

**Supporting Statement for
Paperwork Reduction Act
Submission National
Longitudinal Transition Study
2012 Baseline Data Collection**

Part A

October 11, 2011



MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

Contract Number:

ED-IES-10-C-0073

Mathematica Reference Number:

06876.381

Submitted to:

Institute of Education Sciences

U.S. Department of Education

555 New Jersey Ave., NW, Suite 502K

Washington, DC 20208

Project Officer: Amanda DeGraff, Ph.D.

Submitted by:

Mathematica Policy Research

P.O. Box 2393

Princeton, NJ 08543-2393

Telephone: (609) 799-3535

Facsimile: (609) 799-0005

Project Director: John Burghardt

**Supporting Statement for
Paperwork Reduction Act
Submission National
Longitudinal Transition Study
(NLTS) 2012**

Part A

October 11, 2011

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	1
OVERVIEW.....	2
A. JUSTIFICATION.....	4
1. Circumstances Necessitating Collection of Information.....	4
2. How, by Whom, and for What Purpose the Information Is to Be Used.....	5
3. Use of Technology to Reduce Burden.....	11
4. Efforts to Avoid Duplication of Effort.....	12
5. Methods of Minimizing Burden on Small Entities.....	12
6. Consequences of Not Collecting Data.....	13
7. Special Circumstances.....	13
8. <i>Federal Register</i> Announcement and Consultation.....	13
9. Payment or Gift to Respondents.....	15
10. Confidentiality of the Data.....	17
11. Additional Justification for Sensitive Questions.....	19
12. Estimates of Hours Burden.....	19
13. Estimate of Total Annual Cost Burden to Respondents or Recordkeepers.....	20
14. Estimates of Annualized Cost to the Federal Government.....	20
15. Reasons for Program Changes or Adjustments.....	20
16. Tabulation, Publication Plans, and Time Schedules.....	20
17. Approval Not to Display the Expiration Date for OMB Approval.....	24
18. Exception to the Certification Statement.....	24

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, Section 664(e)
- Appendix B Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, Section 664(a)
- Appendix C *Federal Register* Notice
- Appendix D Advance Mailing (Letter and Brochure) for Parent, Math/Language Arts Teacher, Principal, and School Program Respondent
- Appendix E Consent Form from Districts Requiring Active Consent of Parents
- Appendix F Thank You Letters for Parent, Student, Math/Language Arts Teacher, Principal, and School Program Respondent
- Appendix G Documentation of Consent/Assent for Parent and Student
- Appendix H Mathematica Confidentiality Pledge
- Appendix I School Characteristics Survey Instrument (Principal)
- Appendix J Math or Language Arts Teacher Survey Instrument
- Appendix K School Program Survey Instrument (Special Education Teacher)
- Appendix L Baseline Parent Survey Instrument
- Appendix L Baseline Student Survey Instrument
- Appendix M Variables Measuring Student Characteristics, School Resources and Student Experiences, and Perceived Barriers

TABLES

A.1.	NLTS 2010 Phase I Data Collection Plan.....	3
A.2.	Key Academic, Social, and Economic Outcomes for NLTS 2012.....	9
A.3.	Baseline Data Collection Summary by Instrument.....	15
A.4.	2012 Burden Associated with Baseline Data Collection Activities to Be Completed.....	19
A.5.	Characteristics, School Programs, and School Outcomes at Baseline for Students with an IEP by Age Group.....	21
A.6.	Characteristics, School Programs, Outcomes, and Perceived Challenges at Baseline of Students with an IEP and Students with No IEP.....	22
A.7.	Characteristics, School Experiences, and Outcomes of Students with an IEP in 1987, 2001, and 2010.....	23
A.8.	NLTS Timeline for Data Collection and Reporting.....	24

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) is requesting Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for baseline data collection as part of the National Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS) 2012, Phase I. NLTS 2012 is a longitudinal study focused on the educational experiences and transition from school of youth with disabilities between the ages of 13 and 21.

The main objectives of the study are to describe the background, secondary school, transition, postsecondary experiences, and outcomes of youth who currently have an individualized education plan (IEP) (and therefore receive special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)). The study will compare this group with three other groups: (1) youth who have no identified disability, (2) youth who do not have an IEP but who have a condition that qualifies them for accommodation under Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and (3) similar cohorts of youth with an IEP who were studied in the past.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study will obtain information on three broad areas important for understanding the experiences of transition-age youth: (1) the characteristics of youth and their families; (2) the experiences of youth in high school (including their academic program and the services they receive to support acquisition of academic proficiencies as well as transition); and (3) youth outcomes (high school completion status, access to postsecondary education and employment, persistence in postsecondary education and employment, independent living and integration into the community, and access to and use of services to support positive outcomes). NLTS 2012 will address the following research questions under the three broad objectives:

Describe Transition-Age Students with an IEP

1. What are the personal, family, and school characteristics of this group?
2. What are their courses of study, services and accommodations to support learning, and preparation for transition? What barriers and challenges do they encounter?
3. What are the key academic, social, and economic outcomes in school and after leaving school for youth with disabilities?
4. How do services, courses of study, barriers, and outcomes vary for subgroups defined by the nature of the youth's disability, age, sex, race/ethnicity or characteristics of the student's school or community?
5. How do academic, social, and economic outcomes for youth with disabilities vary by their course of study and receipt of services and accommodations, accounting for preexisting youth characteristics?

Compare Current Transition-Age Students with an IEP to Their Peers in Prior Cohorts

6. How does receipt of services and accommodations and youth outcomes of the current cohort of special education students differ from those of previous cohorts of special education students?

Compare Transition-Age Students with an IEP to Their Peers Who Do Not Have an IEP

7. What are the characteristics, school and transition experiences, and postsecondary outcomes of youth with plans that provide accommodations under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973?
8. How do characteristics, courses of study, receipt of services and accommodations, and key outcomes for transition-age youth with an IEP differ from *students with Section 504 plans* and from *students with no Section 504 Plan and no IEP*?

In NLTS 2012 Phase I, a sample of school districts and nationally representative sample of students will be selected and recruited for the study, and baseline data collection and first follow-up data collection will be completed. ED has not finalized the plan for Phase II. This Supporting Statement requests OMB clearance for securing consent and assent of students and their parents for participation in the study and conducting the baseline data collection. The next section provides an overview of Phase I of NLTS 2012.

OVERVIEW

The study will provide policymakers and educators with critical information that is not available from other sources. The study will provide up-to-date information on the barriers and challenges youth with disabilities encounter during and after high school; the services and support they receive to help them overcome these barriers from their families, community service providers, secondary and postsecondary schools, and employers; and the extent to which youth make a successful transition to postsecondary education, employment, and independent living. The study will examine these issues from multiple perspectives, including those of school staff, parents, and the youth themselves. By comparing the experiences of a current cohort to those of previous cohorts, the study will be able to describe changes in the composition of students with disabilities over time as well as changes in their school experiences and outcomes.

A nationally representative sample of 15,000 students who are between the ages of 13 and 21 in December 2011 and enrolled in public school districts with grades 7–12 will be selected and recruited in two stages. The study team will first select and recruit a nationally representative sample of approximately 500 local education agencies (school districts, charter schools, and special schools). Using student lists provided by participating districts, the team will sample and recruit students. The student sample is designed to provide precision for describing all IEP students and all students with no IEP, as well as for important subgroups, including each of the 12 IDEA disability categories in which transition-age students are served and students who have a Section 504 plan but do not have an IEP.

The first wave of data collection will begin in January 2012 and the second in January 2014, when sample members will be between 13 and 21 years old and 15 and 23 years old, respectively. Table A.1 summarizes the Phase I data collection design.

Table A.1. NLTS 2010 Phase I Data Collection Plan

Respondent	Mode	Timeline	Key Data
Parents	Telephone survey	Spring 2012	Characteristics of youth and educational expectations for child, involvement in transition planning
Students	Telephone survey (all) Academic assessment (16 and older)	Spring 2012	Experiences and perceptions of school career and educational expectations, engagement in school, community, self-determination and work Assess academic skills
Student's School Principal	Web survey with telephone follow-up	Spring 2012	Policies, programs, staffing, and resources at student's school
Student's Math or Language Arts Teacher	Web survey with telephone follow-up	Spring 2012	Class and teacher characteristics, instructional practices, services supports and accommodations, student engagement
Student's Special Education Teacher	Web survey with telephone follow-up (students with IEP)	Spring 2012	School program and supports for students with IEP
Student School Information	School records	Winter 2012	Student characteristics
Parent	Telephone survey	Spring 2014	Youth's experiences in school and postsecondary
Student	Telephone survey (all) Academic assessment (16 and older)	Spring 2014 Spring 2014 (if not done in Spring 2012)	Youth's experiences in school and postsecondary Academic skills
Student's Special Education Teacher	Telephone survey	Spring 2014	School program and supports for students with IEP
Student School Information	School records	Spring 2014	Attendance, transcripts

The study design and data collections for NLTS 2012 Phase I are similar to prior longitudinal studies of students with disabilities in order to address the third broad objective of comparing the characteristics, experiences, and outcomes of students with an IEP over time. However, ED seeks to improve on these prior studies in three important ways: (1) by using innovative methods of securing parental consent for youth participation to increase rates of sample participation, (2) by including students with no IEP (both students who have a condition that qualifies them for a Section 504 plan and students with no identified disability), and (3) by seeking more information on student barriers and activities that support transition.

As noted, this Supporting Statement requests OMB clearance to obtain parental consent and student assent to participate in the study, and to collect baseline data. OMB has approved a prior request to select and recruit districts and acquire lists of students for selecting the student sample (OMB 1850-0882). A future submission will request clearance for conducting first follow-up data collection.

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Circumstances Necessitating Collection of Information

More than 2.7 million youth with disabilities between the ages of 13 and 21 receive special education services funded under Part B of IDEA. In addition to the challenges all youth encounter as they leave high school and become young adults, this group sometimes faces barriers related to health, social isolation, service needs, and access to supports.

The 2004 authorization of IDEA was signed into law (P.L. 108-446) on December 3, 2004. Section 664(e) of IDEA 2004 authorizes studies and evaluations of transitional services and results, including postsecondary placement and employment, for individuals with disabilities identified for services under IDEA (Appendix A). Section 664(a) of IDEA 2004 instructs the Secretary of Education to delegate responsibility for such studies to the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) (Appendix B). The findings from this study will complement those from other IES studies initiated under Section 664 of IDEA 2004 as well as previous studies supported by ED. The study will provide critical information on the characteristics of youth receiving special education services under IDEA, their courses of study, the transition and other services and accommodations they receive, the barriers and challenges they face, and their postsecondary education and employment outcomes. Findings will help to address a national goal of significantly increasing the number of students entering and completing postsecondary education.

In addition to describing a current cohort of transition-age students receiving special education, the study will achieve three other objectives: (1) It will provide the only available information specifically on the characteristics, transition experiences, and outcomes of students with Section 504 plans. (2) Information on a national probability sample of transition-age students without disabilities from the same school districts as the special education student sample will provide a benchmark for assessing national progress in meeting the academic and other needs of all students, and a base of information for better understanding the pathways youth follow as they move from high school to young adulthood. (3) The comparisons between a current cohort of special education students and a prior cohort who were transition-age in 2001 provide a basis for assessing how the experiences and outcomes of youth with disabilities are changing, gauging the effectiveness of efforts over the last decade to ensure that all students have access to a rigorous academic program, and developing new programs and policies to support national goals.

A major challenge in developing policies and improving practice to assist transition-age youth is securing reliable and complete information on their diverse needs, school experiences, and postsecondary paths. The primary data sources to date have been the longitudinal surveys of special education students funded by ED, the NLTS and NLTS2.² The current study will focus on a new cohort of special education students to assess their needs and determine how much

² NLTS 2012 will compare students attending school in fall 2012 with similar-age students with IEPs attending school in 1985 (NLTS) and 2000 (NLTS2). However, data collected for NLTS were collected under a grant and ED does not own or have access to these data. Therefore, comparisons between NLTS 2012 and NLTS will be limited to measures presented in published NLTS reports. For this reason, our discussion of cross-cohort comparisons focuses on the NLTS 2012 to NLTS2 comparisons.

progress has been made addressing them. While the focus of the study will be similar in some respects to NLTS2, the study will also address new policy priorities.

The 2001 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was intended to improve the education of disadvantaged students, including those with disabilities, by holding districts accountable for their academic proficiency. The 2004 amendments to IDEA continued the emphasis on access to the general curriculum and accountability standards for students with disabilities. The IDEA amendments were part of a broader disability policy reform effort to support independent living and employment, reflecting the intent of the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act, including implementation of the 1999 Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act and new disability provisions in the Workforce Investment Act. The emphasis these policies place on preparing students for postsecondary education and employment has heightened the interest in understanding and addressing the array of barriers students face as they leave high school and consider various educational and career options. New data are needed to understand the challenges youth encounter as they prepare for postsecondary education and careers. The study will examine the school experiences and outcomes of special education students and how they are changing. The study will allow federal and state policymakers to gauge progress in meeting the goals of NCLB and IDEA and the needs of transition-age youth with disabilities, and it will inform their efforts to improve programs and services. It will also inform the efforts of special educators and other service providers charged with assisting out-of-school youth with disabilities, as well as youth and their parents, to understand needs and improve practices.

2. How, by Whom, and for What Purpose the Information Is to Be Used

The information will be collected by Mathematica Policy Research and its subcontractor Decision Information Resources (DIR), and analyzed by Mathematica and its subcontractor the Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota, under contract with ED (contract number ED-IES-10-C-0073). Below we first describe how the baseline data summarized in Table A.1 will be collected and then describe how, by whom, and for what purpose it will be used.

a. Baseline Data Collection Overview

Parent/Student Consent and Assent and Baseline Interviews

All of the baseline data collection will be completed between January and June 2012 (spring 2012). As the first step in data collection, Mathematica will obtain oral, digitally recorded consent by telephone from parents and, depending on their age, assent or consent from the students. A script will be read (Appendix G), and the reading and consent (or refusal of consent) will be digitally recorded. Written documentation of the oral consent will be sent to participants for their records. Parents or students will be able to change their minds about participation after they examine the written document or at any time during the study. If a district's research procedures do not allow digitally recorded oral consent and they require written parental consent, we will work out with the district a procedure for accomplishing this. We anticipate that the process will include (1) mailing a description of the study and consent form to the parents, (2)

contacting the parent by telephone to explain the study and answer any questions the parent may have, and (3) receipt of the signed consent form via mail from the parent.

The parent interview (Appendix L) is expected to take 40 minutes, and the student interview (Appendix L) is expected to take about 30 minutes. When agreeable to the parent and student, the parent and student interviews will be conducted in succession during a single session.

All questions will be designed to be answered by persons with disabilities. Questions will avoid high-frequency sounds, offer simple probes if the respondent does not understand the main questions, and accept ranges if exact response categories are unknown. Interviewers will assess the respondent's emotional and physical state to offer breaks if necessary. If a student's disability prohibits self-response, interviewers will ask the parent or guardian to proxy for nonsubjective questions.

Parents will be asked to provide information about the student's disability profile, services related to a disability, expectations for the student in the future, barriers or challenges the student faces, and household characteristics. Youth will be asked about their experiences in and out of school (including classroom engagement, paid employment, and extracurricular activities), as well as their goals and expectations for their future. Both youth who have an IEP and their parents will be asked about their involvement in the IEP process, as well as questions to gather contact information for the next round of data collection in 2014. All students will be asked to complete a brief scale based on the ARC Self-Determination Scale and the Adolescent Self-Determination Assessment. Self-determination refers to the conscious exercise of intention and choice. People who are self determined engage in goal-directed, self-regulated, autonomous behavior. A growing literature has 1) established that students with intellectual disability, learning disabilities, emotional and behavioral disabilities, and autism are less self determined than their non-disabled peers, 2) demonstrated that instruction can promote self-determination, and 3) revealed associations between higher levels of self-determination and more positive outcomes for students in the disability groups with low self-determination. By including the planned measure of self-determination, NLTS 2012 will build on work begun with NLTS2 to build a base of information to better understand the relationship of self-determination and youth outcomes.

We considered completing the student survey as part of the in-person session at which the direct assessment is conducted, but we do not recommend this approach. We believe it is less burdensome and more efficient to complete the student survey by telephone at the time we obtain consent and complete the parent survey. Our reasoning is that (1) the in-person assessments can take a class period or more for many students and, like schools and parents, we want the students to miss as little class time as possible; (2) because the assessment will only be given to students when they are 16 years or older, we will not be able to interview the entire sample at baseline if the interview is linked to the academic assessment; and (3) some students who try the student interview may need assistance from an adult in responding to some questions, and the parent is a more appropriate person for this role given the nature of some of the questions. However, if we have not completed the student interview by phone when the in-person assessment is being administered, we will either ask the student to complete the interview after completing the assessment if time permits or set up an appointment to contact the youth to complete the interview. Information relating to appointments would then be immediately transferred to the telephone center to log the appointment in the electronic call management system.

School Staff Baseline Surveys

Baseline surveys will be conducted with the principal or a designee of the sample member's school, the sample member's math or language arts teacher, and, if the student has an IEP, a special education teacher or other person who is most familiar with the student's overall program. Each of these school staff will be asked to complete a web survey, with telephone follow-up of respondents who do not complete the self-administered web survey. Respondents will also be offered the option of completing a hard copy, which is mailed or faxed. In each of these school staff surveys, the elements of informed consent will be presented upon log-in to the web survey (introduction). Their consent to participate will be captured electronically by having the respondent respond to a yes/no question, confirming their intent. Those completing the instrument by fax or mail will demonstrate passive consent by returning their completed instrument and those completing by phone will provide verbal consent prior to administration.

- The **School Characteristics Survey** (completed by the principal or designee) will furnish data on school programs, policies, and resources. The survey of principals will focus on the characteristics of the school and school environment. (Appendix I)
- The **Mathematics/Language Arts Teacher Survey** (Mathematica will randomly select whether the math or language arts teacher will respond; if the selected teacher does not respond, the other will be asked to substitute.) The survey will focus on classroom characteristics; instructional practices; services, supports, and accommodations; school engagement and parent communications; and teacher characteristics. (Appendix J)
- In the **School Program Survey**, the special education teacher most familiar with the sample member's program will provide additional information about the student's school program; supports and accommodations; barriers the student may face in pursuit of postsecondary education, competitive employment, or independent living; and transition services provided. (Appendix K)
- In addition to the surveys with school staff, the baseline data collection effort will also include acquisition of **school records** for each selected student. At the start of the study, schools or districts will be asked to provide for each sample member (1) the student's free or reduced-price lunch status, (2) whether the student receives instruction as an English language learner, and (3) whether the student has received out-of-school suspension or been expelled in the current school year.

After the 2011–2012 school year, we will request transcripts and attendance information for students who have completed school, are not expected to return, or who have reported in the parent or student interview that they have left school. We anticipate that some sample members will graduate or drop out between the point of sample selection in fall 2011 and the end of the 2011–2012 school year. At the first follow-up interview (and each subsequent round of follow-up data collection), transcripts, performance on state-mandated tests, and attendance information will be requested for students who have left school since the prior round of data collection.

Direct Assessment of Students

Student's academic proficiencies and ability to act on their own behalf in a self-determined way are major student outcomes and may condition the opportunities youth will have for postsecondary education, employment, community involvement, and independent living. To better understand academic proficiency of students with and without disabilities and to examine trends over time in the average proficiencies of youth with disabilities, the study will conduct direct assessments of students' academic proficiencies. We considered using state assessments for this purpose, but based on advice from the study's technical work group, we concluded that direct assessment was necessary to ensure consistent measurement across all sample members and comparability with NLTS2.

The in-person, direct assessments will be conducted by either school psychologists or professionally trained staff from Mathematica, depending on what can be arranged through the school district. Sample members who are 16 to 21 years old at baseline will be asked to complete the direct assessment in spring 2012. Direct assessment of sample members who are 13 to 15 years old at baseline will be conducted at the first follow-up in spring 2014 when most will be 16 to 17 years old. We will conduct the assessment primarily on school campuses, but we will remain open to using other public spaces (such as libraries, community centers) as alternatives. The Woodcock-Johnson III Normative Update will be used to allow comparison with NLTS2. Students who would not be able to participate in such an academic assessment will receive the Learning Characteristics Inventory, completed as part of their special education teacher's survey (approximately 10 percent of the sample).

We have not included completion of the Learning Characteristics Inventory by the teachers of students unable to complete the Woodcock-Johnson III Normative Update, or completion of Woodcock-Johnson III Normative Update in our estimate of burden as these are all measures of student proficiency or aptitude, and therefore, not required by OMB to be part of the burden estimates.

b. How the Information Will Be Used

NLTS 2012 will provide up-to-date information on the characteristics, transition experiences, and transition outcomes of youth with disabilities that will help policymakers, educators, and parents improve policy and education practice to support successful outcomes. It will describe the secondary and postsecondary trajectories of youth with IEPs and how they differ from those of youth with Section 504 plans and youth with no identified disability. The study will inform policy, practice, and future research by examining the needs of various subgroups of youth with disabilities; how those needs are being addressed by schools and other organizations; barriers perceived by youth, parents, and school staff; and how youth outcomes are related to specific competencies, school experiences, and the services and supports youth receive. The study will also examine the extent to which school experiences and outcomes are changing in ways consistent with the goals of IDEA. In addition to supporting the specific analyses planned as part of NLTS 2012 Phase I, the data will be made available to other researchers and practitioners through well-documented restricted use files.

Table A.2 summarizes the main *youth outcomes* that will be captured in the NLTS 2012 data. Appendix Tables M.1, M.2, and M.3 list the main variables relating to *student characteristics, school resources and experiences, and perceived barriers*.

Table A.2. Key Academic, Social, and Economic Outcomes for NLTS 2012

Outcome for Youth	Data Source
Academic Skills and School Engagement	
Math and language arts competencies	Direct Assessment
Scores on state academic assessments	Transcript
Grade point average	Transcript
Whether math/language arts class is at, above, or below grade level	Math/LEA Teacher Survey
High school credits by subject and by level for math	Transcript
Student effort and participation in class	Math/LEA Teacher Survey
Typical homework hours per week	Youth
Repeating current grade level*	Parent
Ever expelled; suspended out of school*	Parent
Out-of-school suspension*	Parent
School attendance	Transcript, Youth
Social Skills, Self-Determination Skills, and Problem Behaviors	
Social Skills Improvement System subscales (communication, engagement, responsibility, externalizing)	Youth
Self-Determination Scales (autonomous function, psychological empowerment, self realization)	Youth
Takes part in social activities (school, out-of-school group, volunteer)	Youth
Days/week get together with friends	Youth
Means of communicating with friends (phone, text, IM, email, social media)	Youth
High School Completion	
Whether obtained diploma and type (regular diploma, GED, certificate of completion)*	Youth, Parent
Postsecondary Education Enrollment	
Enrollment by type of program (two-year, four-year, vocational certificate and degree completion by type of credential)*	Youth, Parent
Employment	
Unpaid or school-sponsored employment	Youth
Paid employment	Youth
Wages	Youth
Hours	Youth
Type of job	Youth
Fired from a job in last two years	Youth
Job search activities	Youth
Independence	
Living arrangement (independent living, with family members, supervised setting)	Youth, Parent
Has health insurance	Parent
Has an allowance or money can spend; has checking/savings accounts; credit/debit card in name; gets bills in own name	Youth
Registered to vote	Youth
Has/expects to get driver's license	Youth, Parent

* These data will be verified against the school records.

The NLTS 2012 study team will undertake three main types of analyses: (1) comparisons among subgroups, (2) description and decomposition of intercohort trends, (3) and identification of barriers and facilitators. We briefly describe these three kinds of analyses below. Section A.16 contains additional detail on the kinds of tabulations planned.

Subgroup Comparisons

The study will examine and compare the needs, barriers, experiences, and outcomes of various groups of students. First, to provide a high-level overview, the study will compare youth with an IEP with those with Section 504 plans as well as those with no identified disability. The inclusion of the latter two groups in the NLTS 2012 study sample is a significant enhancement relative to NLTS and NLTS2. Second, like the previous NLTS studies, the NLTS 2012 analysis will compare subgroups of youth with an IEP. The subgroups will include ones defined by the federal disability categories; the youth's age, gender, race/ethnicity, and family income; and characteristics of the school and district the youth attends.

The study will contrast these groups in several ways. For example, the analysis of background characteristics will include comparisons of the groups' living arrangements, household composition, parent education and employment, household income, receipt of government benefits, access to health coverage, and functional abilities. The study will also compare the outcomes of these groups, including their math and language arts test scores, social skills, self-determination, enrollment in and completion of postsecondary education, employment, and various dimensions of independence. The analysis will include statistical tests that measure the extent to which observed intergroup differences are statistically significant. (Table A.5 and A.6 in Section A.16 illustrate how the data will be displayed).

Description and Decomposition of Intercohort Trends

By combining the NLTS 2012 data with data from NLTS and NLTS2, the study will examine trends over time in the characteristics, school experiences, and outcomes of students with an IEP. The findings will increase understanding of the changing background, needs, and achievements of students with an IEP. For example, the findings will shed light on intercohort changes in family resources; the expectations of parents for their transition-age youth; and the academic achievement and functional abilities of youth as well as their social interactions with peers, postsecondary enrollment, and employment rates. The study will also examine the extent to which observed trends in outcomes appear to be partly attributable to intercohort changes in the background and characteristics of youth or their school experiences.

Identification of Barriers and Facilitators

Key to improving the outcomes of youth with disabilities is to understand both the barriers they face and the factors associated with success in education, jobs, and independent living. The barriers (or challenges) can include anything that may impede a youth's successful transition to

independent living as an adult. Some barriers pertain directly to the conditions that necessitate special education services, whereas others relate to broader social or family characteristics (such as household income or parental expectations for their child) and access to appropriate services, supports, and sources of information about opportunities. “Facilitators” are factors associated with success; they are often the flip side of barriers. For example, facilitators may include high levels of intellectual and social competencies, ambitious aspirations, and self-determination skills.

The data will support two different kinds of analyses of barriers and facilitators. First, drawing on the surveys, the study will describe transition challenges perceived by parents, youth, and school staff. The study will examine perceptions about the challenges youth face in several areas, including (1) developing post-high school plans, (2) selecting, applying to, enrolling in, and financing postsecondary education, (3) identifying and obtaining jobs, (4) engaging in social and recreational activities, and (5) living independently. Since parents, teachers, and youth may view these challenges differently, the study will examine and contrast the challenges described by each of these respondent groups.

Second, in addition to examining perceptions of challenges, the study will also examine the extent to which various factors are associated with negative or positive outcomes. After conducting both the baseline and first follow-up surveys, the study team will examine the relationship between (a) youth baseline competencies, background characteristics, expectations for the future, and high school experiences and (b) various outcomes, including postsecondary enrollment, employment and earnings, and the extent to which youth are living independently.

By identifying predictors of postsecondary outcomes, this analysis can help educators gauge which students are more or less likely to achieve specific outcomes. While the analysis cannot ascertain the causes of outcomes, it can inform hypotheses and future research about the kinds of efforts that might benefit youth. For example, gauging the extent to which specific competencies measured in high school are predictors of outcomes may shed light on the value of cultivating those skills.

3. Use of Technology to Reduce Burden

The study will use a combination of mechanical and electronic technology to collect data. For each data collection task, the study team has selected the form of technology that will provide reliable information while minimizing respondent burden. This submission focuses primarily on protocols for obtaining consent and collecting data from parents, students, and school staff. Information technology will be heavily used in data collection tasks. Examples include the following:

- Electronic **sample management** database to track receipt of parental consent to efficiently monitor sample and ensure timely initiation of subsequent data collection activities. This database will also identify where more than one student attends a given school, ensuring only one principal survey is released.
- Parent and student surveys will use **computer-assisted telephone interviewing** and **digital recording** to capture parent consent and student assent (or consent) conveyed

verbally over the telephone. Written documentation of the consent will be sent to participants for their records (Appendix G).

- Teachers and principals will participate in their surveys online using **web-based surveys**.
- The study will have a **website**, hosted by IES, where interested parties can obtain more information. The study has a **toll-free number**, along with an **email address**, both of which are hosted by Mathematica. Staff from Mathematica will field inquiries to the toll-free number and study email account on a flow basis across the life of the study.
- Acquisition of **school records data** pertaining to students participating in the study will be acquired in electronic format whenever possible to reduce burden on schools for processing or delivering such files.

4. Efforts to Avoid Duplication of Effort

Because the long-term follow-up for the NLTS2 (which followed a sample of students between 13 and 16 years of age who had IEPs in December 2001) ended in 2009, NLTS 2012 will be the only comprehensive source of data on students who are ages 13 to 21 and have IEPs in December 2011 that includes information collected from youth, their parents, and their teachers. It will also be the only source of information on a national probability sample of youth with and without disabilities in the same school districts.

5. Methods of Minimizing Burden on Small Entities

Some of the districts and schools from which the study team will collect information are small entities. The total district sample includes approximately 200 small districts in the base sample and 200 in the reserve sample or 400 total. The sample also includes approximately 60 charter school LEAs for 460 small entities. While we do not expect to collect data from all of them, we have added them all to the IC Data Form Part 2. Building on the experience of NLTS2 and High School Longitudinal Study 2009 (HSL:2009), NLTS 2012 has been designed with an eye to minimizing the burden on small entities both by making the requests for data on individual students efficient and by distributing the student sample across schools in a manner designed to keep the burden on individual schools to the minimum necessary. In contrast to HSL:2009 in which schools are the first stage of sample selection, the first stage sampling unit in NLTS 2012 will be the school district or, in the case of districts having fewer than 100 students with an IEP, groups of districts. Furthermore, we estimate that the student sample of 15,000 will be attending approximately 7,500 schools. We believe the small number of students per school will minimize burden on any individual school and increase the likelihood districts and school staff will agree to participate in the study. This approach also reduces overall burden of the study to the extent that using districts rather than schools as the first-stage sampling unit reduces the effects of clustering (and thereby improves precision).

Our strategy to exclude school districts and charter school agencies with fewer than 30 students with IEPs will exclude approximately 3 percent of students with IEPs. Stratifying the districts attended by the remaining 97 percent of students with IEPs based on district size, and selecting students from small districts at a lower rate and students from large districts at a

slightly higher one will further reduce burden on small districts while still including many rural districts with modest numbers of students with IEPs.

Teacher and principal surveys take 30 minutes each, on average. To minimize burden, we will ask teachers and principals to complete their questionnaires after school hours; they will therefore be compensated for their time. Because the data collections are web based, respondents can complete the questionnaire at a time and place that is convenient. To avoid disrupting school routines, the study team will not conduct the student interviews in school. Student assessments will be scheduled for times when the student is not in class. Mathematica staff will make every effort to schedule their visits at the most convenient times of the day and minimize burden on the school by clustering the student assessments as much as possible within the school day.

6. Consequences of Not Collecting Data

The data collection described in this submission is essential to documenting, on a nationally representative scale, the experiences of youth as they transition from school to adulthood. This includes important details on the barriers they face with respect to pursuit of postsecondary education, competitive employment, and independent living. In addition, this study facilitates a comparison between the experiences of youth with and without disabilities on these important measures and outcomes over time.

Understanding the barriers that youth face and the ways service providers (including schools, community organizations, and postsecondary schools) and employers deal with them can inform efforts to improve special education services and help youth make successful transitions to adulthood. This study also provides important information about the prevalence and types of programs in place to support successful outcomes.

These data are essential for policymakers, as the analysis of practices, programs, and outcomes provides critical data used to shape education policy in the future and to increase the use of practices that can lead to successful outcomes for all students, especially those with disabilities. Improving postsecondary and employment outcomes for transition-age youth with disabilities is an important policy objective for many reasons. In addition to improving the quality of life of these youth and their families, it can reduce the levels of dependency on government-funded programs like Supplemental Security Income.

7. Special Circumstances

There are no special circumstances involved with baseline data collection activities for NLTS 2012.

8. Federal Register Announcement and Consultation

a. Federal Register Announcement

A 60-day notice to solicit public comments was published in the *Federal Register*, Volume 76, page 43995 on July 22, 2011. A copy of the notice is in Appendix C. We received public comment from 1 entity, the Michigan Department of Education, and

responded by agreeing with their statements about the importance of the study beyond Indicator 14 and assuring them that the burden for the districts with regard to compiling student records would not be great.

b. Consultations Outside the Agency

During preparation of the study design and data collection plan for this evaluation, ED has sought professional counsel from a number of people. The following are the key study staff at Mathematica and the Institute on Community Integration:

<p>John Burghardt, Ph.D. Project director and coprincipal investigator JBurghardt@mathematica-mpr.com 609-275-2395</p>	<p>David Johnson, Ph.D. Coprincipal investigator and task leader, analysis plan and reports johns006@umn.edu 612-624-1062</p>
<p>Joshua Haimson, Ph.D. Deputy project director and task leader, data analysis JHaimson@mathematica-mpr.com 609-275-2208</p>	<p>Anne B. Ciemnecki, M.A. Survey director ACiemnecki@mathematica-mpr.com 609-275-2323</p>
<p>Martha Thurlow, Ph.D. Task leader, youth assessment analysis tasks thurl001@umn.edu 612-624-4826</p>	<p>Francis Potter, Ph.D. Task leader, sample selection FPotter@mathematica-mpr.com 609-936-2799</p>
<p>Holly Matulewicz, M.A. Deputy Survey Director hmatulewicz@mathematica-mpr.com 617-674-8362</p>	<p>Eric Zeidman, Ed.M. Task leader, district recruitment EZeidman@mathematica-mpr.com 609-936-2784</p>

In addition, ED has consulted with six researchers and two local school district administrators who make up the project’s Technical Working Group. The group met for the first of four times in February 2011.

<p>Brian Cobb Interim Associate Director College of Applied Human Sciences School of Education, Room 105J Colorado State University Fort Collins, CO 80523-1588 R.Brian.Cobb@ColoState.EDU 970-491-6835</p>	<p>Barbara Altman Consultant Retired Special Assistant on Disability Statistics Office of the Director National Center for Health Statistics, CDC 14608 Melinda Lane Rockville, MD 20853 b.altman@verizon.net</p>
<p>Richard Luecking President, Transcen 451 Hungerford Drive, Suite 700 Rockville, MD 20850 rluecking@transcen.org 301-424-2002 ext. 230</p>	<p>Suzanne Lane School of Education University of Pittsburgh 5916 Wesley W. Posvar Hall Pittsburgh, PA 15260 sl@pitt.edu 412-648-7095</p>
<p>Tom Bailey Community College Research Center Teachers College, Columbia University 525 West 120th Street 439 Thorndike Hall, Box 174 New York, NY 10027 ccrc@columbia.edu 212-678-3091</p>	<p>Judy Elliott, Ph.D. Chief Academic Officer Los Angeles Unified School District 333 South Beaudry Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90017 judy.elliott@lausd.net 213-241-1000</p>
<p>Kalman Rupp Economist Division of Policy Evaluation Office of Research, Evaluation, and Statistics Social Security Administration kalman.rupp@ssa.gov 202-358-6216</p>	<p>Markay Winston Director of Student Services Cincinnati Public School District P.O. Box 5381, 2651 Burnet Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45219 winstom@cps-k12.org 513-363-0300</p>

c. Unresolved Issues

There are no unresolved issues.

9. Payment or Gift to Respondents

The study design has incorporated a monetary incentive for all survey respondents, based on the current literature in this field, as well as the amount of anticipated burden each respondent will experience. Table A.3 summarizes the anticipated time required by each type of survey respondent and proposed incentives for the respondents to the spring 2012 baseline data collection for NLTS 2012. A detailed discussion of the rationale for the incentive offered to each respondent group follows.

Table A.3. Baseline Data Collection Summary by Instrument

<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Interview Length</i>	<i>Mode of Interview</i>	<i>Incentive</i>
Principal	30 minutes	Self-administered: web (option of fax or phone)	\$25
Math or language arts teacher	30 minutes	Self-administered: web (option of fax or phone)	\$25 per student
Special education teacher	30 minutes	Self-administered: web (option of fax or phone)	\$25 per student
Parent (interview)/ contact consent	40 minutes	Telephone	\$20
Youth (Interview)	30 minutes	Telephone	\$10 via prepaid card

Principals. We believe it is very important to offer a small incentive (\$25) to the principal or the person he or she designates to complete the school characteristics questionnaire for NLTS 2012. This survey will take approximately 30 minutes and will ask principals to describe resources, programs, and policies of the school. It is vitally important that we obtain an adequate response from principals because the survey will provide both school context data and the means by which we will estimate students' "access" to various programs and resources, not simply their participation. Providing a token of thanks to principals' in appreciation for the their time spent completing the survey can be justified for several reasons.

First, although some ED-sponsored principal surveys have not offered any incentive payment to respondents, those surveys have differed from this one. For example, incentives for completion of a principal survey was not necessary in some studies where the study provided other benefits to participating schools. In some cases that benefit consisted of a "school" payment to offset study burden, a study-provided intervention (such as a promising curriculum or induction program), or a strong presence of the study team in the school (for example, a

significant set of participating students, classroom observation, conducting professional development). Those components of the study could affect the principal's motivation to complete the survey either extrinsically (the school is receiving benefits for participation) or intrinsically (principal agreed to participate in larger study and is therefore more likely to fully participate). However, in the case of NLTS 2012, the principal will not have a similar motivation for the following reasons:

- a. The school, as a whole, is not receiving any direct benefit for participation, thus extrinsic motivation is not being provided.
- b. The prescriptive sample design required to obtain appropriate counts in each of the disability categories makes it possible that a principal may only have one or two sampled students in their school who have been selected to participate in the study; that level of exposure to the study is unlikely to provide sufficient extrinsic motivation to complete the survey.
- c. There will be no or very limited face-to-face contact with members of the study team that could serve to provide some social motivation for completing the survey. Most of the NLTS 2012 surveys will be completed via the web or telephone.
- d. There is no separate stage in which the principals agree to participate in the study (the youth is the targeted sample); therefore, we cannot count on principals' intrinsic motivation to complete the survey.

Second, IES does have a history of providing incentives to principals in cases where the principal/school is not tied in a meaningful way to the study. Some relevant examples include the following:

1. **Impact of Charter School Strategies** (1850-0799, NOA 3/10/06): paid \$10 for a 15-minute survey. The circumstances are similar to those in NLTS 2012 in that no intervention or treatment was provided to the schools. In addition to the 37 charter schools in the study sample that *did* have significant contact with the evaluation team, the survey included the principals of hundreds of traditional public schools (wherever the control group went) as well as the other 500+ charter middle schools in the country. None of the latter two groups had any connection to the study or had any benefit from participating by completing a survey.
2. **Impact Evaluation of the DC School Choice Program** (1850-0800, NOA 4/15/05 and 12/22/08): This was a 12-minute hard copy survey that went to principals of all private and public schools in DC and paid them \$10 for completion. None of them were connected to the study, although about 66 of the 102 private schools were receiving vouchers from participating students. Due to poor response rates, OMB approved increasing the incentive to \$20 in 2008.

Third, given the budget and staffing shortages many schools face, this payment will partially compensate participating school leaders for their time spent completing the survey, which will almost certainly be done outside regular school hours. This small expression of appreciation for

their time and effort can only serve to provide a positive experience in working with ED, which may result in more cooperation with future studies.

Math or Language Arts Teacher Survey. Each sample member's math or language arts teacher will be asked to complete a web survey with telephone follow-up about that student's math or language arts class (program of study, participation in class, supports, and instructional strategy). Given that the sample is not clustered by school, we anticipate that most teachers will be asked to respond for one student; however, we will offer an incentive of \$25 for each student for whom the teacher completes a questionnaire.

School Program Survey (for the special education teacher of sample members who have an IEP). The special education teacher most familiar with the student's overall program will be asked to complete the school program survey, which covers the characteristics of the student's instructional programs, services, supports and accommodations, and transition planning activities. For the reasons outlined above, we believe it is important to offer an incentive of \$25 per sample member for whom the teacher provides information.

Parent and Youth Data Collection. Ensuring parent and student commitment to the study is of paramount importance. Our first contact will be in one of two ways: (1) when we call parents and students directly for consent and baseline interviewing or (2) when they receive a consent form from the district asking to release contact information to the study team (previously approved, OMB 1850-0882). In either case, we propose to offer incentives for participation in the study to parents (\$20) and students (\$10) to encourage their participation. The parent incentive would be in the form of a check. The student incentive would be in the form of a cash value card worth \$10.

We believe the unique circumstances of NLTS 2012 call for appropriate incentives. First, there is a significant burden on parents because they will in many cases be a proxy for their child, responding to both the student and parent surveys. And second, the study will need to contend with historical concerns about providing researchers with access to students with disabilities. Furthermore, we are proposing to provide incentives to parents and students because substantial incentives are widely considered necessary to maintain sample in longitudinal studies. Laurie and Flynn (2008) review a large number of longitudinal surveys in the United States and Europe. Their summary indicates that incentives are widely used in longitudinal studies in the United States. For example, in 2005–2006, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, Survey of Income and Program Participation, National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, and U.S. Health and Retirement Survey offered adult respondents incentives ranging from \$40 to \$60, with additional incentives in the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth if respondents called in to complete a telephone interview. Laurie and Flynn note that (1) higher incentives tend to produce higher response rates, (2) there is some evidence that effects on wave-to-wave retention are more pronounced than response rates at a particular wave, and (3) there is some, but not consistent, evidence that incentives are most effective with sample members least likely to respond.

10. Confidentiality of the Data

The study team will conduct the parent, youth, principal, and teacher surveys in accordance with all relevant regulations and requirements. These include the Education Sciences Reform Act

of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183, that requires “[all] collection, maintenance, use, and wide dissemination of data by the Institute . . . to conform with the requirements of section 552 of Title 5, United States Code, the confidentiality standards of subsections (c) of this section, and sections 444 and 445 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232 g, 1232h).” These citations refer to the Privacy Act, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment.

In addition, for student information, the project director will ensure that all individually identifiable information about students, their academic achievements, and their families and information with respect to individual schools shall remain confidential in accordance with Section 552a of Title 5, United States Code, the confidentiality standards subsection (c) and

Sections 444 and 445 of the General Education Provision Act. Subsection (c) of Section 183, referenced above, requires the director of IES to “develop and enforce standards designed to protect the confidentiality of persons in the collection, reporting, and publication of data.” The study will also adhere to requirements of subsection (d) of Section 183 prohibiting disclosure of individually identifiable information as well as making the publishing or inappropriate communication of individually identifiable information by employees or staff a felony.

Mathematica and its subcontractors will protect the confidentiality of all information collected for the study and will use it for research purposes only. No information that identifies any study participant will be released. Further, personally identifiable data will not be entered into the analysis file; the analysis data records will contain a numeric identifier only. When reporting the results, data will be presented only in aggregate form so that individuals and institutions cannot be identified. The study team will include a statement to this effect with all requests for data, and the teacher questionnaires will include a reminder about confidentiality protection in compliance with the legislation. When data are collected through telephone interviews, the study team will remind respondents about the confidentiality protections, the voluntary nature of the survey, and their right to refuse to answer individual questions. All members of the study team having access to confidential data will be trained on the importance of confidentiality and data security. All data will be kept in secured locations, and identifiers will be destroyed as soon as they are no longer required.

The following safeguards are employed to carry out confidentiality assurances during the study:

- All employees at Mathematica and its subcontractors sign a confidentiality pledge emphasizing the importance of confidentiality and describing their obligation to it (Appendix H).
- Access to identifying information about sample members is limited to staff members who have direct responsibility for providing and maintaining sample locating information. At the conclusion of the research, these data are destroyed.
- Identifying information is maintained in separate forms and files, which are linked only by sample identification number.

- Access to the file linking sample identification numbers with the respondents' IDs and contact information is limited to a small number of individuals who have a need to know this information.
- Access to the hard-copy documents is strictly limited. Documents are stored in locked files and cabinets. Discarded materials are shredded.
- Computer data files are protected with passwords, and access is limited to specific users. Especially sensitive data are maintained on removable storage devices that are kept physically secure when not in use.

The Privacy Act of 1974 applies to this data collection. Mathematica and its subcontractors will make certain that all surveys are held in strict confidence, as described above, and that in no instance will responses be made available except in tabular form. Under no condition will information be made available to school personnel. District and school staff responsible for assisting Mathematica in the data collection will be fully informed of Mathematica's policies and procedures regarding confidentiality of data.

In addition, the following verbatim language will appear on the parent consent form and other applicable study-related materials:

All information gathered for the study will be kept confidential and will only be used for research purposes. The information collected about this student will be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed or used, in identifiable form, for any other purpose except as required by law (Public Law 107-279, Section 183).

11. Additional Justification for Sensitive Questions

The purpose of the study is to examine the school experiences and outcomes of 13- to 21-year-olds identified as needing special education services and to compare them with a sample of other youth, including some who have Section 504 plans. Therefore, obtaining information about potentially sensitive topics, such as the IEP and Section 504 status of individuals, is central to the study. The study team needs information on IEP and Section 504 status from school districts to ensure that the sample includes adequate numbers of these students. The study team also needs information on students' type of disability to ensure that the sample includes sufficient numbers of students in each disability type or subgroup. The team will request de-identified data for the entire sample frame and collect identifying information only on students selected for the survey sample.

The parent and student surveys will include some questions that may be considered sensitive (such as questions about the functional abilities of youth, their social skills, and their involvement with the criminal justice system). The surveys will not ask for sensitive information that can be gathered from other sources. The study team will adapt many of the questions without modification from other national OMB approved surveys of similar populations such as the NLTS, the Youth Transition Demonstration, and the Short Form 12.

12. Estimates of Hours Burden

Table A.4 describes our assumptions on the total number of responses anticipated, the average hours of burden per respondent, and the total burden hours estimated for baseline data collection.

In total, we estimate the burden of all baseline data collection activities to be 30,800 hours across all respondents.

13. Estimate of Total Annual Cost Burden to Respondents or Recordkeepers

We do not anticipate direct costs to individual district staff members. For the parent and student surveys, it may be possible that some individuals will only be able to complete the telephone survey using cell phones where their plans charge them for each minute used. In such instances, Mathematica interviewers will ask the respondent if there is any other location or landline he or she can be reached on to complete the survey. However, it is not anticipated that there will be many, if any, costs associated with cell phone useage. Most respondents will have plans with unlimited useage or will have free minutes during certain times of the day or on weekends. We can call them back during those times. Others will consider their part of their respondent incentive as reimbursement According to the American Association for Public

Opinion Research (AAPOR), operational report on cellular telephone useage, few organizations have perceived the need to offer both a remuneration and a separate incentive for an interview.³

Table A.4. 2012 Burden Associated with Baseline Data Collection Activities to Be Completed

Activities	Total N Responses ^b	Average Burden Hours per Response	Total Burden Hours
Parent Survey	12,000	.67	8,000
Student Survey	12,000	.50	6,000
Math of Language Arts Teacher Survey	12,000	.50	6,000
School Program Survey (Special Education Teacher)	9,600	.50	4,800
School Characteristics Survey (Principals) ^a	6,000	.50	3,000
Collection of School Records for Student (Administrative Data from School or District)	500	6.00	3,000
Woodcock Johnson III Normative Update Form C—Brief Battery (students)	N/A		
Learning Characteristics Inventory (teachers)	N/A		
Total	52,100		30,800

^aAssumes two students per school, on average.

^bThese numbers reflect an 80% response rate.

14. Estimates of Annualized Cost to the Federal Government

The estimated average annual cost to the federal government for the study—including recruiting districts, designing and administering all collection instruments, processing and analyzing the data, and preparing reports—is \$3,704,797, (the total cost divided by the 5 years of the study). Costs are distributed as follows:

Year 1	2011	\$1,869,149
Year 2	2012	\$7,710,848
Year 3	2013	\$1,416,380
Year 4	2014	\$6,343,809

³ AAPOR Cell Phone Task Force Report, 2010.)New Considerations for New Considerations for Survey ResearchersWhen Planning and Conducting RDD Telephone Surveys in the U.S. With Respondents Reached via Cell Phone Numbers

Year 5	2015	\$1,183,799
Total		\$18,523,985

15. Reasons for Program Changes or Adjustments

There is an overall program change increase of 10,775 to OMB #1850-0882, National Educational Transitional Study, as a result of the burden hours from this phase I collection. This program change is a result of the burden hours being added for Phase I activities of this clearance while the burden hours from the initial submission will be deleted. (The burden from the initial v.1 submission activities will be completed by the time these phase I activities are approved.)

16. Tabulation, Publication Plans, and Time Schedules

The study team will use the data collected at the baseline and first follow-up points to describe the youth and family characteristics; school programs, services, and accommodations for the youth; and youth outcomes. Table A.5 below lists the broad domains in which information will be collected and illustrates how the information will be reported in IES reports on the study.

Table A.5. Characteristics, School Programs, and School Outcomes at Baseline for Students with an IEP by Age Group

	13–15	16–18	19–21	13–21
Youth and Family Characteristics				
Youth characteristics				
Household characteristics				
Disability profiles				
Functional abilities of youth				
Daily living and social skills				
Postsecondary expectations				
School Program, Services, Accommodations				
Education history				
Types of school(s) attended				
School policies, environment				
Courses completed (subject, general education, special education)				
Instructional approach, setting				
Youth classroom participation				
Extra-curricular activities				
Services, supports, accommodations				
IEP development, transition planning, career exploration				
Assistance applying to postsecondary programs and jobs				
Youth Outcomes				
Attendance and engagement				
Grades, test scores				
High school completion				
Postsecondary education, training				

	13-15	16-18	19-21	13-21
Employment and earnings				
Receipt of Social Security Insurance, health insurance, other benefits				
Social adjustment and independence				
Arrests, incarceration				
Unweighted Sample Size				

Basic tabulations of means or distributions of attributes, as appropriate, will be presented for students with an IEP by age at baseline and for all students with an IEP ages 13 to 21. All tabulations will be weighted to reflect individual students' selection probability and nonresponse adjustments. Standard errors of estimates will also be calculated (accounting appropriately for the two-stage and stratified nature of the sample). Because interest centers on the variability of the characteristics, school experiences, and outcomes within and across the federal disability subgroups, the study team will provide similar information for each subgroup.

Tabulations like those shown in Table A.6 will be generated to compare the characteristics, school experiences, outcomes, and perceived barriers faced by students with an IEP and those with no IEP.

Table A.6. Characteristics, School Programs, Outcomes, and Perceived Challenges at Baseline of Students with an IEP and Students with No IEP

	Students with an IEP Group A	Students with a Section 504 Group B	Students with No IEP and No Section 504 Plan Group C	All Students Not Identified for Special Education (Groups B & C Combined)
Youth and Family Characteristics				
Youth characteristics				
Household characteristics				
Disability profiles				
Functional abilities of youth				
Daily living and social skills				
Postsecondary expectations				
School Program, Services, Accommodations				
Education history				
Types of school(s) attended				
School policies, environment				
Courses completed (subject, general education, special education)				
Instructional approach, setting				
Youth classroom participation				
Extra-curricular activities				
Services, supports, accommodations				
IEP development, transition planning, career exploration				
Assistance applying to postsecondary programs and jobs				
Youth Outcomes				
Attendance and engagement				
Grades, test scores				
High school completion				
Postsecondary education, training				
Employment and earnings				
Receipt of Social Security Insurance, health insurance, other benefits				

	Students with an IEP Group A	Students with a Section 504 Group B	Students with No IEP and No Section 504 Plan Group C	All Students Not Identified for Special Education (Groups B & C Combined)
Social adjustment and independence				
Arrests, incarceration				
Perceived Barriers/Challenges Regarding:				
Developing post-high school plans				
Applying to and financing postsecondary education				
Securing jobs				
Engaging in social activities				
Living independently				
Unweighted Sample Size				

Tabulations like those displayed in Table A.7 will be used to compare selected characteristics, school experiences, and outcomes of the cohorts of students identified for special education services in NLTS, NLTS2, and NLTS 2012. NLTS includes a sample of students ages 13 to 21 and who had an IEP in 1987. NLTS2 includes a sample of students ages 13 to 16 and who had an IEP in 2001, and NLTS 2012 will include a sample of students ages 13 to 21 and who have an IEP in fall 2011. The comparisons across these three cohorts will focus on the subset of sample members who were 13 to 16 years old at the point of sample selection in order to eliminate age as a source of between-cohort variations.

Table A.7. Characteristics, School Experiences, and Outcomes of Students with an IEP in 1987, 2001, and 2010

	Students with an IEP Ages 13 to 16 in 1987	Students with an IEP Ages 13 to 16 in 2001	Students with an IEP Ages 13 to 16 in 2011
Youth and Family Characteristics			
Youth characteristics			
Household characteristics			
Disability profiles			
Functional abilities of youth			
Daily living and social skills			
Postsecondary expectations			
School Program, Activities, Services, Accommodations			
Education history			
Types of school(s) attended			
School policies, environment			
Courses completed (subject, general education, special education)			
Instructional approach, setting			
Youth classroom participation			
Extra-curricular activities			

	Students with an IEP Ages 13 to 16 in 1987	Students with an IEP Ages 13 to 16 in 2001	Students with an IEP Ages 13 to 16 in 2011
Services, supports, accommodations			
IEP development, transition planning, career exploration			
Assistance applying to postsecondary programs and jobs			
Youth Outcomes			
Attendance and engagement			
Grades, test scores			
High school completion			
Postsecondary education, training			
Employment and earnings			
Receipt of Social Security Insurance, health insurance, other benefits			
Social adjustment and independence			
Arrests, incarceration			
Unweighted Sample Size			

Because the three NLTS studies differ in sample (student age range) and data collection design (elapsed time between the sample selection and data collection, and so on), isolating cross-cohort samples requires careful consideration of these design features to facilitate the most valid inferences. One concern is that, to compare high school completion between NLTS 2012 and NLTS2 for students sampled at the same ages, we would need to wait at least five years until NLTS 2012 13- to 16-year-olds have an opportunity to graduate. To obtain comparative information on high school completion using NLTS2 data just two years after the NLTS 2012 baseline, we can compare the NLTS2 youth who were 17 to 20 and completed the NLTS2 Wave 3 data collection in spring 2005 with similar age youth who complete the NLTS 2012 survey in spring 2014. However, because the NLTS2 youth were originally sampled at earlier ages (13–16) than the NLTS 2012 youth (15–18), it will be important to restrict the comparison to the NLTS2 students who were also still enrolled in school at ages 15–18 and to remove from the analysis sample students who had left school before spring 2003.

We would need to apply a similar adjustment when comparing any data across youth surveys, since NLTS2 did not survey youth until Wave 2 of the study. Specifically we could compare the youth responding to Wave 2 of NLTS2 who were still in school with the youth responding to the Wave 1 NLTS 2012 baseline youth survey.

Study Schedule

Table A.8 summarizes the schedule for OMB clearance, sample selection, baseline data collection, follow-up data collection, and production of the baseline and follow-up reports.

Table A.8. NLTS Timeline for Data Collection and Reporting

Study Milestone	Milestone Date/Period of Activity
Submit OMB clearance for study and sample selection	February 1, 2011
Select and recruit districts	May 31, 2011–December 31, 2011
Select student samples	October 1, 2011–February 2012
Submit OMB clearance for baseline data collection	July 15, 2011
OMB approval	December 15, 2011
Secure consent; collect baseline data	January 15, 2012–June 30, 2012
Publish report on baseline data	July 31, 2013
Submit OMB clearance for first follow-up data collection	May 15, 2013
Collect first follow-up data	January 1, 2013–June 30, 2014
Publish first follow-up report	July 15, 2015

17. Approval Not to Display the Expiration Date for OMB Approval

Approval not to display the expiration date for OMB approval is not requested.

18. Exception to the Certification Statement

No exceptions to the certification statement are requested or required.

MATHEMATICA

Policy Research, Inc.

**www.mathematica-
mpr.com**

Improving public well-being by conducting high-quality, objective research and surveys

Princeton, NJ ■ Ann Arbor, MI ■ Cambridge, MA ■ Chicago, IL ■ Oakland, CA ■ Washington, DC
Improving public well-being by conducting high-quality, objective research and surveys

Princeton, NJ ■ Ann Arbor, MI ■ Cambridge, MA ■ Chicago, IL ■ Oakland, CA ■ Washington, DC
