499	40	10% - 8%	1	40
500 - 599+	50	10% - 8%	0	0
Total		11.7%		711

- As of 5/2021 there were approximately 6,077 Indicator 13 eligible students in New Hampshire.
- For example, if a district had 53 eligible students, the Bureau would monitor 6 files for Indicator 13 Compliance. That would be approximately 11% of all eligible students for the district. There are 18 LEAs in that range (40-59) and the Bureau would monitor a total of 108 files for that range bracket (40-59).
- Based on the proposed breakdown of student files per district, the Bureau would review Secondary Transition Plans for approximately 11.7% of the eligible students (those students 16 years old or older) each year.
- NH SPP/APR data for Indicator 13 would be based on approximately 11.7% of NH students who are 16 years old or older compared to the previous 1.5%.

Procedural Changes for On-Site Monitoring

- Since the proposed procedural changes increases the number of districts and the number of files reviewed each year, physical on-site visits would not be possible.
- In order to determine Indicator 13 compliance and collect the necessary data for the SPP/APR the Bureau would conduct an internal file review (desk audit) of selected files in NHSEIS from each district that are representative of their special education population (demographics, age, gender, disability, case manager, high school(s), placements – including charter school, out-of-district and out-of-state (new addition)).
- The number of files reviewed for each LEA would be predetermined and based on the proposed breakdown as outlined on the previous slide.
- Selected files would be Indicator 13 Eligible students in NHSEIS as of 10/1.

Procedural Changes for On-Site Monitoring

- Some items on the Indicator 13 Checklist may not be reviewable in NHSEIS, (transition assessments, evidence that the student was invited to the IEP meeting, and if necessary, evidence that the parent or adult student gave prior consent to invite an outside agency to the IEP meeting).
- Evidence for any items not reviewable in NHSEIS would need to be verified via a scheduled virtual meeting or uploaded to NHSEIS. Review of required evidence would be conducted in conjunction with the desk audits (initial desk audits conducted between November and December of that school year).
- Districts who do not use NHSEIS would be scheduled for an onsite visit (either virtually or in person).
- If it is indicated in NHSEIS that the parent has provided consent for the IEP that would be sufficient for the Bureau to conduct the desk audit.
- The entire Indicator 13 Checklist could be reviewed via desk audit when using the paperclip option in NHSEIS as a means to upload documents not found in the IEP.

Procedural Changes for On-site Monitoring

- Student SASID lists would be sent to each LEA in mid-October. (List may include additional 2-4 students (if applicable) that could be used if a selected student has moved or exited special education).
- LEAs would have 2 weeks to paperclip evidence, not viewable in the IEP, to each selected student file in NHSEIS for review during Indicator 13 desk audit.
- LEAs that do not use NHSEIS for their IEPs would be scheduled for either a physical or virtual initial onsite review in early November.
- Desk audits would be conducted between November and December.

Child Specific Corrections

- An Indicator 13 Compliance Matrix would be maintained for each LEA and identify, by SASID number, compliance for each item on the Indicator 13 Checklist for the files reviewed (current practice).
- The completed Indicator 13 Compliance Matrix and notification of compliance letter would be sent to each LEA (following the current time line – as soon as possible but no later than 90 days after the initial monitoring).
- For any child specific findings identified during the initial monitoring, verification of corrections would need to occur within 60 days of notification of noncompliance (this is the same procedure currently in place).
- Child-specific corrections would be verified via a desk audit.

Prong 2

- According to OSEP Memo 09-02, States must determine that each LEA program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. This must be based on the State's review of updated data such as data from subsequent on-site monitoring or data collected through a State data system.
- New files will continue to be reviewed for Prong 2 only for areas found in non-compliance during initial monitoring (in order to determine the correct implementation of Indicator 13 requirements).
- The Bureau will need to track and maintain communication with each of the LEAs and be able to keep the next year's initial monitoring separate from the previous year's Prong 2.
- LEAs with a limited number of students may have to use the same SASIDs for Prong 2 and the next year's initial monitoring. This could be problematic if the new SASIDs used for Prong 2 are non-compliant.
- Ideally, Prong 2 monitoring would be completed by the end of the school year. However, it could happen in conjunction with the next year's initial monitoring.
- When monitoring every LEA every year, compliance should improve and instances for Prong 2 reduced.

Determining the Number of Files for Prong 2

OPTION 1:
Number of Files Based on the Number of Files Reviewed During the Initial Monitoring

# of Eligible Indicator 13 Students	# of Files to be Reviewed during Initial Monitoring	# of Files to be Reviewed for Stage 2 Monitoring	Percentage of Files to Be Reviewed
1 - 9	1	1	100% - 11%
10 - 19	2	1	10% - 5.0%
20 - 39	4	1	5.0% - 2.5%
40 - 59	6	1	2.5% - 1.7%
60 - 79	8	2	3.3% - 2.5%
80 - 99	10	2	2.5% - 2.0%
100 - 149	12	2	2.0% - 1.3%
150 - 199	17	3	2.0% - 1.5%
200 - 299	22	4	2.0% - 1.3%
300 - 399	32	6	2.0% - 1.5%
400 - 499	40	8	2.0% - 1.6%
500 - 599+	50	10	2.0% - 1.7%

OPTION 2:
Number of Files Based on a Percentage of Compliance

Percentage of Compliance per District after the Initial Monitoring	# of Files to be Reviewed per District Based on the Percentage of Initial Compliance*
100%	0
67% - 99%	1
34% - 66%	2
0% - 33%	3
* A district will never be asked to review more files than what was reviewed during the initial monitoring	

Review of Changes

- Monitor each LEA/School District rather than each high school
- Monitor every year rather than once during a 6 year cycle
- Monitor approximately 11.7% of student files each year rather than approximately 1.5%
- Revised the Indicator 13 Checklist – 7 items rather than 8 items
- Include out-of-state placements in Indicator 13 eligible students selection
- Desk audits with some virtual on-sites
- NHSEIS paperclip feature to attach required evidence
- Shorter initial monitoring time period (2 months vs 6 months)
- Reduce the number of files to be reviewed during Prong 2 since monitoring every district every year

In Summary...

- Based on past data, Indicator 13 Compliance is not changing or improving.
- The proposed changes are in process only - items monitored and data collected/reported remain the same. This changes HOW Indicator 13 Compliance is monitored not WHAT is monitored.
- Indicator 13 compliance is the responsibility of the district.
- Moving from high school monitoring to LEA monitoring data will be more representative and better align to LEA Determinations.
- Compliance should improve due to the yearly monitoring practice.
- Compliance with Indicator 13 should become automatic.
- As compliance with Indicator 13 improves so should the process of transition planning.
- With improved compliance, we can focus our efforts on higher quality transition plans which lead to better student outcomes and post-school results.



WHAT'S ON YOUR MIND?

Questions, Concerns, Feedback