

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

Idaho



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) continues to improve the strategic plan to ensure alignment with Governor's Task Force recommendations.

The current strategic plan includes the following goals.

1. Ensure all Idaho children are reading on-grade-level by third grade.
2. All Idaho students persevere in life and are ready for college and careers.
3. Collaborate with all education stakeholders to support student progress and achievement.
4. Idaho attracts and retains great teachers and leaders.

A brief summary of strategies to achieve each goal are as follows:

Goal 1: Ensure all Idaho children are reading on grade-level by third grade.

Align with Governor's Task Force recommendations and focus on literacy.

Strategies Include:

- Provide increased opportunities for all-day kindergarten.
- Implement a kindergarten screener to assess readiness.
- Provide resources to families and students for early education opportunities.
- Strengthen professional development support for teachers in grades K through 3.
- Increase the number of reading coaches.
- Provide additional opportunities for teachers to become reading specialists.

Goal 2: All Idaho students persevere in life and are ready for college and careers.

Strategies reflect the continuation of the work started under the prior strategic plan.

Strategies Include:

- Provide ongoing support for the implementation of the Idaho Content Standards. (Previously: Fully implement the Idaho Content Standards)
- Ensure funding is strategically aligned to benefit students. (Previously: Improve how funding is leveraged to benefit students.)
- Ensure conditions for learning are in place to support student learning and school safety.

Goal 3: Collaborate with all education stakeholders to support student progress and achievement.

Strategies reflect the continuation of the work started under the prior strategic plan. (Previously: All education stakeholders in Idaho are mutually responsible for accountability and student progress.)

Strategies include:

- Increase district autonomy and ability to innovate.
- Provide targeted support for identified districts to accelerate growth.

Goal 4: Idaho attracts and retains great teachers and leaders.

Strategies reflect the continuation of the work started under the prior strategic plan.

Strategies include:

- Strengthen the impact of the rural education centers. (Previously: Establish rural education centers.)
- Align programs within the department to support educators. (Previously: Align systems to support educators.)
- Elevate and support the education profession.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft-closure due to the COVID-19 crisis. All local education agencies (LEAs) were required to follow national CDC guidelines pertaining to large gatherings and social distancing. Students were not allowed on school grounds, but LEAs were required to continue facilitating essential services and student learning. The soft-closure extended through the end of the school year with flexibilities starting April 20, 2020, which allowed LEAs to bring select students into school buildings or reopen based on compliance with specific criteria. In addition, Idaho's Governor issued a statewide stay-at-home order, which was in effect March 25, 2020 through May 1, 2020. The soft-closure, combined with the stay-at-home order, negatively impacted LEA teams' ability to conduct face-to-face assessments and observations in the regular education environment. For Idaho's SPP/APR data, the impact of these COVID-19-related closures is most evident in Indicators 3, 7, 11, and 12. These indicators typically require assessment and/or observation to determine students' eligibility for special education and related services or progress towards typical development. To mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Division of Special Education immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families.

The ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services during the COVID-19 pandemic. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Division of Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft-closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a question and answer guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

During the soft-closure period, the ISDE collaborated with IPUL and Disability Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. These webinars offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft-closure.

The ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 pandemic. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

Listed below are Indicators 1-16 and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic for FFY 2019.

Indicators 1, 2, 4A, and 4B: Data are lag year data. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for these indicators.

Indicator 3: Idaho received a waiver for statewide assessment participation and performance for FFY 2019. As a result of COVID-19-related closures,

Idaho canceled the statewide assessment for all students.

Indicators 5, 6, 9, 10, and 13: The ISDE collected Indicators 5, 6, 9, 10, and 13 data for the FFY 2019 reporting year in the fall and winter of 2019. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for these indicators.

Indicator 7: COVID-19 substantially impacted Early Childhood Outcomes data. Idaho's results in all outcome measures dropped dramatically. COVID-19 impacted the number of Early Childhood Outcomes ratings due to an increased number of students withdrawn from LEAs before meeting the six months of service minimum required for federal reporting. As a result of the soft closure, many LEA teams' were unable to conduct face-to-face assessments and observations in the student's regular education environment. This inability to conduct face-to-face assessments resulted in the use of an alternative state-approved practice to collect student data, teacher observation, and parent input. The change in the collection process did not impact the validity and reliability of ECO exit ratings for students exiting the early childhood program in the spring of 2020.

Indicator 8: Idaho anticipates that the COVID-19 pandemic had a marginally positive impact on the survey response rate. Social distancing rules resulted in less travel during the survey administration period and increased awareness of emailed materials. The ISDE's processes were consistent with prior years of administration. There is no evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the completeness, validity, or reliability of survey results.

Indicator 11: LEA teams did not have access to students for face-to-face assessment or observations in the regular education environment. LEA teams communicated with families to establish written extensions, discuss processes that would meet social distancing requirements, and provide written notice. The ISDE identified a substantial increase in usage of the State Exception Rule (SE) code, which addresses school closures extending five or more consecutive school days as a result of Acts of Nature, Holiday Break, Other School Break, Spring Break, and Summer Break. See Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03. The ISDE notes that the count of students referred and for whom consent for initial assessment was received decreased significantly.

Indicator 12: LEA teams did not have access to students for face-to-face assessments or observations in the regular education environment. As a result, LEA teams communicated with families to establish written extensions and discuss processes that would meet social distancing requirements. The inability to conduct face-to-face assessments directly contributed to slippage in Indicator 12.

Indicator 14: Idaho anticipates that the COVID-19 pandemic may have positively impacted the survey response rate. Social distancing rules resulted in less travel during the survey administration and increased communication by phone and awareness of emailed materials. The majority of the response rate improvement is directly attributed to increased effort and participation of LEAs as part of scaling up the opt-in survey process. Idaho's approach was consistent with the prior year's survey administration (phone and email). The response rate increased from 2018-19 to 2019-20 by 20 percentage points moving from a 41 percent response rate in FFY 2018 to just over 61 percent in FFY 2019. Indicator 14 data do not suggest COVID-19 had an impact on the completeness, accuracy, or validity.

Indicator 15: The COVID-19 pandemic did not have a substantial impact on the count of written signed complaints between FFY 2018 and FFY 2019 for Indicator 15. The ISDE Dispute Resolution office saw an overall reduction in requests for Dispute Resolution during COVID-19-related closures. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 15 data.

Indicator 16: The COVID-19 pandemic did not have a substantial impact on Indicator 16 data between FFY 2019 and prior reporting years. FFY 2018 had substantially lower counts, but appeared to have been an anomaly in reporting, as FFY 2019 numbers are more consistent with previous years of reporting. The ISDE Dispute Resolution office saw an overall reduction in requests for Dispute Resolution during COVID-19-related closures. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 16 data.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

169

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

General Supervision System

1. The ISDE general supervision system for special education, entitled the Result Driven Accountability (RDA) Monitoring System, includes policies, procedures, and practices designed to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements and improve results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. Elements of the system provide leadership, guidance, technical assistance (TA), and helps build relationships with local education agencies (LEAs) to facilitate the implementation of high-quality educational programs.

2. The ISDE uses the RDA Monitoring System to evaluate LEAs and includes performance and compliance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. LEAs are placed into one of three differentiated levels of support, as listed below.

Level 1: Supporting and Guiding

Level 2: Assisting and Mentoring

Level 3: Directing

Supports range from required attendance at specific ISDE-sponsored training, submission of letters of assurance, and more intensive supports, including up to three years of TA to address improvement areas.

All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA Monitoring System. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct a root-cause analysis and assist LEAs to identify factors contributing to low performance in specific areas. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely (SMART) Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training on the process to SESTA coordinators and LEAs.

3. If an LEA's performance does not meet State targets, the ISDE provides TA and support to LEAs through ISDE central office staff, Idaho SESTA, and contractors to address the identified deficiencies.

4. Idaho continues to improve systems of support to ensure equity in IDEA. The ISDE has developed a robust system to assist LEAs in addressing factors contributing to significant disproportionality. The system focuses on a proactive approach and provides LEAs identified as at-risk with information and resources prior to identification.

As part of the significant disproportionality process, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct a root-cause analysis and help LEAs identify factors contributing to significant disproportionality. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training on the process to SESTA coordinators and LEAs.

5. When noncompliance issues are identified as findings, the ISDE tracks the process of correction via the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). The ISDE ensures that issues of noncompliance are corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 365 days after the date of notification of noncompliance. The ISDE implements OSEP's 09-02 memo when verifying correction of noncompliance by applying two tests - prongs 1 and 2, as described below.

Prong 1 – the LEA corrects each student-level case of noncompliance unless the student is no longer within the LEA's jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Prong 2 – the LEA demonstrates that it is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, e.g., data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the state data collection system.

ISDE and Idaho SESTA staff analyze the general supervision system and noncompliance annually. Areas of need discovered through the data analysis are used to tailor the scope of work and TA offered to LEAs.

Dispute Resolution

Several mechanisms are available through the ISDE to assist in resolving IDEA disputes. These processes are: facilitation, informal conflict resolution, mediation, state complaints, due process hearings, and expedited due process hearings. The ISDE Dispute Resolution office has a team of 15 highly-trained and experienced contractors who manage Idaho's caseload. Three of the 15 contractors are dedicated to the hearing officer role.

Idaho makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve disputes at the least adversarial level appropriate. Contractors and hearing officers are assigned on a rotational basis and trained by the ISDE Dispute Resolution office. Contractors participate in the Complaint Investigator Workgroup offered through Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) and are offered the opportunity to attend regional and national conferences.

Idaho's Special Education Dispute Resolution office regularly provides hot topic information as part of monthly webinars to local special education directors and presents at the annual New Superintendents Orientation. The team has also developed resources for principals related to discipline, IEP and evaluation processes, accommodations, etc. The Dispute Resolution office also offers regular updates to stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC).

Facilitations accounted for the majority (74%) of the caseload in dispute resolution. In FFY 2019 Idaho had 141 facilitation requests and held 134 facilitations, resulting in an 87% agreement rate. The FFY 2019 count represents an increase of 18% from FFY 2018. In FFY 2019, Idaho had 14 mediation requests with 14 mediations accepted, and 30 state complaints filed with 27 reports issued.

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Two websites house special education resources for LEAs, the ISDE's webpage and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC). Instructional webinars are available on the ITC website on a variety of special education topics including: Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA), Accessible Instructional Materials, Assistive Technology, Charter Schools, Early Childhood, Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind, English Language Learners, IDEA Dispute Resolution, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, School-Based Medicaid, Secondary Transition, Specific Learning Disability, the Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Monitoring System, and Excel Essentials for Educators. Informative and instructive documents and forms, including, but not limited to, the Idaho State Special Education Manual and Reporting Special Education Data through ISEE are posted on the ISDE's website. ISDE Special Education Division personnel provide technical assistance on a case-by-case basis to answer queries from LEAs, parents, and other individuals via phone and email.

Idaho SESTA serves as a primary point of contact for LEAs. Idaho SESTA coordinators have expertise in instruction or behavior, as well as IDEA compliance and oversight. Each LEA is assigned an Idaho SESTA coordinator per topic area so that they have a clear point of contact to access TA and support. Idaho SESTA collects data on each request throughout the year. The data are compiled on an annual basis and are an essential component of the information gathered to identify the training and professional development needed for the following year. The ISDE develops technical assistance training for statewide initiatives, Corrective Action Plans, and LEA program requests.

Character limits did not allow for a full description of Idaho's technical assistance system. For additional information regarding technical assistance and training provided by the ISDE to special educators throughout the state, please see the Section 508 accessible attachment labeled FFY 2019 Idaho Part B SPP-APR Introduction.

The ISDE provides a wide variety of technical assistance, training, and supports in the following areas:

1. New Teacher
2. Secondary Transition
3. Funding and Fiscal Accountability
4. Early Childhood
5. Data and Reporting
6. Stakeholders
7. New Directors

Technical assistance provided by the ISDE Division of Special Education through collaboration with other ISDE Divisions and State agencies:

1. Annually, the Division of Special Education, in collaboration with the Division of Technology Services, provides information regarding data quality, reporting requirements, and processes related to the statewide longitudinal data system, the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE), through the annual ISEE Roadshow, which is conducted in multiple sites around the state.
2. Starting in February 2018, the Division of Special Education participated as an active partner in the Assessment Roadshow with the Division of Assessment and Accountability. The Assessment Roadshow provided LEAs with information regarding the importance of statewide and interim assessments, available accommodations, the 1% cap on alternate assessment participation, and statewide assessment processes.
3. The ISDE Division of Special Education collaborates with the IDHW on the biannual Early Years Conference, promoting networking and strengthening early childhood partnerships, programs, and systems-building initiatives.
4. The ISDE collaborates with the IDVR and the National Technical Assistance Center for Transitions to provide regional and customized training to improve post-secondary outcomes for low incidence disabilities and connect students to competitive employment options.
5. The ISDE collaborates with the IDOL to train and educate secondary transition teachers on how to utilize information regarding trends in employment, available training, and job requirements to benefit and promote successful student transitions.
6. The ISDE is collaborating with the IDHW to create a new system of care designed to support the mental health needs of children and youth.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Professional development opportunities were funded by special education grants through the ISDE Special Education Division and made available through the following centers:

Idaho SESTA;

- Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHD), University of Idaho, 875 Perimeter Drive MS 4061, Moscow, ID 83844-4061, Phone: (208) 885-6132, Fax: (208) 885-6145; and
- Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies, Boise State University, Ron and Linda Yanke Family Research Park 220 E. Parkcenter Blvd., Boise, ID 83706-3940.

Professional Development Projects hosted by the ISDE and Idaho SESTA:

1. Autism Supports: The Autism Supports project is designed to improve educational services to children with Autism by building the capacity of school personnel and teams to assess, set goals, determine placement, and implement instructional strategies and supports across a variety of environments within the school.
2. The Idaho Assistive Technology Project (IATP): The IATP is a federally funded program administered by the CDHD. The goal of the IATP is to increase the availability of assistive technology devices and services for older persons and Idahoans with disabilities.
3. Idaho AT4All: The Idaho AT4All website (<https://idaho.at4all.com/>) lists a variety of used equipment available for sale, give-away, or loan, including wheelchairs and scooters, walkers, personal care items, items for those with vision and hearing impairments, hospital beds, computers, adapted vehicles, etc.
4. Pyramid Model Collaborative: Idaho's Pyramid Model follows the guidance from the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI), a federally-funded project established to disseminate effective use of the Pyramid Model to support young children's social, emotional, and behavioral

development through a variety of training and technical assistance activities. The Pyramid Model focuses on program leadership, creating internal coaching capacity, and building knowledge for teachers to support the development of social and emotional competencies in young children. The project provides technical assistance and professional development to teams, identified practitioner coaches, and instructional staff as part of the project.

5. Cultivating Leaders to Grow Young Readers: The Idaho Cultivating Leaders to Grow Young Readers is a multi-year technical assistance and professional development project. This project is a collaborative effort between with the ISDE LEAs to increase the percentage of students with disabilities in cohort LEAs that show growth in literacy from 3rd to 4th grade on the state summative assessment, currently ISAT by Smarter Balanced. The Cultivating Leaders to Grow Young Readers Project will focus on both district leadership and explicit instruction.

6. Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC): The ITC (<https://idahotc.com/>) is a website listing all current special education-related training and resources across the state and is sponsored by the ISDE to link special educators and parents of students with disabilities with training opportunities across multiple agencies and parent groups. The ITC houses numerous webinars covering a wide variety of special education subjects available for professional development use including modules on highly effective instruction, developing high-quality IEPs, behavior, secondary transition, early childhood, etc.

For professional development events hosted by Idaho SESTA, please see the attached accessible document labeled FY20 FINAL all-SESTA Flyer at the end of the Professional Development section of the Introduction.

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The ISDE solicited input regarding improvements and/or revisions to Idaho's policies, practices, and procedures from various stakeholders. The Idaho Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3) (combined with parents of preschoolers), the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) (including community partners), individuals with disabilities, representatives from higher education, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the Idaho's Parent Information Center, and the Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC) all took an active role in the development of this SPP/APR and provided the ISDE with quality input on improving performance on several priority indicators. SEAP membership represents parents and families of students with disabilities, self-advocates, and representatives from higher education, Idaho Department of Corrections (IDOC), Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (IDJC), LEA superintendents, special education directors, teachers, IDVR, IDHW, IPUL, and the ISDE.

EC3 includes representatives from the following: the medical community, state legislators, higher education, Idaho Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind, Community Council of Idaho, parents, IDHW; Head Start and Early Head Start, Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Medicaid, Title V Maternal and Child Health Programs, Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program, Idaho Children's Trust Fund, and IDEA Part C, membership also included representatives from private child care facilities, the judicial system, State Department of Insurance, early intervention providers, Tribal Relations, and the Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities. EC3 has been reformed since target setting to address the requirements of the Preschool Development Grant.

DAC consists of a minimum of 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

During target setting planning sessions were held with ISDE personnel, including the Special Education Director and all Special Education Coordinators. State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) priority indicators were assigned to individual coordinators and specialists for additional research. After completing research on the priority indicators, the ISDE team reconvened and discussed criteria for measurable and rigorous targets, improvement activities, and drafted the SPP/APR using this information. The ISDE discusses SPP/APR priority indicators and data no less than annually with stakeholders. Stakeholders provide feedback and recommend improvements. Stakeholders are an integral part of Idaho's processes and provide valuable diverse input on SPP/APR priority indicators and general supervision processes.

In addition, collaborative discussions across ISDE Divisions ensured that the ISDE Strategic Plan and all Leadership Team activities were incorporated into the SPP/APR, as appropriate. The Division of Special Education regularly collaborates with the divisions of Assessment and Accountability, Content and Curriculum, Federal Programs, English Learner and Migrant Education, Student Engagement/Career and Technical Readiness, and Technology Services to ensure that the ISDE is maximizing resources in its efforts to improve the academic and functional outcomes for students with disabilities in Idaho.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

NO

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>

<https://idahoschools.org/>

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/Accountability/results.html>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As directed by the Department and per its determination received in June of 2020, the ISDE is reporting on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the state received assistance; and (2) the actions the state took as a result of that technical assistance.

The information below includes the list of national technical assistance (TA) resources accessed.

Character limits did not allow for a full description of the national TA centers accessed and actions taken by Idaho as a result of that technical assistance to meet the requirements pursuant to 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a). For the complete version, including the national TA and corresponding actions, please see the Section 508 accessible FFY 2019 Idaho Introduction attachment.

Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Education (CADRE)

Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcome (CEELO)

Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)

Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID)

The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy)

IDEA Data Center (IDC)

National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NAECS)

National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)

National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER)

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)

National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO)

National Center on Improving Literacy

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)

National Implementation Research Network

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT)

Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE)

Workforce Innovation Technical Assistance Center (WITAC)

Youth Technical Assistance Center (YTAC)

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 25, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State does not have any FFY 2019 data for indicator 17.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	60.46%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	65.40%	65.48%
Data	59.22%	58.41%	60.46%	60.95%	65.48%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	70.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Historically, Idaho reported a four-year Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (four-year ACGR). Targets listed in the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for Indicator 1 match targets listed in Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan) under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), accepted March 29, 2018. On July 15, 2019, the U.S.

Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, accepted Idaho's amended Consolidated State Plan. The Plan amendment, among other changes, added a five-year Extended Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (five-year Extended ACGR) to the state's accountability and reporting system. Starting in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, Idaho shifted to reporting a five-year Extended ACGR for Indicator 1. The five-year Extended ACGR is included as part of the 2018-19 EDFacts FS151 and 150.

Four-year ACGR (historical information):

Long-term goal = Class of 2016 % graduating + (75% x (100 – Class of 2016 % graduating))

Interim progress goal = Difference between the long-term goal and the baseline / 6

Five-year Extended ACGR Calculation (current calculation):

Long-term goal = Class of 2017 % graduating + (75% x (100 – Class of 2017 % graduating))

Interim progress goal = Difference between the long-term goal and the baseline/5

The five-year Extended ACGR baseline was established for FFY 2018 at a rate of 65.48%. The interim progress goals were set to achieve a 75% increase or an increase in five-year Extended ACGR of 25.9 percentage points over five years to a long-term target of 91.4% for FFY 2023. The mean year-to-year rate increase is 5.2 percentage points.

FFY 2018 baseline= 65.48%,

FFY 2019 target = 70.7%

The development of the Plan and amendment to the Plan included stakeholder input from local teachers, administrators, parents, advocacy groups, and other state agencies. For additional information regarding stakeholder involvement or to view the Plan, please see the Idaho State Consolidated Plan web page at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/topics/consolidated-plan/>.

Note: The Plan lists data and targets rounded to the nearest tenth to align with the Idaho State Board of Education's existing graduation rate goal for all students.

In discussions regarding graduation, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and Directors Advisory Committee consistently expressed frustration with the four-year ACGR measure. Stakeholders noted that students with disabilities might take longer than typically developing peers to acquire the credits necessary to meet regular graduation requirements. Each stakeholder group strongly supported moving to an extended cohort option that better accounts for students with disabilities and extended timelines.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,387
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	2,221
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	62.45%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1,387	2,221	65.48%	70.70%	62.45%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Idaho saw a 3% decline in the percentage of students who graduated with a regular diploma in FFY2019 as compared to FFY2018. The data team analyzed the graduation data and determined there was a substantial increase in the number of students coded as Completed Adapted Requirements (or Received a Certificate EDFacts FS009) in FFY 2019 as compared to the prior year. The increased count of students coded as Completed Adapted Requirements within the four and five-year adjusted cohorts closely corresponds to the decreased number of students coded as Met Regular Graduation Requirements. The Completed Adapted Requirements exit code does not satisfy ESSA requirements for inclusion in EDFacts FS150 and FS151.

The ISDE determined that some LEAs had an automatic default in their student management system that coded students with disabilities to Completed Adapted Requirements exit code instead of Graduated Met Regular Graduation Requirements. Idaho's emphasis on data quality and accurate reporting has remedied these coding issues. Idaho continues to work with LEAs to report accurate data by providing monthly webinars targeting local special education directors and secondary special education teachers. Training encourages consistent communication across local systems and clarifies differences between accommodations and adaptations at the classroom level. The ISDE also developed guidance and resources for local special education data stewards. Idaho will be sharing information about the new methodology for APR Indicator B1, which will provide additional opportunities to clarify reporting requirements.

Idaho supports a robust appeals process for Adjusted Cohort Graduation data, allowing LEAs to address data issues before data finalization. A substantial number of appeals were to shift coding from Completed Adapted Requirements to Graduated Met Regular Graduation Requirements. Finalized data reflect changes confirmed through the appeals process and are considered valid and reliable. The ISDE continues to monitor the use of the Completed Adapted Requirements exit code and provide guidance to LEAs regarding appropriate exit coding.

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

Extended ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

5

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma are the same conditions all youth must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

A copy of the High School Graduation Minimum Requirements, revised May 29, 2019, may be viewed at: <https://sde.idaho.gov/topics/hs-grad-req/files/general/High-School-Graduation-Minimum-Requirements.pdf>

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data are lag year data for the FFY 2019 reporting year and were not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis.

Idaho recognizes a substantial statewide gap between the graduation rate of students with disabilities and all other students. The ISDE is accessing national technical resource centers and leveraging internal resources to address this gap. National technical assistance providers that have contributed to Idaho's system improvements for Indicator 1 include IDC, CIID, and NCES.

Idaho's Consolidated State Plan is designed to identify schools performing among the lowest 5% in the state for subgroup graduation rates. These school leaders are then required to develop and follow a plan to address the specific area of improvement. Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes Indicator 1 and other performance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs receive their determination and are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct a root-cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including graduation rate. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive

supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process. Communication between ISDE internal teams is a continued area of focus. The ISDE has seen several positive outcomes as a result of improved internal communication, including enhanced communication to LEAs regarding timelines and training, development of a quick reference crosswalk between LEA exit reasons and program exit reasons, and cross-team collaboration on LEA training. The ISDE provides training regarding exit data and coding to LEA personnel through the annual Data Drill Down training, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, Secondary Institute, and monthly special education director webinars. The Secondary Coordinator continues to participate as part of the Data Drill Down, providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data, available supports, and indicators. Starting in the 2020-2021 school year, ISDE holds monthly webinars focusing on secondary transition topics. In the summer of 2019, Idaho released a new application, the Cohort Graduation Rate Preview. The application allows LEAs and schools to track future (up to five years) cohort members and identify students who have been retained, demoted, or skipped a grade in their previous school(s). The application replaced and enhanced a legacy system and further promoted improved data transparency and management. To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and rules of completion as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan. The optional software was released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 educational entities comprised of LEAs and LEA authorized charters, are utilizing the system, which represents about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count. Idaho EDPlan has rules and validations embedded to generate appropriate exit coding based on processes such as evaluation and written notice. The process-based approach improves program exit data quality by ensuring that all necessary documentation is finalized and limits user coding error.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	6.42%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	4.58%	4.08%	3.58%	3.08%	2.58%
Data	6.41%	29.93%	6.42%	4.32%	7.63%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	2.08%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In the fall of 2017, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Committee (DAC) met and discussed Indicator 2 Options 1 and 2 calculations. Participants agreed that the Option 1 measure did not accurately reflect Idaho's dropout rate for students exiting special education, as it left out an essential category of student exit - Transferred to Other Educational Environment. By not including this group, the denominator reduced substantially, resulting in an inflated dropout rate. Stakeholders further noted the importance of this group because it included students who demonstrated growth in the acquisition and use of skills, knowledge, and/or behaviors to the degree that they were determined no longer eligible for special education and related services. Based on the subsequent review of data, information, and stakeholder input, Idaho moved back to the Option 2 calculation for Indicator 2 starting in FFY 2016.

Program exit is a focus of annual training and discussion in Idaho because of language in the state's regulations. Idaho has been reticent to use the reporting category of "Received a Certificate" as it is a one diploma state without any other form of a certificate. As part of the ISDE alignment work, which started with IDEA Data Center's (IDC's) on-site facilitation for the Data Process Mapping Toolkit, Idaho has established validations in the state longitudinal data system Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) and aligned Special Education Program Exit to demographic exit and the Graduation/Completers file.

The understanding during the FFY 2018 data collection, was that the definition for completers must align with the Grad Cohort definition of graduation. Per that definition, starting in the 2017-2018 school year data collection, students who received a formal document certifying the successful completion of a prescribed secondary school program of study, as outlined in their IEP, and coded as "Completed Adapted Requirements" were counted as non-completers in FS040 and dropouts in FS032.

Further discussions with stakeholders, other states, and a data clarification request regarding state regulations and exit coding prompted Idaho to reach out to Partner Service Support (PSC) for additional information in May of 2019. In early October 2019, Idaho received clarification from the U.S. Department of Education regarding the state's Graduation/Completers question.

The clarification to FS040 - Graduates/Completers, documented in the PSC ticket 19-04150, addressed appropriate aggregation of students coded as Completed Adapted Requirements in the Graduates/Completers file. For all future reporting, ISDE shall exclude students coded as exiting through Completed Adapted Requirements from FS032 - Dropout and aggregate counts into the Received a Certificate category for FS009 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education. The use of the Received a Certificate category was updated for the FFY 2019 reporting year in the state's State Supplemental Survey for IDEA (SSS-IDEA).

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,070
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	298
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	**
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	300
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	**

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs grades 9-12 who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs in Membership	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
446	8,614	7.63%	2.08%	5.18%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

Dropouts are defined as students who:

1. were enrolled in school at some time during the school year, were not enrolled the following school year, but were expected to be in membership (i.e., were not reported as dropouts the year before).
2. did not graduate from high school (graduates include students who received a GED without dropping out of school).
3. did not complete a state or district-approved educational program.
4. did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - a. transfer to another public-school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program;
 - b. temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness;
 - c. death.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ISDE's key strategies for reducing the dropout rate for students with disabilities are establishing clear definitions and processes for file specifications across programs, communication between ISDE internal teams, and training to LEAs. ISDE leveraged several national technical assistance providers when developing system improvements for Indicator 2 include IDC, Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID), and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES).

The work to align processes and definitions across programs began as part of work with the IDC on data process mapping. The ISDE has now fully established data collection validations and developed a consistent dropout definition to ensure the data accurately reflect and capture information required for all divisions at the ISDE. The clarification to FS040 - Graduates/Completers, documented in the PSC ticket 19-04150, addressed appropriate aggregation of students coded as Completed Adapted Requirements in the Graduates/Completers file. For all future reporting, the ISDE shall exclude students coded as exiting through Completed Adapted Requirements from FS032 - Dropout and aggregate counts into the Received a Certificate category for FS009 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education. The use of the Received a Certificate category was updated for FFY 2019 in the State Supplemental Survey for IDEA (SSS-IDEA).

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan, released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 LEAs and LEA authorized charter schools utilize the system, representing about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count. Idaho EDPlan has embedded rules and validations to generate appropriate exit coding based on evaluation and written notice processes. The process-based approach improves program exit data quality by limiting user coding errors and ensuring the finalization of all necessary documentation.

Communication between internal teams is a continued area of focus. The ISDE has seen several positive outcomes resulting from improved collaboration between ISDE teams, including enhanced communications to LEAs regarding timelines and training, development of a quick reference crosswalk between LEA exit and program exit reasons, and cross-team collaboration on LEA training.

The ISDE provides training to LEA personnel regarding program exit data and coding through the annual Data Drill Down training, ISEE Roadshow, Secondary Transition Institute, and special education director webinars. Starting in the 2020-2021 school year, the ISDE holds monthly webinars focusing on secondary transition.

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes Indicator 2 and other performance indicators as part of LEA level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct a root cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including high rates for indicator 2. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process. The ISDE is committed to the health and safety of every student in Idaho public schools. Students are far more likely to realize their academic and life skills potential in a supportive school climate that is safe and free from violence. One of ISDE's current initiatives, Stop Bullying in Idaho, is focused on bullying prevention for school-age youth. This initiative supports LEAs and schools through:

- Training resources on best practices;
- Guidance, training, and technical assistance related to policy development;
- Collecting data about youth risk behaviors, including bullying and harassment;
- Assisting schools with the implementation of prevention programs;
- Providing funding to address bullying and harassment; and
- Hosting an annual conference focused on prevention.

Idaho is increasing focus on students' social-emotional well-being and the impact on education. To further understand available supports for students and families related to behavioral health, ISDE contracted with Education Northwest to conduct a survey to gather information on behavioral health and wellness services (BHWS) throughout Idaho. This work was in response to a 2020 legislative mandate (House Bill 627, Section 5) to conduct a comprehensive scan of all BHWS that support K-12 general education students in Idaho. The survey was launched on September 10, 2020 and remained open until October 23, 2020.

For the purposes of the survey, BHWS was defined as services focused on the well-being services, strategies, and/or programs available to the K-12 general student population. These services are available to all students, families, and/or school staff members to support students' mental, social, and personal health. The survey asked about the BHWS strategies and/or programs available as part of a typical school experience for students before the COVID-19 pandemic. Administrators were encouraged to connect with a team of educators in their district/school for a full picture of pre-pandemic efforts. Survey questions focused on identifying the types of BHWS available to the general population in each school and district; identifying service delivery gaps, challenges, and perceived value; and fostering understanding of how service delivery is being measured across districts and in schools. Information collected through the BHWS survey will help the ISDE better support LEA teams related to behavioral health and improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

Data are lag year data for the FFY 2019 reporting year were not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine slippage because in its narrative, the State reported that "The ISDE has now fully established data collection validations and developed a consistent dropout definition to ensure the data accurately reflect and capture information required for all divisions at the ISDE. The clarification to FS040 - Graduates/Completers, documented in the PSC ticket 19-04150, addressed appropriate aggregation of students coded as Completed Adapted Requirements in the Graduates/Completers file. For all future reporting, the ISDE shall exclude students coded as exiting through Completed Adapted Requirements from FS032 - Dropout and aggregate counts into the Received a Certificate category for FS009 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education. The use of the Received a Certificate category was updated for FFY 2019 in the State Supplemental Survey for IDEA (SSS-IDEA)."

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Grade 3	X										
B	Grade 4		X									
C	Grade 5			X								
D	Grade 6				X							
E	Grade 7					X						
F	Grade 8						X					
G	HS											X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Grade 3	2006	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Grade 3	98.00%	Actual	99.91%	98.26%	99.29%	98.76%	98.48%
B	Grade 4	2006	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Grade 4	98.50%	Actual	98.05%	98.20%	99.47%	98.49%	98.64%
C	Grade 5	2006	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	Grade 5	99.20%	Actual	97.26%	98.40%	99.37%	98.58%	98.72%
D	Grade 6	2006	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
D	Grade 6	99.10%	Actual	97.40%	97.69%	99.47%	97.44%	98.70%
E	Grade 7	2006	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
E	Grade 7	98.50%	Actual	97.79%	98.09%	98.94%	97.44%	97.91%
F	Grade 8	2006	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
F	Grade 8	98.20%	Actual	96.41%	97.29%	99.00%	97.09%	97.27%

G	HS	2006	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
G	HS	99.50%	Actual	88.41%	92.27%	99.11%	96.10%	96.39%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Grade 3	2013	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Grade 3	97.13%	Actual	98.06%	98.11%	99.29%	98.47%	98.52%
B	Grade 4	2013	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Grade 4	96.29%	Actual	98.19%	98.16%	99.81%	98.54%	98.61%
C	Grade 5	2013	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	Grade 5	96.93%	Actual	97.59%	98.36%	99.68%	98.65%	98.69%
D	Grade 6	2013	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
D	Grade 6	95.10%	Actual	97.50%	97.65%	99.62%	97.54%	98.35%
E	Grade 7	2013	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
E	Grade 7	92.43%	Actual	97.64%	97.87%	99.27%	97.21%	97.59%
F	Grade 8	2013	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
F	Grade 8	93.58%	Actual	96.72%	96.88%	99.09%	96.87%	97.03%
G	HS	2013	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
G	HS	84.03%	Actual	87.92%	92.05%	99.32%	96.10%	96.57%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	95.00%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	95.00%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	95.00%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	95.00%
Reading	G >=	HS	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 3	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	95.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	95.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	95.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	95.00%
Math	G >=	HS	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Idaho's waiver request to the U.S. Department of Education from administering statewide assessments, accountability and school identification requirements, and certain reporting requirements has been approved. Idaho does not have data for statewide assessments for school year 2019-2020. Data for prior school years is located on the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), Special Education, Public Reporting page <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Grade 3	X										
B	Grade 4		X									
C	Grade 5			X								
D	Grade 6				X							
E	Grade 7					X						
F	Grade 8						X					
G	HS											X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Grade 3	2014	Target >=	16.00%	19.00%	22.00%	25.00%	28.00%
A	Grade 3	20.10%	Actual	20.10%	19.59%	18.37%	20.31%	18.12%
B	Grade 4	2014	Target >=	12.00%	19.00%	22.00%	25.00%	28.00%
B	Grade 4	15.82%	Actual	15.82%	17.80%	16.72%	17.56%	16.34%
C	Grade 5	2014	Target >=	13.00%	15.00%	22.00%	25.00%	28.00%
C	Grade 5	16.93%	Actual	16.93%	17.32%	15.04%	16.77%	15.57%
D	Grade 6	2014	Target >=	10.00%	16.00%	18.00%	25.00%	28.00%
D	Grade 6	12.85%	Actual	12.85%	11.41%	12.73%	11.39%	11.65%
E	Grade 7	2014	Target >=	8.00%	13.00%	19.00%	21.00%	28.00%
E	Grade 7	13.39%	Actual	13.39%	12.89%	13.70%	12.10%	13.03%

F	Grade 8	2014	Target >=	8.00%	11.00%	16.00%	22.00%	24.00%
F	Grade 8	11.87%	Actual	11.87%	11.75%	10.89%	11.87%	9.64%
G	HS	2014	Target >=	11.00%	11.00%	14.00%	19.00%	25.00%
G	HS	13.43%	Actual	13.43%	14.73%	13.05%	14.59%	12.37%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Grade 3	2014	Target >=	18.00%	21.00%	24.00%	27.00%	30.00%
A	Grade 3	22.13%	Actual	22.13%	24.97%	20.79%	24.22%	21.59%
B	Grade 4	2014	Target >=	13.00%	21.00%	24.00%	27.00%	30.00%
B	Grade 4	17.36%	Actual	17.36%	20.19%	17.07%	18.18%	18.39%
C	Grade 5	2014	Target >=	10.00%	16.00%	24.00%	27.00%	30.00%
C	Grade 5	13.90%	Actual	13.90%	14.81%	12.83%	13.65%	12.34%
D	Grade 6	2014	Target >=	7.00%	13.00%	19.00%	27.00%	30.00%
D	Grade 6	10.98%	Actual	10.98%	12.16%	10.99%	10.17%	9.50%
E	Grade 7	2014	Target >=	6.00%	10.00%	16.00%	22.00%	30.00%
E	Grade 7	11.83%	Actual	11.83%	13.59%	11.36%	10.48%	9.64%
F	Grade 8	2014	Target >=	4.00%	9.00%	13.00%	19.00%	25.00%
F	Grade 8	9.36%	Actual	9.36%	10.97%	9.40%	9.57%	6.89%
G	HS	2014	Target >=	3.00%	7.00%	12.00%	16.00%	22.00%
G	HS	6.04%	Actual	6.04%	7.88%	7.16%	7.12%	6.75%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	31.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	31.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	31.00%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	31.00%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	31.00%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	25.00%
Reading	G >=	HS	26.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 3	33.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	33.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	33.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	33.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	33.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	30.00%
Math	G >=	HS	28.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Idaho's waiver request to the U.S. Department of Education from administering statewide assessments, accountability and school identification requirements, and certain reporting requirements has been approved. Idaho does not have data for statewide assessments for the 2019-2020 school year. For data from prior school years, see the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), Special Education, Public Reporting page <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho participates in a multistate alternate assessment (AA) item sharing group. Participating states share in the development and field testing of AA items. In spring 2021, Idaho will administer new Idaho Alternate Assessments (IDAAs) in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math based on these shared items, necessitating standard setting before scoring and assigning proficiency levels. However, due to instructional and placement shifts experienced by students who qualify for the IDAA related to the COVID-19 pandemic, ISDE staff have concerns that data from the spring 2021 IDAA administration will not be representative of this student population and impact the validity and reliability of standard-setting. Therefore, the ISDE plans to use standard-setting data from one of the item sharing states whose standards most closely align with Idaho's Extended Content Standards as a stopgap measure to produce scores for the IDAA in spring 2021. The ISDE anticipates the spring 2022 IDAA administration to produce more representative data that will allow valid and reliable standard-setting in summer 2022.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.87%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) collected 618 discipline data from each local education agency (LEA) for out-of-school suspensions and expulsions. The data were then reviewed for significant discrepancies. Results were shared with stakeholders and the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for comments and input. The ISDE redefined and recalculated significant discrepancy in April 2012 due to the Office of Special Education APR clarification process.

Information regarding results of the clarification process was presented, and feedback was sought with a variety of stakeholders including the state's

advisory committee SEAP. Idaho's stakeholders agreed that it was appropriate to extend the targets for this indicator for the FFY 2019 submission. The ISDE will focus future efforts towards establishing targets and baseline for FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. Idaho continues to evaluate Indicator 4A processes to ensure Idaho has a cohesive support system to address disciplinary action. Areas of discussion with stakeholders include potential changes to calculation (i.e., n-size, cell size, and the number of years of analysis) and processes. In the Fall of 2020, stakeholders from SEAP and the Special Education Directors Advisory Committee (DAC) recommended that the ISDE adopt the Self-Assessment Protocol for Disciplinary Action as part of the process to determine if the significant discrepancy is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The self-assessment protocol helps LEA teams conduct a root-cause analysis and identify factors contributing to significantly discrepant rates of disciplinary action. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely (SMART) Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training on the process to SESTA coordinators and LEAs.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

69

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
2	96	0.00%	0.00%	2.08%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Many local education agencies (LEAs) in Idaho are small rural LEAs with 50 or fewer students with disabilities enrolled. As a result, small cell and n-size have a substantial impact on Idaho's calculations for SPP/APR indicator data. Idaho's current method for calculating significant discrepancy only accounts for n-size. Any LEA that meets the state n-size with one instance of out of school suspension greater than ten days is calculated for significant discrepancy. The median count of students receiving out-of-school disciplinary action for greater than ten days for LEAs included in Indicator 4A is one. The current calculation for significant discrepancy impacts smaller LEAs. Idaho is evaluating the current calculation and will review changes to the calculation and targets and baseline with stakeholders for SPP/APR reporting for FFY 2020-2025.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The ISDE defined and updated the calculation for Significant Discrepancy in April 2012, as a result of the Office of Special Education APR clarification process. The e-formula was replaced with a state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all students with disabilities (SWD) to set the suspension/expulsion-rate bar measure. The state bar is the state-level suspension/expulsion rate plus one percentage point. Idaho has defined Significant Discrepancy as one percentage point or more above the current year's State suspension/expulsion rate.

The formula for FFY2019 is:

$$((\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2018-2019} > 10 \text{ days}) / (\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs in the state for SY 2018-2019})) * 100$$

Total # of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2018-2019 > 10 days = 46

Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2018-2019 = 34,310

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = $(46/34,310) \times 100$

Application of data:

$$\text{State-level suspension/expulsion rate} = (46/34,310) \times 100 = 0.134\%$$

The state bar is $0.134\% + 1.00\% = 1.134\%$.

An LEA will have a significant discrepancy if its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.134% for FFY 2019 data.

For Indicator 4A, Idaho has established a minimum n-size of at least 40 students with IEPs enrolled in the LEA. After applying the minimum n-size, 69 of 165 LEAs in Idaho were excluded ($165 - 69 = 96$) from the calculation for Indicator 4A for FFY 2019.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 4A data for the FFY 2019 reporting year are from the 2018-2019 school year, they were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan, released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 LEAs and LEA authorized charter schools utilize the system, representing about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules across the IEP and Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP). Idaho developed EDPlan to ensure IEPs and BIPs meet IDEA compliance requirements, include necessary details, and have processes finalized.

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft closure due to the COVID-19 pandemic. To mitigate the effects of COVID-19 related closure on education, the ISDE special education team immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as OSEP guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's parent center, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, School-Based Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a Question and Answer Guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

During the soft closure period, ISDE collaborated with IPUL and Disability Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. The webinars also offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft closure.

ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 pandemic. For additional information or to access

available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

ISDE developed several resources for educators related to disciplinary action specific to students with disabilities. Training and documents are available to all levels, but an emphasis is placed on new principals and superintendents. For additional information and to view available resources related to disciplinary action, go to <https://idahotc.com/> and search for discipline.

The ISDE is committed to the health and safety of every student in Idaho public schools. Students are far more likely to realize their academic and life skills potential in a supportive school climate that is safe and free from violence. One of ISDE's current initiatives, Stop Bullying in Idaho, is focused on bullying prevention for school-age youth. This initiative supports LEAs and schools through:

- Training resources on best practices;
- Guidance, training, and technical assistance related to policy development;
- Collecting data about youth risk behaviors, including bullying and harassment;
- Assisting schools with the implementation of prevention programs;
- Providing funding to address bullying and harassment; and
- Hosting an annual conference focused on prevention.

Idaho is increasing focus on students' social-emotional well-being and the impact on education. To further understand available supports for students and families related to behavioral health, ISDE contracted with Education Northwest to conduct a survey to gather information on behavioral health and wellness services (BHWS) throughout Idaho. This work was in response to a 2020 legislative mandate (House Bill 627, Section 5) to conduct a comprehensive scan of all BHWS that support K–12 general education students in Idaho. The survey was launched on September 10, 2020, and remained open until October 23, 2020.

For the purposes of the survey, BHWS was defined as services focused on the well-being services, strategies, and/or programs available to the K–12 general student population. These services are available to all students, families, and/or school staff members to support students' mental, social, and personal health. The survey asked about the BHWS strategies and/or programs available as part of a typical school experience for students before the COVID-19 pandemic. Administrators were encouraged to connect with a team of educators in their LEA/school for a full picture of pre-pandemic efforts. Survey questions focused on identifying the types of BHWS available to the general population in each school and LEA; identifying service delivery gaps, challenges, and perceived value; and fostering understanding of how service delivery is being measured across LEAs and in schools. Information collected through the BHWS survey will help the ISDE better support LEA teams related to behavioral health and improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The ISDE reviewed the suspension/expulsion rate of LEAs compared to the state rate and identified two LEAs with a significant discrepancy in the rate of out of school suspensions greater than ten days.

Idaho requires that all LEAs provide an assurance documenting the adoption of policies, practices, and procedures consistent with Idaho's current Special Education Manual prior to the approval of the LEA's application for IDEA Part B Grant funds.

As part of the General Supervision File Review (GSFR), the ISDE reviews student files from each LEA annually. The review ensures that LEAs comply with IDEA requirements and are consistently applying policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. GSFR results help to determine if policies, practices, and procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy. Each of the two identified LEAs were found to have policies, practices, and procedures compliant with IDEA requirements.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

78

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	87	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The ISDE defined and updated the calculation for Significant Discrepancy in April 2012, as a result of the Office of Special Education APR clarification process. The e-formula was replaced with a state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all students with disabilities (SWD) to set the suspension/expulsion-rate bar measure. The state bar is the state-level suspension/expulsion rate plus one percentage point. Idaho has defined Significant Discrepancy as one percentage point or more above the current year's State suspension/expulsion rate.

The formula for FFY2019 is:

$$((\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2018-2019} > 10 \text{ days}) / (\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs in the state for SY 2018-2019})) * 100$$

Total # of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2018-2019 > 10 days = 46

Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2018-2019 = 34,310

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = $(46/34,310) \times 100$

Application of data:

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = $(46/34,310) \times 100 = 0.134\%$

The state bar is $0.134\% + 1.00\% = 1.134\%$.

An LEA will have a significant discrepancy if its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.134% for FFY 2019 data.

For Indicator 4B, Idaho has established a minimum n-size of at least 40 students by race-ethnicity with IEPs enrolled in the LEA. After applying the minimum n-size, 78 of 165 LEAs in Idaho were excluded ($165 - 78 = 87$) from the calculation for indicator 4B for FFY 2019.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 4B data for the FFY 2019 reporting year are from the 2018-2019 school year, they were not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan, released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 LEAs and LEA authorized charter schools utilize the system, representing about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules across the IEP and Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP). Idaho developed EDPlan to ensure IEPs and BIPs meet IDEA compliance requirements, include necessary details, and have processes finalized.

In the Fall of 2020, stakeholders from SEAP and DAC recommended that the ISDE adopt the Self-Assessment Protocol for Disciplinary Action as part of the process to determine if the significant discrepancy is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Disciplinary Action was developed as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. Using the same tool for Indicator 4B and significant disproportionality will improve alignment and reduce confusion for LEAs and stakeholders. The self-assessment protocol works in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft closure due to the COVID-19 pandemic. To mitigate the effects of COVID-19 related closure on education, the ISDE special education team immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as OSEP guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's parent center, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, School-Based Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a Question and Answer Guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

During the soft closure period, ISDE collaborated with IPUL and DisAbility Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. The webinars also offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft closure.

ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 pandemic. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

ISDE developed several resources for educators related to disciplinary action specific to students with disabilities. Training and documents are available to all levels, but an emphasis is placed on new principals and superintendents. For additional information and to view available resources related to disciplinary action, go to <https://idahotc.com/> and search for discipline.

The ISDE is committed to the health and safety of every student in Idaho public schools. Students are far more likely to realize their academic and life skills potential in a supportive school climate that is safe and free from violence. One of ISDE's current initiatives, Stop Bullying in Idaho, is focused on bullying prevention for school-age youth. This initiative supports LEAs and schools through:

- Training resources on best practices;
- Guidance, training, and technical assistance related to policy development;
- Collecting data about youth risk behaviors, including bullying and harassment;
- Assisting schools with the implementation of prevention programs;
- Providing funding to address bullying and harassment; and
- Hosting an annual conference focused on prevention.

Idaho is increasing focus on students' social-emotional well-being and the impact on education. To further understand available supports for students and families related to behavioral health, ISDE contracted with Education Northwest to conduct a survey to gather information on behavioral health and wellness services (BHWS) throughout Idaho. This work was in response to a 2020 legislative mandate (House Bill 627, Section 5) to conduct a comprehensive scan of all BHWS that support K–12 general education students in Idaho. The survey was launched on September 10, 2020, and remained open until October 23, 2020.

For the purposes of the survey, BHWS was defined as services focused on the well-being services, strategies, and/or programs available to the K–12 general student population. These services are available to all students, families, and/or school staff members to support students' mental, social, and personal health. The survey asked about the BHWS strategies and/or programs available as part of a typical school experience for students before the COVID-19 pandemic. Administrators were encouraged to connect with a team of educators in their LEA/school for a full picture of pre-pandemic efforts. Survey questions focused on identifying the types of BHWS available to the general population in each school and LEA; identifying service delivery gaps, challenges, and perceived value; and fostering understanding of how service delivery is being measured across LEAs and in schools. Information collected through the BHWS survey will help the ISDE better support LEA teams related to behavioral health and improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The ISDE reviewed the suspension/expulsion rate of LEAs compared to the state rate and identified three LEAs with a significant discrepancy in the rate of out of school suspensions greater than ten days by race-ethnicity.

Idaho requires that all LEAs provide an assurance documenting the adoption of policies, practices, and procedures consistent with Idaho's current Special Education Manual prior to the approval of the LEA's application for IDEA Part B Grant funds.

As part of the General Supervision File Review (GSFR), the ISDE reviews student files from each LEA annually. The review ensures that LEAs comply with IDEA requirements and are consistently applying policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. GSFR results help to determine if policies, practices, and procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy. Each of the two identified LEAs were found to have policies, practices, and procedures compliant with IDEA requirements.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2005	Target >=	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%
A	63.80%	Data	60.85%	60.55%	60.81%	62.02%	62.69%
B	2005	Target <=	7.42%	6.94%	6.46%	5.98%	5.50%
B	8.00%	Data	10.10%	9.86%	9.48%	9.13%	8.99%
C	2005	Target <=	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
C	1.60%	Data	1.18%	1.58%	1.57%	1.42%	1.45%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	71.00%
Target B <=	5.02%
Target C <=	1.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) staff collaborated across divisions and then met with the Idaho Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Director's Advisory Council (DAC). The stakeholder groups reviewed and discussed Indicator 5 information and provided input to establish baseline and targets. The ISDE solicited broad stakeholder input at regional special education director meetings, the Idaho Council for Exceptional Children Conference, the annual Idaho Association of Special Education Administrators Conference, and the regional Idaho School Superintendents Association meetings.

In the Spring and Fall of 2020, the ISDE discussed changes for the FFY 2020 reporting year with stakeholders. Topics of discussion included setting targets and baseline for FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR submissions and data collection and reporting changes. Stakeholders were informed that the ISDE does not anticipate any substantial impact on inclusion rates reported under Indicator 5 School Age Environments. The change in reporting of students age five enrolled in kindergarten from collection under EDFacts FS089 to FS002 will represent a substantial increase in student counts, but is not anticipated to impact inclusion rates included as part of 5A. The majority of students age five enrolled in kindergarten receive services in an inclusive environment and may result in a slight improvement to Indicators 5B and 5C.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	31,740

SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	20,557
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,741
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	307
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	87
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	27

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	20,557	31,740	62.69%	71.00%	64.77%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,741	31,740	8.99%	5.02%	8.64%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	421	31,740	1.45%	1.50%	1.33%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ISDE collected Indicator 5 data for the FFY 2019 reporting year in the fall of 2019. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 5 data.

Idaho includes Indicator 5 information as part of regional training for Data Drill Down, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, and Directors Webinars to improve LEA understanding of data and appropriate environment coding. In FFY 2019 training, ISDE emphasized upcoming environment coding changes for students age five enrolled in kindergarten. The ISDE is also developing changes to validations for the 2020-2021 collection within Idaho's statewide longitudinal data system, ISEE.

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan, released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 LEAs and LEA authorized charter schools utilize the system, representing about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count. For Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21) data, Idaho EDPlan established calculations and rules based on information entered into the service grid and enrollment type. Once the user finalizes the service grid and enrollment sections, the system automatically generates the appropriate educational environment code. This process-based approach improves educational environment data quality by limiting user coding errors and ensuring the finalization of all necessary documentation.

LEAs are provided support to improve Indicator 5 data through Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education. ISDE uses performance and compliance indicators, including Indicator 5, as part of LEA level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help conduct a root cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including low inclusion rates. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

The ISDE is committed to the health and safety of every student in Idaho public schools. Students are far more likely to realize their academic and life skills potential in a supportive school climate that is safe and free from violence. One of ISDE's current initiatives, Stop Bullying in Idaho, is focused on bullying prevention for school-age youth. This initiative supports LEAs and schools through:

- Training resources on best practices;
- Guidance, training, and technical assistance related to policy development;
- Collecting data about youth risk behaviors, including bullying and harassment;
- Assisting schools with the implementation of prevention programs;
- Providing funding to address bullying and harassment; and
- Hosting an annual conference focused on prevention.

Idaho is increasing focus on students' social-emotional well-being and the impact on education. To further understand available supports for students and families related to behavioral health, ISDE contracted with Education Northwest to conduct a survey to gather information on behavioral health and wellness services (BHWS) throughout Idaho. This work was in response to a 2020 legislative mandate (House Bill 627, Section 5) to conduct a comprehensive scan of all BHWS that support K–12 general education students in Idaho. The survey was launched on September 10, 2020, and remained open until October 23, 2020.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2011	Target >=	33.40%	34.40%	35.40%	36.40%	37.40%
A	30.40%	Data	29.57%	29.33%	28.73%	24.43%	25.35%
B	2011	Target <=	48.30%	47.30%	46.30%	45.30%	44.30%
B	50.30%	Data	51.73%	51.85%	51.25%	54.59%	53.18%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	38.40%
Target B <=	43.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho established the current targets based on data analysis and stakeholder input. In setting targets and addressing the needs of students 3-5 years of age, Idaho engaged three broad stakeholder groups: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3), and Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC). Each of these three stakeholder groups represents different stakeholder members. SEAP membership represents parents and families of students with disabilities, self-advocates, higher education, Idaho correctional facilities, local education agency (LEA) superintendents, special education directors, teachers, Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Parents Unlimited, and State Department of Education staff. EC3 represented the following: the medical community, state legislators, higher education, Idaho Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind, Community Council of Idaho, parents, Department of Health and Welfare; Head Start and Early Head Start, Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Medicaid, Title V Maternal and Child Health Programs, Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program, Idaho Children's Trust Fund, and IDEA Part C, membership also included representatives from private child care facilities, the judicial system, State Department of Insurance, early intervention providers, Tribal Relations, and the Council on Developmental Disabilities. DAC consists of a minimum of 14 special education directors nominated regionally by their peers. There are two representatives per region. Membership is distributed between large/small and rural/urban districts to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

For the FFY 2019 reporting year, Idaho's stakeholders recommended extending targets. In the Spring and Fall of 2020, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) discussed changes for the FFY 2020 reporting year with stakeholders. Topics of discussion included setting targets and baseline for FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR submissions and data collection and reporting changes. Stakeholders were informed that ISDE anticipates inclusion rates, reported under Indicator 6A Preschool Environments, to decrease substantially and a corresponding increase for Indicator 6B as students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten shift to reporting under school age environment codes as part of EDFacts FS002 starting in FFY 2020. Idaho does not have a state-funded preschool program. Without support from state funding, many local educational agency (LEA) early childhood programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in higher numbers of students participating in less inclusive environments. As a result, students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten contributed substantially to Idaho's Indicator 6A inclusion rate. As part of these discussions, stakeholders noted that the change, while reducing percentages for indicator 6A, will more accurately reflect information and data on students age 3-5 enrolled in early childhood programs. Stakeholders will re-examine targets and baseline for Indicator 6 after ISDE completes data

analysis on Child Count 2020-2021, reflecting federal changes in reporting for FFY 2020. ISDE also noted that LEAs communicate an increased number of families shifting to homeschooling during the COVID-19 crisis, which might further impact inclusion rates for FFY 2020.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	4,106
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,109
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,737
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	**
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	**

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,109	4,106	25.35%	38.40%	27.01%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,182	4,106	53.18%	43.30%	53.14%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ISDE collected Indicator 6 data for the FFY 2019 reporting year in the fall of 2019. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 6 data. Idaho does not have a state-funded preschool program. LEAs are encouraged to develop inclusive programs through the use of title I funds, collaborating with local Head Start, and private preschool programs. Without support from state funding, many LEA programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in higher numbers of students participating in less inclusive environments. Historically, students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten have contributed substantially to Idaho's Indicator 6A inclusion rate. ISDE anticipates inclusion rates, reported under Indicator 6A Preschool Environments, to decrease substantially with a corresponding increase in Indicator 6B as students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten shift to reporting under school age environment codes as part of EDFacts FS002. Idaho LEAs are also communicating an increased number of families electing to homeschool their students during the COVID-19 crisis, which might further impact inclusion rates for FFY 2020. ISDE notes that the change in data and reporting will more accurately reflect information for students age 3-5 enrolled in early childhood programs. ISDE regularly accesses national technical resources to improve understanding of strategies to improve systems and implementation. The information gained from national centers has enabled ISDE to increase partnerships with fellow agencies and leverage internal resources. Strategies to address data quality and performance for Indicator 6 include increased and improved communication and training developed through collaboration with other state agencies and grant opportunities.

Communication and Training:

ISDE continues to develop and produce training modules and recordings related to early childhood coding and inclusive practices. To access available training, go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/A-M/Early-Childhood?page13538=1&size13538=6>. The recordings are open to the public with a target audience of new teachers and existing staff who need additional training.

In the spring of 2019, ISDE worked with Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) staff to develop a plan to improve early childhood data. Based on the review with ECTA, the ISDE team made changes to annual data trainings to fully integrate early childhood information. By including early childhood data, ISDE increased awareness and understanding of data and appropriate environment coding. Data related training that incorporated early childhood information included the Data Drill Down, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, and the Director's Webinars. The

annual Data Drill Down training now provides additional information, reports, and break-out sessions specific to early childhood. Early childhood and preschool data reporting were also agenda items for DAC and SEAP for school year 2019-2020.

ISDE partners with other agencies and resources to increase training and develop guidance documents related to inclusionary practices. IdahoSTARS provides oversight and training to childcare providers across the state. Materials, including guidance documents and training, are shared with childcare providers and made available to the public on the IdahoSTARS Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS).

Idaho is scaling up Idaho's Pyramid Model Collaborative, a social and emotional program for early childhood settings. Idaho joined a national initiative to address inclusive policies and practices at the state, local program leadership, and early care and education environments levels. The State Department of Education, Idaho Special Education Support & Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA), Head Start Collaborative Office, Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHC/University of Idaho), IdahoSTARS, and Boise State University are working together to improve early childhood outcomes and increase positive social-emotional competencies for all children.

Idaho's Pyramid Model follows the guidance from the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI), a federally-funded project established to disseminate effective use of the Pyramid Model to support young children's social, emotional, and behavioral development through a variety of training and technical assistance activities. The Pyramid Model focuses on program leadership, creating internal coaching capacity, and building knowledge for teachers to support the development of social and emotional competencies in young children. The project provides technical assistance and professional development to teams, identified practitioner coaches, and instructional staff as part of the project.

Grant Opportunities:

Preschool the Idaho Way, is a grant opportunity administered out of the Idaho Association of the Education of Young Children (IAEYC). The Kellogg Foundation provided Idaho with grant funds to increase high-quality early education opportunities. ISDE staff also utilized IAEYC to review grant opportunities and provide training/webinars on inclusionary practices.

In the fall of 2019, ISDE announced and awarded a competitive sub-grant opportunity for IDEA Part B 619 Reallocated Flow-through Funds to support the needs of children ages 3-5 with disabilities. The competitive sub-grant funds supported early childhood special education programs in addressing specific needs, such as accessible playground equipment, early childhood assessments, and parenting classes.

Idaho was awarded funds for the Preschool Development Grant (PDG) in 2019 and 2020. The Office of the Governor partnered with the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare and ISDE to apply for the PDG to further efforts in improving Idaho's early childhood programs. Idaho is using PDG funds to scale up from local collaboration at fifteen sites to twenty sites across the state. PDG supported early childhood special education teachers with professional development credit through the Early Learning Academies and Ready! for Kindergarten. Idaho also purchased access to ePyramid modules on social and emotional development with PDG funds. Individuals participating in Idaho's Pyramid Model currently have access to the modules. ISDE plans to expand access and offer the ePyramid modules as a for-credit professional development option to all early childhood teachers in the spring of 2021.

Data Quality:

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and rules of completion as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan. As of October 2019, approximately 56 educational entities comprised of LEAs and LEA authorized charters, which represent about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count, are utilizing the system. For Indicator 6: Preschool Environments data, Idaho EDPlan routes users through the decision tree process to determine the student's educational environment. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate educational environment code based on responses to decision tree questions. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that all necessary documentation is finalized and limits user coding error.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2019	Target >=	85.20%	84.70%	84.20%	85.70%	85.20%
A1	64.25%	Data	78.27%	68.61%	67.75%	66.79%	68.29%
A2	2019	Target >=	54.38%	54.88%	55.38%	55.88%	56.38%

A2	45.95%	Data	53.65%	49.09%	51.16%	49.51%	50.45%
B1	2019	Target >=	78.55%	79.05%	79.55%	80.05%	80.55%
B1	62.88%	Data	72.17%	71.71%	68.74%	64.19%	69.96%
B2	2019	Target >=	27.87%	28.37%	28.87%	29.37%	29.87%
B2	13.75%	Data	22.92%	19.16%	19.10%	19.61%	17.52%
C1	2019	Target >=	83.81%	84.31%	84.81%	85.31%	85.81%
C1	64.89%	Data	76.14%	69.98%	67.66%	61.34%	67.42%
C2	2019	Target >=	65.91%	66.41%	66.91%	67.41%	67.91%
C2	54.75%	Data	61.46%	60.32%	60.53%	57.45%	57.95%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	
Target A2 >=	
Target B1 >=	
Target B2 >=	
Target C1 >=	
Target C2 >=	

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho set targets based on the analysis of state trend data and stakeholder input. To establish targets for Indicator 7 that appropriately address the needs of students 3-5 years of age, Idaho utilized two major stakeholder groups: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC). SEAP membership represents parents and families of students with disabilities, self-advocates, higher education, Idaho correctional facilities, LEA superintendents, special education directors, teachers, Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Parents Unlimited, and State Department of Education. DAC consists of a minimum of 14 special education directors nominated regionally by their peers. There are two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter local education agencies (LEAs) to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

Idaho made a concerted effort to address reporting and training issues related to early childhood outcomes (ECO). A new data collection tool was developed and piloted in FFY 2017 with full implementation in FFY 2018. The new tool substantially increased the quantity and accuracy of ECO ratings reported to the state. ISDE followed up the collection system's change with extensive training, including webinars, online modules, and conference presentations, which addressed appropriate ECO rating and data entry. Based on multiple years of data using the new tool and full implementation of training, ISDE and stakeholders scheduled the Indicator 7 target and baseline reset for FFY 2019.

In preparation for the target and baseline reset, communication and training with stakeholders began early in the spring of 2020 and included discussions regarding the proposed FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. The soft-closure of Idaho schools beginning March 17, 2020, due to the COVID-19 crisis, substantially impacted outcomes for early childhood students and LEA team's ability to conduct face-to-face assessments. Idaho's results in all outcome measures dropped dramatically. Throughout the Fall of 2020, ISDE presented data and information and held discussions with stakeholders regarding the Indicator 7 target and baseline reset. Discussions carefully considered the potential consequence of resetting targets based on COVID-19 impacted data. Stakeholder groups discussed options including delaying target resetting until FFY 2020 and establishing targets as part of the new SPP/APR package. Both stakeholder groups independently determined that resetting the baseline and target for FFY 2019 was the most appropriate action, citing that the targets established in 2013 were not relevant to current collection processes, targets were unattainable based on existing data, and that COVID-19 would have a residual impact on ECO results. In accordance with stakeholder feedback, Idaho established the baseline and target for Indicator 7 utilizing FFY 2019 data with an annual target increase of .5 percentage points. Stakeholders requested that ISDE revisit Indicator 7 targets in no more than three years.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,295

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	36	2.78%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	339	26.18%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	325	25.10%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	349	26.95%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	246	19.00%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	674	1,049	68.29%		64.25%	N/A	N/A
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	595	1,295	50.45%		45.95%	N/A	N/A

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14	1.08%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	460	35.52%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	643	49.65%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	160	12.36%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	18	1.39%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	803	1,277	69.96%		62.88%	N/A	N/A
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	178	1,295	17.52%		13.75%	N/A	N/A

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	29	2.24%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	313	24.17%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	244	18.84%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	388	29.96%

e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	321	24.79%
---	-----	--------

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	632	974	67.42%		64.89%	N/A	N/A
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	709	1,295	57.95%		54.75%	N/A	N/A

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Early Childhood Outcome rating data and information are collected and incorporated into the Early Childhood IEP using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process. ISDE mandated that all LEAs utilize the updated ECO/IEP no later than FFY 2015 with full integration into IEP platforms no later than FFY 2018.

Once documented as part of the ECO/IEP, ECO ratings are then reported to the ISDE in the Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System. Upon student exit, LEA staff finalize the student record through submission of ECO exit and progress ratings. The system uses validations on entry and exit date fields to ensure that only students who have received special education and related services for at least six months are reported to the federal level. In FFY 2017, ISDE developed and piloted the Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System application. The ECO application establishes records for students based on demographic data reported to the statewide longitudinal data system. Using demographic and enrollment data helps guarantee that students are recorded under the correct LEA and eliminates records duplication. Validations also exist between entry and exit ratings ensuring federal reporting only reflects students meeting the minimum months of service.

The 2018-2019 school year was the first year of full implementation using the new Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System. The change in systems resulted in improved data quality, security, reduced duplication of effort, and a substantial increase in the number of students with ECO ratings recorded.

The soft-closure beginning March 17, 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, substantially impacted outcomes for early childhood students. COVID-19 impacted the number of Early Childhood Outcomes ratings due to an increased number of students withdrawn from LEAs before meeting the six months of service minimum required for federal reporting. As a result of the soft closure, many LEA teams' were unable to conduct face-to-face assessments and observations in the student's regular education environment. This inability to conduct face-to-face assessments resulted in the use of an alternative state-approved practice to collect student data, teacher observation, and parent input. To facilitate data collection for ECO, the ISDE developed guidance on processes to collect relevant information necessary to establish exit rating comparable to conducting a full exit anchor assessment. The change in the collection process did not impact the validity and reliability of ECO exit ratings for students exiting the early childhood program in the spring of 2020. Idaho attributes decreased outcome ratings to changes in service delivery (i.e., modified and virtual instruction, telehealth, etc.) resulting from COVID-19-related closures, which caused undue stress and negatively impacted students' education, especially social-emotional outcomes.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The soft-closure beginning March 17, 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, substantially impacted outcomes for early childhood students.

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft closure due to the COVID-19 crisis. All local education agencies (LEAs) were required to follow national CDC guidelines pertaining to large gatherings and social distancing. Students were not allowed on school grounds but LEAs were required to continue facilitating essential services and student learning. To mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on education, the ISDE special education team immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families.

ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, OSEP guidance, and information from partner agencies. During the soft closure period, ISDE collaborated with IPUL and DisAbility Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families, and provided an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns.

ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 crisis. For additional information or to access

available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

Idaho makes a concerted effort to improve data quality and performance in early childhood indicators. ISDE regularly accesses available national technical resources and partners to leverage internal resources. Strategies to address data quality and performance for Indicator 7 include increased and improved communication and training developed through collaboration with other state agencies and grant opportunities.

Communication and Training:

High turnover for early childhood special education teachers continues to be a problem. In response, ISDE continues to develop and produce training modules and recordings related to early childhood outcomes and inclusive practices. To access available training, go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/A-M/Early-Childhood?page13538=1&size13538=6>. The recordings are open to the public with a target audience of new teachers and existing staff who need additional training.

In October 2019 and 2020, ISDE provided statewide training in the use of Visual Phonics intervention. Visual Phonics is an intervention to help preschool students improve their pre-literacy skills and specifically address Outcome 2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication). ISDE staff annually conduct the training in multiple sessions. Over the last two years, 210 Speech-Language Pathologists and special education teachers across the state participated.

In the spring of 2019, ISDE worked with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) staff to develop a plan to improve early childhood data. Based on the review with ECTA, the ISDE team made changes to annual data training to fully integrate early childhood information. By including early childhood data, ISDE increased awareness and understanding of data and appropriate environment coding. Data-related training that incorporated early childhood information included the Data Drill Down, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, and the Director's Webinars.

ISDE partners with other agencies and resources to increase training and develop guidance documents related to inclusionary practices. IdahoSTARS provides oversight and training to childcare providers across the state. Materials, including guidance documents and training, are shared with childcare providers and made available to the public on the IdahoSTARS Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS).

Idaho is scaling up Idaho's Pyramid Model Collaborative, a social and emotional program for early childhood settings. Idaho joined a national initiative to address inclusive policies and practices at the state, local program leadership, and early care and education environments levels. The State Department of Education, Idaho SESTA (Special Education Support & Technical Assistance), Head Start Collaborative Office, Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHC/University of Idaho), IdahoSTARS, and Boise State University are working together to improve early childhood outcomes and increase positive social-emotional competencies for all children.

Idaho's Pyramid Model follows the guidance from the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI), a federally-funded project established to disseminate effective use of the Pyramid Model to support young children's social, emotional, and behavioral development through a variety of training and technical assistance activities. The Pyramid Model focuses on program leadership, creating internal coaching capacity, and building knowledge for teachers to support the development of social and emotional competencies in young children. The project provides technical assistance and professional development to teams, identified practitioner coaches, and instructional staff as part of the project.

Grant Opportunities:

Preschool the Idaho Way, is a grant opportunity administered out of the Idaho Association of the Education of Young Children (IAEYC). The Kellogg Foundation provided Idaho with grant funds to increase high-quality early education opportunities. ISDE staff also utilized IAEYC to review grant opportunities and provide training/webinars on inclusionary practices.

In the fall of 2019, ISDE announced and awarded a competitive sub-grant opportunity for IDEA Part B 619 Reallocated Flow-through Funds to support the needs of children ages 3-5 with disabilities. The competitive sub-grant funds supported early childhood special education programs in addressing specific needs, such as accessible playground equipment, early childhood assessments, and parenting classes.

Idaho was awarded funds for the Preschool Development Grant (PDG) in 2019 and 2020. The Office of the Governor partnered with the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare and ISDE to apply for the PDG to further efforts in improving Idaho's early childhood programs. Idaho is using PDG funds to scale up from local collaboration at fifteen sites to twenty sites across the state. PDG supported early childhood special education teachers with professional development credit through the Early Learning Academies and Ready! for Kindergarten. Idaho also purchased access to ePyramid modules on social and emotional development with PDG funds. Individuals participating in Idaho's Pyramid Model currently have access to the modules. ISDE plans to expand access and offer the ePyramid modules as a for-credit professional development option to all early childhood teachers in the spring of 2021.

Data Quality:

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan, released in March of 2019. For Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcome data, Idaho EDPlan routes users through the Early Childhood Outcome Decision Tree for Summary Ratings process for each outcome area. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate rating based on the user's responses to decision tree questions.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State reported that "[t]he soft-closure of Idaho schools beginning March 17, 2020, due to the COVID-19 crisis, substantially impacted outcomes for early childhood students and LEA team's ability to conduct face-to-face assessments. Idaho's results in all outcome measures dropped dramatically" of the FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

The State reported that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the data for this indicator. Specifically, the State reported, "[t]he soft-closure beginning March 17, 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, substantially impacted outcomes for early childhood students. COVID-19 impacted the number of Early Childhood Outcomes ratings due to an increased number of students withdrawn from LEAs before meeting the six months of service minimum required for federal reporting. As a result of the soft closure, many LEA teams' were unable to conduct face-to-face assessments and observations in the student's regular education environment. This inability to conduct face-to-face assessments resulted in the use of an alternative state-approved practice to collect student data, teacher observation, and parent input."

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) was directly involved in the development of questions, processes, and targets for Indicator 8 collection. SEAP membership represents the following: higher education, parents, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Parents Unlimited (Idaho's Parent Training and Information center), charter schools, and State Department of Education staff. In the 2016-17 school year, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) presented information and results from the Indicator 8 Parent Involvement survey to SEAP and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC). Upon reviewing historical Indicator 8 Parent Involvement survey processes, data, and national comparisons, stakeholders recommended resetting the baseline and targets. With stakeholder input, ISDE set the baseline for the FFY 2015 data at 55.44% with a target increase of 0.25 percentage points every two years. For FFY 2016, Idaho included an additional 0.06 percentage point increase to facilitate a more orderly numeric progression. Idaho surveys LEAs on a two-year rotation, so increasing the targets every two years better aligns indicator results and targets, allowing both sample groups to be evaluated against the same objectives.

In the 2017-2018 school year, Idaho made a concerted effort to improve its response rate. After reviewing Indicator 8 processes from other states—with input from Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), IDEA Data Center (IDC), and stakeholders—ISDE determined that providing the survey in more than one format could positively impact the response rate and improve families' access to the survey. The ISDE then coordinated with its vendor to provide the survey first in a web-based format and then a follow-up mail-out format. With stakeholder input, ISDE modified the survey to a four-option Likert scale, removing the neutral option, so that survey responses clearly illustrated agreement or disagreement of family engagement. Emoji icons were added to communicate response options further through visual cueing. Per stakeholder request, an N/A option was also added for questions that focused on specific age groups. The ISDE maintained calculation of responses on a 100-point scale. As no changes were made to the participant selection process, LEA participation cycle, or survey questions, ISDE and stakeholders chose to continue use of the baseline and targets established in FFY 2015.

Idaho is currently researching the option to combine the Indicator 8 Parent Involvement Survey as part of the Parent Engagement survey conducted as part of the Idaho Consolidated State Plan. This option was discussed with both the SEAP and DAC. Both groups noted the advantage of conducting one survey because parents and families in the current environment are experiencing survey fatigue. Other noted potential advantages were increased participation, collaboration between general education and special education, improved anonymity, and better integration of data across systems. Using multiple years of data from the Parent Involvement survey responses, Idaho has identified key areas for improvement.

1. Parent training opportunities: SEAP and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) will play a crucial part in keeping local education agencies (LEAs) informed regarding organizations and training that provide support to parents.

2. Communication regarding progress and goals: Idaho Special Education Support & Technical Assistance (SESTA) will provide regional support and training regarding IEP progress and goals.

3. Receipt of accurate contact information: ISDE is working with stakeholder groups to identify and discuss ways to further improve the collection of contact information. ISDE provides reminders to LEAs through email and webinar about the importance of communicating with families regarding the survey and encouraging them to participate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	55.44%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	59.60%	55.44%	55.50%	55.75%	55.75%
Data	61.16%	55.44%	59.88%	70.26%	68.29%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	56.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
650	906	68.29%	56.00%	71.74%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

4,947

Percentage of respondent parents

18.31%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The selection process for participants is dependent on the size of the population of students with disabilities within the LEA. For LEAs with fewer than 100 students with disabilities, all families are selected for participation. For those LEAs that have a sample selection process, the population is stratified by grade pre-k-12, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender to ensure the representativeness of the resulting sample by these characteristics. Sampling procedures included all students ages 3-21, and there was not a separate selection process for preschool students.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

As outlined in the sampling plan submitted and approved in FFY 2013, LEAs are separated out into two-cycle groups for participation in the Parent Involvement Survey. The selection process for participants is dependent on the size of the population of students with disabilities within the LEA. For LEAs with fewer than 100 students with disabilities, all families are selected for participation. LEAs with 100 or more students have a stratified, representative sample of families selected proportionate to the number of total students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA. For those LEAs that have a sample selection process, the population is stratified by grade, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender to ensure the representativeness of the resulting sample by these characteristics. Sampling procedures included all students ages 3-21, and there is not a separate selection process for preschool students. The sample sizes ensure roughly similar margins of error across the different LEA sizes. When calculating the state-level results, the LEA's responses are weighted according to their student population size. To determine the percent of parents who report that schools facilitated parent involvement, a percent of maximum score was calculated based on all 21 survey items. A percent of maximum score of 66% is the minimum score required for a parent to report that the school facilitated his/her involvement. This rating indicates that, on average, the parent agreed with all items. After calculating the weighted rate, 68.30% of parents had a percent of the maximum score of 66% or above. Thus, 68.30% of parents reported the school facilitated parent involvement.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

ISDE continues to work with stakeholders, including IPUL, to increase parent knowledge and encourage parents of all racial-ethnic backgrounds to complete the parent survey. ISDE recognizes that there is a lower response rate for the Hispanic/Latino racial/ethnic group for the Indicator 8 Parent Involvement Survey, as well as other educational surveys. The difference in response rate is even more pronounced when focused on the participation of parents of students designated as limited English proficiency. Spanish and English versions of the survey are available to all participants to prevent language from being a barrier to participation.

To improve access and communication across systems, ISDE is researching options to integrate the Indicator 8 Parent Involvement survey into the Parent Engagement survey, a non-academic indicator in the Idaho Consolidated State Plan. The Parent Engagement survey is administered on an annual basis for all LEAs and buildings. This change would improve parent access to the survey, improve the anonymity of response, and maximize communication and collection efforts. The change would also allow the ISDE Special Education team to improve collaboration across divisions and facilitate migrant education teams' involvement. The ISDE Division of Special Education will further partner to provide information on the Parent Involvement Survey to LEP Coordinators at the school building level.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Analysis for representativeness of survey response was determined based on statistical significance testing. The demographic characteristics of students whose parents responded to the survey were compared to the demographics of all students in the stratified, representative sample to determine any over or under-representation of subgroups in the response rate.

This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by the size of the LEA where the student attends school; and (2) by the grade level of the student. Response rates differed by racial-ethnic background and primary disability. Parents of students with a specific learning disability were less likely to respond than parents of students identified in other disability categories: 16% of respondents were parents of a student with a specific learning disability, whereas 22% of the sample are students with a specific learning disability. Parents of White racial-ethnic students were more likely to respond than parents of non-White students: 81% of respondents are parents of a White student, whereas 69% of the sample are of White racial-ethnic background. Parents of Hispanic students were less likely to respond than parents of non-Hispanic students: 12% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a Hispanic student, whereas 22% of the students with disabilities in the sample are Hispanic.

Parent response rates for Asian, Black or African American, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders were insufficient to generate reliable statistical significance.

Idaho anticipates that the COVID-19 crisis may have marginally impacted the survey response rate. Social distancing rules resulted in less travel during the survey administration and increased awareness of emailed materials. Idaho's process was consistent with the prior year's survey administration (email and mail). The response rate increased from 2018-19 to 2019-20 by two percentage points. The percent of parents indicating their school facilitated their involvement and individual item responses slightly increased from 2018-19 to 2019-20, but ISDE has no reason to believe that was a function of COVID.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft closure due to the COVID-19 crisis. The ISDE special education team immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as OSEP guidance. Representatives from IPUL, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, School-Based Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a question and answer guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

During the soft closure period, ISDE collaborated with IPUL and DisAbility Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. The webinars also offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft closure.

ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 crisis. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) contracted with Education Northwest to conduct a survey to gather information on behavioral health and wellness services (BHWS) throughout Idaho. This work is in response to a 2020 legislative mandate (House Bill 627, Section 5) to conduct a comprehensive scan of all BHWS that support K-12 general education students in Idaho. The survey was launched on September 10, 2020, and remained open until October 23, 2020.

For the purposes of the survey, BHWS was defined as services focused on the well-being services, strategies, and/or programs available to the K-12 general student population. These services are available to all students, families, and/or school staff members to support students' mental, social, and personal health. The survey asked about the BHWS strategies and/or programs available as part of a typical school experience for students before the COVID-19 pandemic. Administrators were encouraged to connect with a team of educators in their LEA/school for a full picture of pre-pandemic efforts. Survey questions focused on providing an understanding of what types of BHWS are being implemented to the general population in each school and LEA; identifying service delivery gaps, challenges, and perceived value; and fostering understanding of how service delivery is being measured across LEAs and in schools. Information collected through the BHWS survey will assist ISDE to better support LEA teams related to behavioral health and improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	16.10%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

87

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	82	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

In school year 2013-2014, stakeholder groups provided input regarding shifting the calculation method from the "E-Formula" to an alternate risk ratio calculation to determine disproportionate representation for indicators 9 and 10. Additionally, the threshold of 3.0 was recommended, along with a minimum n-size of 25 students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA. Stakeholder groups included: State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST), Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3), and Director Advisory Committee (DAC). In 2015, these same stakeholder groups provided input to adjust the n-size from 25 to 40 to better align with significant disproportionality calculations. At this time, stakeholders also reaffirmed the use of the alternate risk ratio formula to calculate disproportionate representation. All stakeholder recommendations were adopted.

Idaho continues to evaluate how Indicators 9 and 10 are used to support activities related to significant disproportionality. Areas of discussion include potential changes to calculation (i.e. n-size, cell size, and the number of years of analysis) and processes to address disproportionality in a more cohesive system.

The current calculation for disproportionate representation is as follows:

ARR = DLR/SLR

Where:

ARR = Alternate risk ratio

DLR = District-level risk for racial/ethnic group for disability identification

SLR = State-level risk for comparison group for disability identification

Threshold: Idaho has established a threshold of 3.0. The ARR would have to equal or be greater than 3.0 to flag disproportionate representation

Minimum n-size: Idaho has established 40 students with disabilities in a district as the minimum n-size for calculation.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

By applying the alternate risk ratio formula to LEA-level data, the ISDE identifies LEAs with ARR equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, as having disproportionate representation. Each of those LEAs must complete a Performance Response that includes an explanation of policies, practices, and procedures used to refer, evaluate, and identify students for special education. The ISDE also selects student eligibility files to review. LEA responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by ISDE staff to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected, based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, the ISDE looks for a preponderance of evidence-based on data collected to support eligibility for special education. The ISDE also checks to see if the exclusionary factors have been adequately addressed. From this information, the ISDE determines whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification and, if it is, makes a finding of noncompliance in regards to the appropriateness of the LEA's identification policies, practices, and procedures.

The number of LEAs analyzed for FFY 2019 was 82 (those having 40 or more students with disabilities enrolled between the ages of 6 and 21). One LEA was found to have disproportionate representation, but no LEAs were found to have disproportionate representation (using data from SY 2019-2020) as a result of inappropriate identification based on the ISDE's review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ISDE collected Indicator 9 data for the FFY 2019 reporting year in the fall of 2019. The COVID-19 health crisis had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 9 data.

Idaho continues to evaluate how Indicators 9 and 10 are used to support activities related to significant disproportionality. Areas of discussion include potential changes to calculation (i.e. n-size, cell size, and the number of years of analysis) and processes to address disproportionality as a cohesive system. In the Fall of 2020, stakeholders from the SEAP and DAC recommended that the ISDE adopt the Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification as part of the process to determine if disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification was developed as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. The self-assessment protocol will replace the Performance Response as part of the review. Using the same tool for Indicators 9, 10, and significant disproportionality will improve alignment and reduce confusion for LEAs and stakeholders. The self-assessment protocol works in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan, released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 LEAs and LEA authorized charter schools utilize the system, representing about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules from referral through eligibility determination. Ensuring LEA teams meet compliance requirements for evaluation and finalize all necessary documentation.

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft closure due to the COVID-19 crisis. The ISDE special education team immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020.

Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as OSEP guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's parent center, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, School-Based Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a Question and Answer Guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

During the soft closure period, ISDE collaborated with IPUL and DisAbility Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. The webinars also offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft closure.

ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 crisis. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

The ISDE is committed to the health and safety of every student in Idaho public schools. Students are far more likely to realize their academic and life skills potential in a supportive school climate that is safe and free from violence. One of ISDE's current initiatives, Stop Bullying in Idaho, is focused on bullying prevention for school-age youth. This initiative supports LEAs and schools through:

- Training resources on best practices;
- Guidance, training, and technical assistance related to policy development;
- Collecting data about youth risk behaviors, including bullying and harassment;
- Assisting schools with the implementation of prevention programs;
- Providing funding to address bullying and harassment; and
- Hosting an annual conference focused on prevention.

Idaho is increasing focus on students' social-emotional well-being and the impact on education. To further understand available supports for students and families related to behavioral health, ISDE contracted with Education Northwest to conduct a survey to gather information on behavioral health and wellness services (BHWS) throughout Idaho. This work was in response to a 2020 legislative mandate (House Bill 627, Section 5) to conduct a comprehensive scan of all BHWS that support K–12 general education students in Idaho. The survey was launched on September 10, 2020, and remained open until October 23, 2020.

For the purposes of the survey, BHWS was defined as services focused on the well-being services, strategies, and/or programs available to the K–12 general student population. These services are available to all students, families, and/or school staff members to support students' mental, social, and personal health. The survey asked about the BHWS strategies and/or programs available as part of a typical school experience for students before the COVID-19 pandemic. Administrators were encouraged to connect with a team of educators in their district/school for a full picture of pre-pandemic efforts. Survey questions focused on identifying the types of BHWS available to the general population in each school and district; identifying service delivery gaps, challenges, and perceived value; and fostering understanding of how service delivery is being measured across districts and in schools. Information collected through the BHWS survey will help the ISDE better support LEA teams related to behavioral health and improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	16.10%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size.

Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

117

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
6	0	52	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

In school year 2013-2014, stakeholder groups provided input regarding shifting the calculation method from the "E-Formula" to an alternate risk ratio calculation to determine disproportionate representation for indicators 9 and 10. Additionally, the threshold of 3.0 was recommended, along with a minimum n-size of 25 students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA. Stakeholder groups included: State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST), Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3), and Director Advisory Committee (DAC). In 2015, these same stakeholder groups provided input to adjust the n-size from 25 to 40 to better align with significant disproportionality calculations. At this time, stakeholders also reaffirmed the use of the alternate risk ratio formula to calculate disproportionate representation. All stakeholder recommendations were adopted.

Idaho continues to evaluate how Indicators 9 and 10 are used to support activities related to significant disproportionality. Areas of discussion include potential changes to calculation (i.e. n-size, cell size, and the number of years of analysis) and processes to address disproportionality in a more cohesive system.

The current calculation for disproportionate representation is as follows:

$$ARR = DLR/SLR$$

Where:

ARR = Alternate risk ratio

DLR = District-level risk for racial/ethnic group for disability identification

SLR = State-level risk for comparison group for disability identification

Threshold: Idaho has established a threshold of 3.0. The ARR would have to equal or be greater than 3.0 to flag disproportionate representation

Minimum n-size: Idaho has established 40 students with disabilities in a district as the minimum n-size for calculation.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

By applying the alternate risk ratio formula to LEA-level data, the ISDE identifies LEAs with ARR equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, as having disproportionate representation. Each of those LEAs must complete a Performance Response that includes an explanation of policies, practices, and procedures used to refer, evaluate, and identify students for special education. The ISDE also selects student eligibility files to review. LEA responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by ISDE staff to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected, based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, the ISDE looks for a preponderance of evidence-based on data collected to support eligibility for special education. The ISDE also checks to see if the exclusionary factors have been adequately addressed. From this information, the ISDE determines whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification and, if it is, makes a finding of noncompliance in regards to the appropriateness of the LEA's identification policies, practices, and procedures.

The number of LEAs analyzed for FFY 2019 was 52 (those having 40 or more students with disabilities enrolled between the ages of 6 and 21). Six LEAs were found to have disproportionate representation, but no LEAs were found to have disproportionate representation (using data from SY 2019-2020) as a result of inappropriate identification based on the ISDE's review.

Two of the six LEAs were identified as significantly disproportionate for FFY 2019 and are working to address contributing factors through Idaho's significant disproportionality process.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ISDE collected Indicator 10 data for the FFY 2019 reporting year in the fall of 2019. The COVID-19 health crisis had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 10 data.

Idaho continues to evaluate how Indicators 9 and 10 are used to support activities related to significant disproportionality. Areas of discussion include potential changes to calculation, i.e. n-size, cell size, and the number of years of analysis, and processes to address disproportionality as a cohesive system. In the Fall of 2020, stakeholders from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC) recommended that ISDE adopt the Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification as part of the process to determine if disproportionality is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification document was developed as part of the state's work on significant disproportionality and will help support Indicator 9, 10, and significant disproportionality alignment.

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft closure due to the COVID-19 crisis. The ISDE special education team immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as OSEP guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, School-Based Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a Question and Answer Guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE

website.

During the soft closure period, ISDE collaborated with IPUL and DisAbility Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. The webinars also offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft closure.

ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 crisis. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) contracted with Education Northwest to conduct a survey to gather information on behavioral health and wellness services (BHWS) throughout Idaho. This work is in response to a 2020 legislative mandate (House Bill 627, Section 5) to conduct a comprehensive scan of all BHWS that support K–12 general education students in Idaho. The survey was launched on September 10, 2020, and remained open until October 23, 2020.

For the purposes of the survey, BHWS was defined as services focused on the well-being services, strategies, and/or programs available to the K–12 general student population. These services are available to all students, families, and/or school staff members to support students' mental, social, and personal health. The survey asked about the BHWS strategies and/or programs available as part of a typical school experience for students before the COVID-19 pandemic. Administrators were encouraged to connect with a team of educators in their district/school for a full picture of pre-pandemic efforts. Survey questions focused on providing an understanding of what types of BHWS are being implemented to the general population in each school and district; identifying service delivery gaps, challenges, and perceived value; and fostering understanding of how service delivery is being measured across districts and in schools. Information collected through the BHWS survey will assist ISDE to better support LEA teams related to behavioral health and improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and rules of completion as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan. The optional software was released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 educational entities comprised of LEAs and LEA authorized charters, which represent about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count, are utilizing the system. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that LEAs follow all required documentation and processes from referral through the determination of eligibility.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	91.40%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.53%	99.31%	98.60%	99.14%	98.36%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5,552	5,473	98.36%	100%	98.58%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

79

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Forty-five initial evaluations exceeded the timeline due primarily to scheduling difficulties. These evaluations were made within the range of 1-148 days over the 60-day timeline, with a median of 15 days.

Twenty initial evaluations exceeded the timeline due primarily to the need for additional assessments to determine eligibility. These evaluations were made within the range of 4-149 days over the 60-day timeline, with a median of 33.5 days.

** initial evaluations exceeded the timeline without reasoning provided. These evaluations were made within the range of 5-76 days over the 60-day timeline, with a median of 20.5 days. The ISDE is reaching out to LEAs to determine the specific reasons for each of these instances exceeding the 60-day timeline.

** initial evaluations exceeded the timeline due primarily to staffing issues. These evaluations were made within the range of 26-111 days over the 60-day timeline, with a median of 74 days.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03 states;

The total timeline from the date of receipt of written parental consent for an initial evaluation to the date of determination of eligibility for special education and related services must not exceed sixty (60) calendar days, excluding periods when regular school is not in session for five (5) or more consecutive school days, unless all parties agree to an extension.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data are collected through the state's longitudinal database, the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE). LEAs are required to submit all 60-day timeline data at the student level. Data are available for LEA teams to review and ensure accuracy throughout the year on the web-based application, the Special Education (SPED) Data Application. The data are then reviewed annually by the ISDE.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 pandemic had a direct impact on Indicator 11 data for Idaho. The impact of COVID-19 on Indicator 11 is shown in a significant decrease in the count of students referred and for whom consent for initial assessment was received. The COVID-19 pandemic did not substantially impact the percentage for Indicator 11 because of the state's established timeline and the efforts of LEA teams to communicate and coordinate with families. Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03 states;

The total timeline from the date of receipt of written parental consent for an initial evaluation to the date of determination of eligibility for special education and related services must not exceed sixty (60) calendar days, excluding periods when regular school is not in session for five (5) or more consecutive school days, unless all parties agree to an extension.

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes Indicator 11 and other compliance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs receive their determination and are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct a root-cause analysis and assist LEAs to identify factors contributing to compliance issues in specific areas, including Child Find and the 60-day timeline. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely (SMART) Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training on the process to SESTA coordinators and LEAs.

To improve data quality on multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan, released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 LEAs and LEA authorized charter schools utilize the system, representing about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count. For Indicator 11 data, Idaho EDPlan includes calendar information that provides timelines and reminders to LEA staff related to compliance requirements. The system allows teachers and supervisors to monitor caseloads and IEP teams to ensure compliance with timeline requirements. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate date fields for state reporting. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules from referral through eligibility determination. The system ensures LEA teams meet compliance requirements and finalize all necessary documentation for initial eligibility.

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft-closure due to the COVID-19 pandemic. All LEAs were required to follow national CDC guidelines pertaining to large gatherings and social distancing. Students were not allowed on school grounds, but LEAs were required to continue facilitating essential services and student learning. The soft-closure extended through the end of the school year with flexibilities starting April 20, 2020, which allowed LEAs to bring select students into school buildings or reopen based on compliance with specific criteria. In addition, Idaho's Governor issued a statewide stay-at-home order, which was in effect March 25, 2020 through May 1, 2020. The soft-closure, combined with the stay-at-home order, negatively impacted LEA teams' ability to conduct face-to-face assessments and observations in the regular education environment. To mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, the ISDE Division of Special Education immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families.

The ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services during the COVID-19 pandemic. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Division of Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft-closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a question and answer guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

During the soft-closure period, the ISDE collaborated with IPUL and Disability Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. These webinars offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft-closure.

The ISDE and its partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 pandemic. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
39	39	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To ensure that the 39 LEAs identified with noncompliance in FFY 2018, correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE reviewed updated Child Find 60-day timeline data subsequently collected through the statewide longitudinal data system, the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE), for each LEA identified with noncompliance in FFY 2018. As a result of this subsequent review of updated data, the ISDE determined that each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. Based on ISDE's review of subsequent updated data, the ISDE determined that all LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for Indicator 11 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The ISDE verified the correction of noncompliance by reviewing the data and verifying that all initial evaluations were completed. All instances of noncompliance in FFY 2018 were investigated at the student level. The ISDE verified that all eligible students received an eligibility determination although late, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the data for this indicator. Specifically, the State reported, "LEA teams did not have access to students for face-to-face assessment or observations in the regular education environment. LEA teams communicated with families to establish written extensions, discuss processes that would meet social distancing requirements, and provide written notice. The ISDE identified a substantial increase in usage of the State Exception Rule (SE) code, which addresses school closures extending five or more consecutive school days as a result of Acts of Nature, Holiday Break, Other School Break, Spring Break, and Summer Break. See Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03. The ISDE notes that the count of students referred and for whom consent for initial assessment was receive decreased significantly."

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	59.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.00%	99.53%	99.38%	99.82%	98.95%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,038
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	42

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	603
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	364
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	10
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	603	622	98.95%	100%	96.95%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The ISDE directly attributes slippage on Indicator 12 to local education agencies (LEA) teams' inability to conduct face-to-face assessments due to COVID-19-related school closures. Another contributing factor the ISDE has identified is a training issue regarding the differences in coding for Child Find and the 60-day timeline versus early childhood transition. Idaho has identified a major staffing shortage for school psychologists. The ISDE is coordinating with national resources to encourage certified individuals from around the nation to come to Idaho.

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

19

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Nineteen students were reported as exceeding the Early Childhood Transition timeline for eligibility determination and IEP development. The range was 1-63 days with a median of 12 days.

Seven transitions exceeded the timeline due primarily to COVID-19.

Seven transitions exceeded the timeline due primarily to schools being out of session for regularly scheduled breaks.

Five transitions exceeded the timeline due primarily to scheduling issues.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The ISDE collects Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition data through the statewide longitudinal data system Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE). After the school year's final data upload, a report is pulled from ISEE, representing all early childhood transitions for the year.

Idaho does not have an automated system notifying Part B providers of potentially eligible early childhood children transitioning from Part C. A manual notification process occurs between Part C and Part B providers, which notifies LEAs concerning potentially eligible students. The ISDE is copied on all notifications and receives a quarterly report of all students referred as potentially eligible. The ISDE then provides the quarterly information from Part C back to the LEAs to facilitate tracking of potentially eligible students who do not meet requirements for reporting in ISEE. Example: Part C refers a student to a Part B provider as potentially eligible. The family indicates interest in proceeding through early childhood transition but then does not provide consent for the LEA to assess the student. The LEA documents this on the quarterly tracking report since the student is not eligible for recording in ISEE.

The ISEE Early Childhood Transition report and quarterly tracking, returned from LEAs, are then cross-verified to ensure that Part B providers account for all Part C potentially eligible students.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

LEA teams did not have access to students for face-to-face assessments or observations in the regular education environment during the COVID-19-related closures. As a result, LEA teams communicated with families to establish written extensions and discuss processes that would meet social distancing requirements. Idaho's State Exception Rule does not apply to early childhood transition. LEA teams were not able to establish written extensions in all instances. The inability to conduct face-to-face assessments during the COVID-19 pandemic directly contributed to slippage on Indicator 12.

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes Indicator 12 and other compliance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs receive their determination and are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct a root-cause analysis and assist LEAs to identify factors contributing to low performance in specific areas, including early childhood transition. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely (SMART) Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training on the process to SESTA coordinators and LEAs.

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan, released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 LEAs and LEA authorized charter schools utilize the system, representing about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count.

For Indicator 12 data, Idaho EDPlan includes calendar information with timelines and reminders to LEA staff related to compliance requirements. The system allows teachers and supervisors to monitor caseloads and IEP teams to ensure compliance with timeline requirements. Once the user completes

all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate date fields based on finalization. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules from referral through eligibility determination. The system ensures LEA teams meet compliance requirements and finalize all necessary documentation for eligibility and IEP development.

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft-closure due to the COVID-19 crisis. All LEAs were required to follow national CDC guidelines pertaining to large gatherings and social distancing. Students were not allowed on school grounds, but LEAs were required to continue facilitating essential services and student learning. The soft-closure extended through the end of the school year with flexibilities starting April 20, 2020, which allowed LEAs to bring select students into school buildings or reopen based on compliance with specific criteria. In addition, Idaho's Governor issued a statewide stay-at-home order, which was in effect March 25, 2020 through May 1, 2020. The soft-closure, combined with the stay-at-home order, negatively impacted LEA teams' ability to conduct face-to-face assessments and observations in the regular education environment. For Idaho's SPP/APR data, the impact of these COVID-19-related closures is most evident in Indicators 7, 11, and 12. These indicators typically require assessment and/or observation to determine students' eligibility for special education and related services or progress towards typical development. To mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, the ISDE Division of Special Education immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families.

The ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services during the COVID-19 pandemic. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Division of Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft-closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a question and answer guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

During the soft-closure period, the ISDE collaborated with IPUL and DisAbility Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. These webinars offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft-closure.

The ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 pandemic. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

To ensure that the five LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE reviewed additional Early Childhood Transition data collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for any LEAs where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2018. As a result of this review, the LEAs demonstrated that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on training or changes to practices to ensure students' timely transition from Part C to Part B.

The ISDE confirmed correction of noncompliance passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the ISDE's review of subsequent information, the ISDE determined that the LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for Indicator 12 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected

The ISDE verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing the data and verifying that all early childhood transitions were completed. All instances of noncompliance in FFY 2018 were investigated at the student level. The ISDE verified that all eligible students had an evaluation and IEP developed, although late. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with 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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	63.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	67.37%	98.43%	90.30%	98.62%	95.80%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
133	147	95.80%	100%	90.48%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Between FFY 2015 and FFY 2016, there was an eight-percentage point drop in compliance for Indicator 13. In response, the ISDE and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) provided local education agencies (LEAs) extensive support in secondary transition resulting in substantial improvement for FFY 2017 reporting. The technical assistance (TA) provided was very targeted and specific to individual LEAs, including multiple site visits and video or audio conferencing. In FFY 2019, ISDE changed the type of TA it provided to address systemic issues contributing to low compliance for Indicator 13 instead of providing intensive one-on-one LEA support. This change will have greater and more sustainable impact on the system overall. ISDE attributes slippage in this indicator to this change in TA delivery.

In FFY 2019, the ISDE and Idaho SESTA provided multiple regional trainings related to compliance and the general supervision file review (GSFR) process. LEAs requested support on an as-needed basis, but Idaho SESTA did not make multiple attempts to contact each LEA as in previous years. Current training and TA aim to balance compliance and performance and emphasize how compliant, high-quality transition plans improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

High turnover of special education teachers is also a factor contributing to the Indicator 13 slippage. To mitigate the effects of this high turnover rate, the ISDE requires all LEAs to provide assurances that staff members new to the LEA have participated in a new teacher training provided by Idaho SESTA or an LEA equivalent. The ISDE continues to provide substantial support for secondary transition, as documented in this indicator's section for additional information.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for Indicator 13: Secondary Transition is collected as part of state monitoring in a process called General Supervision File Review (GSFR). To complete GSFR, LEAs are required to conduct an internal file review and provide the ISDE with an assurance of the review. The LEA then self-selected three files, entered self-review results, and uploaded all required materials to the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT) application. For the 2018-2019 GSFR process, all LEAs with secondary programs provided a minimum of one secondary file for review. ISDE staff and Idaho SESTA staff conducted an initial desk review of all documents submitted by LEAs. LEAs were encouraged to contact their designated Idaho SESTA coordinator for technical assistance and support throughout the internal review process.

Small groups comprised of ISDE and Idaho SESTA staff performed a desk review of individual student files. The data gathered during the desk review were entered into the CTT on a student-by-student basis. LEA's were informed of desk review results and provided with an opportunity to address any areas of concern resulting from an incomplete submission of review materials. Areas of concern that were not able to be addressed by providing existing documentation that was missing from the initial review received a final evaluation by ISDE staff. The final review determined if the area of concern constituted noncompliance. All LEAs identified with noncompliance received written notification of noncompliance.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho does not specify an age younger than 16 that public agencies must meet these requirements. Idaho rules establish that the IEP in effect when the student turns age 16 must meet these requirements. Teams may elect to include secondary transition elements prior to age 16 and if they do they may be included as part of the indicators and will be held to these requirements.

Data were finalized and notifications of noncompliance were issued February 14, 2020, for Indicator 13. Indicator 13 was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis.

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes Indicator 13 and other compliance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs receive their determination and are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct a root-cause analysis and assist LEAs in identifying factors contributing to low performance in specific areas, including secondary transition. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho SESTA coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

The Secondary Transition Coordinator participates as part of annual data training, Data Drill Down, by providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data and indicators. Starting in the 2020-2021 school year, the ISDE holds monthly webinars focusing on secondary transition topics.

In addition to training and support from the ISDE, the ISDE and Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) interagency collaboration resulted in a customized employment pilot with three Idaho LEAs, as well as the expansion of LEAs accessing school-to-work counselors through the IDVR. The ISDE's enhanced collaboration with IDVR has led to improved LEA participation in IDVR-sponsored transition opportunities. The customized employment pilot with IDVR and the Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities (ICDD) resulted in the training of 17 LEA administrators and staff who have also been receiving local support through the pilot to access individuals, train families, and carve out jobs within the community. Future expansion of the customized employment pilot is currently under discussion.

Joint ISDE and IDVR administrator training has resulted in LEA/IDVR funding partnerships to provide dedicated school-to-work counselors who are full time or shared between smaller LEAs. Those LEAs engaged in this shared resource have begun to show an increase in their students connecting to pre-employment activities offered by IDVR. The ISDE anticipates the interaction will improve post-school outcome results in measurements 14B and 14C. The Secondary Transition Coordinator has partnered with other state agencies to provide training and information to parents and LEAs about the availability of local resources and benefits. Partnering agencies include the IDVR, Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL), and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW).

Communication with parents frequently illuminates a concern that the employment of the exited student with disabilities will result in a loss of benefits and services. There is a need to keep families and secondary transition students informed, so the IDHW is making a concerted effort to provide training regarding benefits. Training is offered in multiple formats for accessibility purposes.

In November of 2019, The ISDE partnered with ten state agencies, and organizations, and all of Idaho's public universities to hold Idaho's second annual Transition Institute. Lead state partner agencies included the IDVR, IDOL, ICDD, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, and Idaho Parents Unlimited. The Transition Institute links LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies.

Overall, more than 350 personnel participated in the Transition Institute, representing 84 LEAs. Participant feedback was overwhelmingly positive. Idaho plans to continue the Transition Institute and expects to see growth for students with disabilities in future Post School Outcomes data as a result.

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 educational entities comprising LEAs and LEA authorized charters utilize the system, representing about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count. To improve transition planning, Idaho EDPlan provides

teams with reminders and an organizational framework for transition assessments, goals, and other materials. The embedded layout and processes ensure compliance and promote quality transition planning.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
37	36	1	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

LEAs submitted additional student files, subsequent to the notification of noncompliance, to demonstrate the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. ISDE and Idaho SESTA reviewed the submitted files. ISDE verified that subsequent data showed 100% compliance, indicating LEAs implemented the regulatory requirements correctly. The review of additional files was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). ISDE passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on ISDE's review of subsequent information, ISDE determined that all LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for Indicator 13 and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The ISDE verified the correction of each instance of noncompliance by a review of individual student files. LEAs submitted student files showing correction of noncompliance at the student level. The ISDE verified that all student files, where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2018, had been corrected to 100% compliance. One instance of noncompliance exceeded 365. ISDE and Idaho SESTA provided intensive support to the LEA and required subsequent review of the student's file and additional files to confirm compliance with IDEA requirements.

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	22.50%	23.00%	23.50%	24.00%	24.50%
A	17.00%	Data	13.70%	18.01%	16.93%	17.58%	21.41%
B	2009	Target >=	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%
B	31.00%	Data	41.11%	41.71%	38.19%	50.59%	55.31%
C	2009	Target >=	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	79.50%
C	71.00%	Data	54.81%	54.03%	59.45%	67.22%	69.38%

FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	25.00%
Target B >=	50.00%
Target C >=	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY 2013, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) set targets based on stakeholder input, data analysis, and current baseline figures. Before setting targets, stakeholders received training on survey items, survey methodology, and background information. In FFY 2014, stakeholders reviewed survey results and identified that smaller LEAs often do not have an adequate number of survey respondents to inform their processes. To make data more meaningful for LEAs, stakeholders recommended that the SDE provide additional reports for regional-level and reports grouping LEAs by total students with disabilities population.

In FFY 2016, Idaho's response rate for the Post-School Outcomes survey was in a steady decline. The decreasing number of participants raised concerns with the ISDE and stakeholders regarding representation. As a result, Idaho reviewed other states' processes, connected with the IDEA Data Center, the Special Education Data Manager Advisory Group (SEDMAG), and the Center for Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) to identify the best options for addressing participation rate deficiencies. Overwhelmingly, other states that had the highest participation rates allowed LEAs to conduct the first round of surveys themselves. Other options that also improved response rates were providing surveys in multiple forms of media and having data-sharing agreements with other state agencies such as higher education, the Idaho Department of Labor, and the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR).

During 2017-2018, stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Director Advisory Committee (DAC), and special education teams that attended the regional Data Drill Down training, supported a change in the data collection process. Based on positive feedback from stakeholders, the ISDE adjusted the collection process and opened a pilot group for LEAs to conduct Post-School Outcomes surveys for students ages 16-21 who exited special education the prior school year. The follow-up mail-out survey was moved to an emailed survey link to attend to issues related to physical address changes. ISDE also established data sharing with the Office of the Idaho State Board of Education for improved data quality on Measurement A.

ISDE presented DAC and SEAP with survey results for FFY 2017 in fall 2018. Stakeholders from both groups expressed satisfaction with the increase in response rates. Based on the success shown in prior Post-School Outcome survey administrations, ISDE expanded the LEA opt-in opportunity to conduct first-round surveys to all LEAs.

ISDE will update the baseline and targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,014
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	207
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	358
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	78
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	86

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	207	1,014	21.41%	25.00%	20.41%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	565	1,014	55.31%	50.00%	55.72%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	729	1,014	69.38%	80.00%	71.89%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Idaho's substantially increased the response rate moving from a 41 percent response rate in FFY 2018 to just over 61 percent in FFY 2019. The 20-percentage point increase in response suggests that the data better represent students exiting special education. Supplementary data pulled from higher education does indicate that additional past students were enrolled in higher education for a minimum of one term but did not respond to survey attempts. ISDE anticipates that a lack of accurate contact information for students who move out of the area contributes to nonresponse. Valid up to date contact information continues as an area for improvement. ISDE identified that student management systems used in the state typically do have data collection fields that capture student contact information. Future training will encourage LEAs to collect student contact information as a part of the exit process.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES

Survey Question	Yes / No
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Analysis for representativeness of survey response was determined based on statistical significance testing. The analysis compared respondents' demographic characteristics, including gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and exit type, to past students eligible to participate in the survey to determine any over or under-representation of subgroups in the response rate.

The comparison indicates the results are representative by gender and primary disability, but statistically significant differences existed by race-ethnicity and exit type. Past students with a racial-ethnic background of White (64% response rate) were significantly more likely to respond than those with a racial-ethnic background of Hispanic/Latino (52% response rate). Past students coded as exiting as a drop out (37% response rate) were significantly less likely to respond than students coded as exiting through graduated met regular requirements (64% response rate), graduated met IEP requirements (63% response rate), or reached maximum age (70% response rate).

Question	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Idaho continues to work with stakeholders to improve response rates for all race-ethnicities and exit types. ISDE continues to expand the Indicator 14 LEA opt-in opportunity and encourages all LEAs to conduct initial survey attempts. ISDE anticipates these efforts will further improve data quality and increase the response rate, particularly for past students who dropped out. LEAs participating in the opt-in survey collection noted that response rates increased when contact was initiated by staff directly connected to the student's secondary program, i.e., case manager, teacher, secondary transition coordinator, etc. In future training, ISDE will strongly encourage that LEAs have staff involved in the past student's education conduct survey instead of general staff members. LEAs will also be encouraged to collaborate between programs including special education, migrant, English Learner, to determine individuals to involve in the survey process.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho anticipates that the COVID-19 crisis may have positively impacted the survey response rate. Social distancing rules resulted in less travel during the survey administration and increased communication by phone and awareness of emailed materials. The majority of the response rate improvement is directly attributed to increased effort and participation of LEAs as part of scaling up the opt-in survey process. Idaho's approach was consistent with the prior year's survey administration (phone and email). The response rate increased from 2018-19 to 2019-20 by 20 percentage points moving from a 41 percent response rate in FFY 2018 to just over 61 percent in FFY 2019. Indicator 14 response data does not suggest any impact on the completeness, accuracy, or validity as a result of COVID-19.

The Secondary Transition Coordinator participates as part of annual data training, Data Drill Down, by providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data and indicators. Starting in the 2020-2021 school year, the ISDE holds monthly webinars focusing on secondary transition topics. In addition to training and support from the ISDE, the ISDE and Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) interagency collaboration resulted in a customized employment pilot with three Idaho LEAs, as well as the expansion of LEAs accessing school-to-work counselors through the IDVR. The ISDE's enhanced collaboration with IDVR has led to improved LEA participation in IDVR-sponsored transition opportunities. The customized employment pilot with IDVR and the Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities (ICDD) resulted in the training of 17 LEA administrators and staff who have also been receiving local support through the pilot to access individuals, train families, and carve out jobs within the community. Future expansion of the customized employment pilot is currently under discussion.

Joint ISDE and IDVR administrator training has resulted in LEA/IDVR funding partnerships to provide dedicated school-to-work counselors who are full time or shared between smaller LEAs. Those LEAs engaged in this shared resource have begun to show an increase in their students connecting to pre-employment activities offered by IDVR. The ISDE anticipates the interaction will improve post-school outcome results in measurements 14B and 14C.

The Secondary Transition Coordinator has partnered with other state agencies to provide training and information to parents and LEAs about the availability of local resources and benefits. Partnering agencies include the IDVR, the Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL), and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW).

Communication with parents frequently illuminates a concern that the employment of the exited student with disabilities will result in a loss of benefits and services. There is a need to keep families and secondary transition students informed, so the IDHW is making a concerted effort to provide training regarding benefits. Training is offered in multiple formats for accessibility purposes.

In November of 2019, The ISDE partnered with ten state agencies, and organizations, and all of Idaho's public universities to hold Idaho's second annual Transition Institute. Lead state partner agencies included the IDVR, IDOL, ICDD, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, and Idaho Parents Unlimited. The Transition Institute links LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. Overall, more than 350 personnel participated in the Transition Institute, representing 84 LEAs. Participant feedback was overwhelmingly positive. Idaho plans to continue the Transition Institute and expects to see growth for students with disabilities in future Post School Outcomes data as a result.

To improve data quality in multiple indicators, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan released in March of 2019. As of October 2019, approximately 56 educational entities comprising LEAs and LEA authorized charters utilize the system, representing about 22% of Idaho's 2019-2020 child count. To improve transition planning, Idaho EDPlan provides teams with reminders and an organizational framework for transition assessments, goals, and other materials. The embedded layout and processes ensure compliance and promote quality transition planning.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	2
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	2

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. Data reported on the APR matches the data submitted in the November 2020 submission of the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data	0.00%	33.33%	50.00%	66.67%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
2	2	0.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 pandemic did not have a substantial impact on the count of written signed complaints between FFY 2018 and FFY 2019 for Indicator 15. The ISDE Dispute Resolution office saw an overall reduction in requests for Dispute Resolution during COVID-19-related closures. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 15 data.

Several mechanisms are available through the ISDE to assist in resolving IDEA disputes. These processes are: facilitation, informal conflict resolution, mediation, state complaints, due process hearings, and expedited due process hearings. The ISDE Dispute Resolution office has a team of highly trained and experienced contractors and hearing officers who manage Idaho's caseload.

Idaho makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve disputes at the least adversarial level appropriate. Contractors and hearing officers are assigned on a rotational basis and trained by the ISDE Dispute Resolution office. Contractors participate in the Complaint Investigator Workgroup offered through Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) and are also offered the opportunity to attend regional and national conferences.

Idaho's special education Dispute Resolution office regularly provides hot topic information as part of monthly webinars to local special education directors and presents at the New Superintendents Orientation. The team has also developed resources for principals related to discipline, IEP and evaluation processes, accommodations, etc. The Dispute Resolution office also offers regular updates to stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC).

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft closure due to the COVID-19 crisis. The ISDE special education team immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020.

Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as OSEP guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, School-Based Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a Question and Answer Guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

During the soft closure period, ISDE collaborated with IPUL and DisAbility Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. The webinars also offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft closure.

ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 crisis. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) contracted with Education Northwest to conduct a survey to gather information on behavioral health and wellness services (BHWS) throughout Idaho. This work is in response to a 2020 legislative mandate (House Bill 627, Section 5) to conduct a comprehensive scan of all BHWS that support K-12 general education students in Idaho. The survey was launched on September 10, 2020, and remained open until October 23, 2020.

For the purposes of the survey, BHWS was defined as services focused on the well-being services, strategies, and/or programs available to the K-12 general student population. These services are available to all students, families, and/or school staff members to support students' mental, social, and personal health. The survey asked about the BHWS strategies and/or programs available as part of a typical school experience for students before the COVID-19 pandemic. Administrators were encouraged to connect with a team of educators in their district/school for a full picture of pre-pandemic efforts. Survey questions focused on providing an understanding of what types of BHWS are being implemented to the general population in each school and district; identifying service delivery gaps, challenges, and perceived value; and fostering understanding of how service delivery is being measured across districts and in schools. Information collected through the BHWS survey will assist ISDE to better support LEA teams related to behavioral health and improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	14
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	13

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

After stakeholder input, the targets were determined based on data analysis and current baseline figures. ISDE staff presented Indicator 16 data to the Idaho Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in February 2015. The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) consists of higher education, parents, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Parents Unlimited, charter schools, and Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) staff. Through the target setting process, SEAP members asked questions, discussed possible numbers, and dialogued about the implications of their final recommendation.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%
Data	100.00%	83.33%	77.78%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	75.00%	85.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target (low)	FFY 2019 Target (high)	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1	13	14	100.00%	75.00%	85.00%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 pandemic did not have a substantial impact on Indicator 16 data between FFY 2019 and prior reporting years. FFY 2018 had substantially lower counts, but appeared to have been an anomaly in reporting, as FFY 2019 numbers are more consistent with previous years of reporting. The ISDE Dispute Resolution office saw an overall reduction in requests for Dispute Resolution during COVID-19-related closures. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 16 data.

Several mechanisms are available through the ISDE to assist in resolving IDEA disputes. These processes are: facilitation, informal conflict resolution, mediation, state complaints, due process hearings, and expedited due process hearings. The ISDE Dispute Resolution office has a team of highly trained and experienced contractors and hearing officers who manage Idaho's caseload.

Idaho makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve disputes at the least adversarial level appropriate. Contractors and hearing officers are assigned on a rotational basis and trained by the ISDE Dispute Resolution office. Contractors participate in the Complaint Investigator Workgroup offered through Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) and are also offered the opportunity to attend regional and national conferences.

Idaho's special education Dispute Resolution office regularly provides hot topic information as part of monthly webinars to local special education directors and presents at the New Superintendents Orientation. The team has also developed resources for principals related to discipline, IEP and evaluation processes, accommodations, etc. The Dispute Resolution office also offers regular updates to stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC).

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft closure due to the COVID-19 crisis. The ISDE special education team immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Information provided during the weekly webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as OSEP guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, School-Based Medicaid also presented as part of the weekly webinar series. Throughout the soft closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a Question and Answer Guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

During the soft closure period, ISDE collaborated with IPUL and DisAbility Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide regular webinar training and increase resource awareness for families. The webinars also offered an opportunity for families of students with disabilities to discuss questions and concerns resulting from the COVID-19 soft closure.

ISDE and partners created over 70 new resources to assist LEAs and families during the COVID-19 crisis. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the ISDE website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/re-opening/student-learning.html> and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/COVID19>.

The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) contracted with Education Northwest to conduct a survey to gather information on behavioral health and wellness services (BHWS) throughout Idaho. This work is in response to a 2020 legislative mandate (House Bill 627, Section 5) to conduct a comprehensive scan of all BHWS that support K–12 general education students in Idaho. The survey was launched on September 10, 2020, and remained open until October 23, 2020.

For the purposes of the survey, BHWS was defined as services focused on the well-being services, strategies, and/or programs available to the K–12 general student population. These services are available to all students, families, and/or school staff members to support students' mental, social, and personal health. The survey asked about the BHWS strategies and/or programs available as part of a typical school experience for students before the COVID-19 pandemic. Administrators were encouraged to connect with a team of educators in their district/school for a full picture of pre-pandemic efforts. Survey questions focused on providing an understanding of what types of BHWS are being implemented to the general population in each school and district; identifying service delivery gaps, challenges, and perceived value; and fostering understanding of how service delivery is being measured across districts and in schools. Information collected through the BHWS survey will assist ISDE to better support LEA teams related to behavioral health and improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Dr Charlie Silva

Title:

State Director of Special Education

Email:

csilva@sde.idaho.gov

Phone:

208332-6806

Submitted on:

04/29/21 4:10:54 PM