

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Idaho



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**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) is currently revising the strategic plan to align with Governor's Task Force recommendations. The current proposed 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.

Proposed strategies to achieve each goal are as follows:

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

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

•New Strategies Include:

- Provide greater all-day Kindergarten opportunities.
- 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.

•New 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.)

•New 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.

•New 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

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

165

General Supervision System

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

Included herein are the State's systems which are designed to drive improved results for children with disabilities and to ensure that the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction includes descriptions of the following State systems:

General Supervision System:

1. The ISDE general supervision 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, and build relationships with Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to facilitate the implementation of high-quality educational programs.
2. ISDE uses the Result Driven Accountability Monitoring System to evaluate LEAs using both compliance and performance indicators. Based on the local determination results LEAs are placed into one of three differentiated levels of support, Level 1: Supporting and Guiding, Level 2: Assisting and Mentoring, Level 3: Directing. Supports range from required attendance at specific ISDE sponsored trainings and submission of letters of assurance to more intensive supports including up to three years of on-site technical assistance to address areas of improvement.
3. If the performance of an LEA does not meet State targets, the ISDE provides technical assistance and support to LEAs by ISDE central office staff, Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) and contractors to address the identified deficiencies.
4. When issues of noncompliance are identified as "findings," the ISDE tracks the process of correction via the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). The ISDE ensured that issues of LEA 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:
Prong 1 – the LEA corrects each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, 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.

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 Dispute Resolution office had a team of 17 contractors to manage the caseload for Idaho. Of the 17 contractors, two were dedicated to the hearing officer role. Idaho makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes in an effort to resolve disputes at the least adversarial level appropriate. Contractors and hearing officers are assigned on a rotational basis and are trained by the ISDE Dispute Resolution office. Contractors participate in the Complaint Investigator Workgroup offered through Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESA) and are also offered the opportunity to attend regional and national conferences. Facilitations accounted for the majority (78%) of the caseload in dispute resolution. Idaho had 134 facilitation requests in 2018-19 with 109 facilitations held (decrease of 30% over 2017-2018) at 94% agreement rate. In the 2018-2019 school year, Idaho had 9 mediations requested with one denied and 2 held within the EDFacts reporting timeframe, and 29 state complaints filed with 23 investigated.

Idaho recognizes that there are areas for improvement in the Idaho Part B system. To facilitate improvements and maximize the use of available resources, Idaho engages with a variety of national technical assistance resources. The State's IDEA Part B Determination for both 2018 and 2019 was "Needs Assistance." In the State's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available technical assistance resources, 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 to improve its performance.

As directed by the Department and in accordance, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission due February 3, 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 resources accessed and the 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)

National TA/resources accessed by Idaho:

- 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)
- Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy)
- IDEA Data Center (IDC)
 - o Data Manager Connection, Part B Data Meeting Protocol
 - o Enhanced Pre-submission Edit Check Tools for IDEA
 - o 618 Part B Data IDC Interactive Institute
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
 - o Special Education Data Manager Affinity Group (SEDMAG)
 - o Special Education 619 Coordinator
- National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO)
- National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL)
- National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)
 - o Cross-State Learning Collaborative Language and Literacy
 - o RBA Collaborative
- National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education
- National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)
- National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER)
- National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT)
- State Personnel Development Network (SIG)
- SPDG SSIP Community of Practice
- Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) Jobs Alike
- Alternate Assessment Monitoring
- Workforce Innovation Technical Assistance Center (WITAC)
- Youth Technical Assistance Center (YTAC)

For additional information regarding Idaho's SPP/APR Introduction including actions taken as a result of accessing national technical assistance resources see attached "Idaho FFY2018 SPP/APR Introduction."

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.

A. Technical Assistance Provided by ISDE to LEAs

Instructional webinars are available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (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, Program Monitoring, 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 Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (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 so that they have a clear point of contact to access technical assistance and support. Idaho SESTA collects data on each request throughout the year. The data are compiled on an annual basis and are an important component of the information gathered to identify the training and professional development needed for the following year. The ISDE develops technical assistance trainings for statewide initiatives, Corrective Action Plans, and LEA program requests. For additional information regarding Idaho's SPP/APR Introduction including a detailed description of Idaho's technical assistance system see the attached "Idaho FFY2018 SPP/APR Introduction."

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 Idaho State Department of Education Special Education Division, and made available through the following centers:
Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (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 Idaho SESTA CDHD:

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: The Idaho Assistive Technology Project (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 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 vision and hearing impairments, hospital beds, computers, adapted vehicles, etc.
4. Idaho Training Clearinghouse: The Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) <https://idahotc.com/>, a website listing all current special education-related training and resources across the state, 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 goals, behavior, secondary transition, early childhood, etc.

Professional Development Events hosted by Idaho SESTA:

Please see the "SESTA flyer 2018-2019-accessible.pdf" document attached at the conclusion 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.

Input regarding improvements and/or revisions to Idaho's policies, practices, and procedures was solicited from a variety of stakeholders this past year. 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, the Idaho 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 a number of priority indicators.

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.

EC3 represented the following: the medical community, state legislators, higher education, Idaho Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind, Community Council of Idaho, IDEA Part C, parents, state child care, child welfare, judicial system, State Department of Insurance, infant/child mental health, mental health, Head Start, public health, early intervention providers, regional EC3 representative, Developmental Disabilities Council, and Medicaid. EC3 has been reformed since target setting to address requirements of the Preschool Development Grant.

DAC consists of special education directors in Idaho from large/small and rural/urban districts to reflect the demographic groups of the state.

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 internal team reconvened and discussed criteria for measurable and rigorous targets, improvement activities, and drafted the SPP/APR using this information. The draft, along with the raw data, was presented to stakeholder groups for input on all content targets and improvement activities.

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, Academics, Federal Programs, English Learner and Migrant Education, Student Engagement/Career and Technical Readiness, and Technology Services to ensure that 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 FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

<https://idahoschools.org/>

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

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

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 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 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, 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 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 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 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (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- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Idaho recognizes that there are areas for improvement in the Idaho Part B system. To facilitate improvements and maximize the use of available resources, Idaho engages with a variety of national technical assistance resources. The State's IDEA Part B Determination for both 2018 and 2019 was "Needs Assistance." In the State's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available technical assistance resources, 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 to improve its performance.

As directed by the Department and in accordance, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission due February 3, 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. For information including the list of national technical assistance resources accessed and the 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) see attached Idaho FFY 2018 SPP/APR Introduction.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, 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.

The State provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator B-17/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and OSEP accepts that target.

The State did not provide verification that the attachments it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

Intro - Required Actions

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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), 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 | 2016 | 60.46% | | | |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 65.40% |
| Data | 73.77% | 59.22% | 58.41% | 60.46% | 60.95% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-----------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 65.48% | 70.70% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Historically, Idaho has 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 is shifting to reporting a five-year Extended ACGR for Indicator 1.

Four-year ACGR (historical information):

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

Stakeholder Input:

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 have expressed frustration with the use of the four-year ACGR since its implementation and supported moving to extended cohorts to better account for the needs of students with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|---|--------|
| SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 10/02/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | 1,306 |
| SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 10/02/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 2,231 |
| SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 10/02/2019 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 58.54% |

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 1,306 | 2,231 | 60.95% | 65.48% | 58.54% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage in the four-year ACGR is attributed to shifts in coding after the depreciation of a demographic exit code for data collection starting in school year 2017-2018. The exit code was removed to comply with the removal of Idaho Administrative Rule 08.02.03.105.06 Proficiency. After the elimination of this demographic exit code, there was a substantial increase in the use of exit codes for students with disabilities, which do not meet requirements for inclusion as graduated under EDFacts FS150 or FS151.

Additional training and crosswalks between the district and program exit reasons have resulted in improved data quality. Improved understanding of codes may also be a contributing factor to slippage in the four-year ACGR.

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 in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are the same conditions all youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

To view a copy of the High School Graduation Minimum Requirements, revised May 29, 2019, go to the following address:

<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

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Please note: Prepopulated data included in the FFY18 tables above represents four-year Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate data submitted as part of SY 2017-18 EDFacts file spec FS151. Idaho is choosing to report on the five-year Extended Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate, also reported as part of the 2017-18 EDFacts file spec FS151.

FFY 2018 Extended Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate Data

SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Extended Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151) submitted 4/26/2019

Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma = 1396

Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate = 2132

Extended five-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate = 65.48%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's five-year extended adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma = 1396

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's five-year extended adjusted cohort eligible to graduate = 2132

FFY17 Data = NA

FFY18 Target = 65.48%

FFY18 Data = 65.48%

Status = Met Target

Slippage (y/n) = No Slippage

Additional information on the indicator:

Idaho recognizes that there is a substantial gap in the state between the graduation rate of students with disabilities and all other students. The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) is accessing national technical resource centers and leveraging internal resources to address this gap. Idaho's Consolidated State Plan is designed to identify school buildings performing among the lowest 5% in the state for subgroup graduation rates. These buildings 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 also includes Indicator 1 and other performance indicators as part of LEA level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring LEAs are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review students with disabilities performance data on an annual basis as part of the RDA system.

Communication between ISDE internal teams is a continued area of focus. 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. National technical assistance providers that have contributed to Idaho's system improvements for Indicator 1 include IDC, CIID, and NCES.

The ISDE provides training to LEAs regarding exit data and coding to LEA personnel through the regionally offered Data Drill Down training and Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, the annual Secondary Institute, and special education director webinars. The Secondary Coordinator continues to participate as part of annual regional data training, Data Drill Down, providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data, available supports, and indicators.

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.

In the summer of 2019 Idaho release 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 the previous school(s). The goals of this application are to replace and enhance what was previously known as the "Preview Window" with this application, as well as to promote data transparency and management.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

The State did not provide verification that the attachments it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

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 C009.

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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). 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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), 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 | 2016 | 6.42% | | | |
|-----------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target <= | 5.08% | 4.58% | 4.08% | 3.58% | 3.08% |
| Data | 5.08% | 6.41% | 29.93% | 6.42% | 4.32% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-----------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 2.58% | 2.08% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

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 because it left out an essential category of student exit, "Transferred to Other Educational Environment". By not including this group, the denominator was reduced substantially, resulting in an inflated dropout rate. Stakeholders involved in the meetings 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 our alignment work, which started with IDEA Data Center's (IDC's) on-site facilitation for the Data Process Mapping Toolkit, Idaho has established validations and aligned Special Education Program Exit to demographic exit and the Graduation/Completers file.

The understanding at the time was that the definition 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 how to appropriately include these exiting students in the Graduates/Completers file. The timing of this information did not allow the state to apply the changes in categorization to data submitted for the 2017-2018 school year. Future reporting of students exiting and coded as "Completed Adapted Requirements" shall be excluded from FS032 - Dropout and aggregated into the Received a Certificate category for FS009 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education. The use of "Received a Certificate" category has been updated for the 2018-2019 school year in the state's State Supplemental Survey for IDEA (SSS-IDEA). Idaho's stakeholders have agreed that it is appropriate to extend the targets for this indicator for the FFY 2019 submission. Extending the targets will allow the state to focus efforts towards establishing targets and baseline that will appropriately reflect changes in the new SPP/APR package.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|-------|
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 1,013 |
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | |
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 11 |
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 551 |
| SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/30/2019 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 10 |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

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

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

Per the OSEP Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement table, Idaho chose to report Indicator 2 using Option 2 and the same data source and measurement that the State used for its FFY 2010 APR submitted on February 1, 2012, ESEA dropout event rate:

[(the number of (special education) students enrolled in grades 9-12 who dropped out) divided by the (total number of (special education) students enrolled in grades 9-12) times 100].

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth with IEPs in grades 9-12 who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of youth with IEPs enrolled in grades 9-12 | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 658 | 8,626 | 4.32% | 2.58% | 7.63% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Idaho has established validations and aligned Special Education Program Exit to our demographic exit and the Graduation/Completers file. The understanding at the time was that the definition 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 how to appropriately include these exiting students in the Graduates/Completers file. The timing of this information did not allow the state to apply the changes in categorization to data submitted for the 2017-2018 school year. Future reporting of students exiting and coded as "Completed Adapted Requirements" shall be excluded from FS032 - Dropout and aggregated into the "Received a Certificate" category for FS009 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education. The use of the "Received a Certificate" category has been updated for the 2018-2019 school year in the state's State Supplemental Survey for IDEA (SSS-IDEA).

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)

For FFY 2018 dropout data is as follows:
 Number of youth with IEPs in grades 9-12 who exited special education due to dropping out = 658
 Total number of youth with IEPs enrolled in grades 9-12 = 8626
 FFY 2017 Data = 4.32%
 FFY 2018 Target = 2.58%
 FFY 2018 Data = 7.63%
 Status = Did Not Meet Target
 Slippage = Slippage

Key strategies the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) is employing to reduce the rate of dropout for students with disabilities are establishing clear definitions and processes between file specifications, collaboration, and training. The work to align processes and definitions across programs began as part of the work with IDC on data process mapping. ISDE has now fully established validations and developed a consistent dropout definition to ensure it accurately reflects and captures information required for all divisions at the ISDE. The clarification to FS040 - Graduates/Completers, documented in the PSC ticket 19-04150, addressed how to include appropriately, students coded as "Completed Adapted Requirements" in the Graduates/Completers file. Future reporting of students exiting and coded as "Completed Adapted Requirements" shall be excluded from FS032 - Dropout and aggregated into the "Received a Certificate" category for FS009 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education. The use of the "Received a Certificate" category has been updated for the 2018-2019 school year in the state's State Supplemental Survey for IDEA (SSS-IDEA). Communication between internal teams is a continued area of focus. ISDE has seen several positive outcomes as a result of improved communication between teams, 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. National technical assistance providers that have contributed to Idaho's system improvements for Indicator 2 include IDC, CIID, and NCES. The ISDE provides training to LEAs regarding program exit data and coding to LEA personnel through the regionally offered Data Drill Down training and Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, the annual Secondary Transition Institute, and special education director webinars. 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.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

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 |
| H | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Historical Data: Reading

| Group | Group Name | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------|------------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | Grade 3 | 2006 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| A | Grade 3 | 98.00% | Actual | 97.91% | 99.91% | 98.26% | 99.29% | 98.76% |
| B | Grade 4 | 2006 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| B | Grade 4 | 98.50% | Actual | 95.87% | 98.05% | 98.20% | 99.47% | 98.49% |
| C | Grade 5 | 2006 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| C | Grade 5 | 99.20% | Actual | 96.79% | 97.26% | 98.40% | 99.37% | 98.58% |
| D | Grade 6 | 2006 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| D | Grade 6 | 99.10% | Actual | 96.19% | 97.40% | 97.69% | 99.47% | 97.44% |
| E | Grade 7 | 2006 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| E | Grade 7 | 98.50% | Actual | 93.29% | 97.79% | 98.09% | 98.94% | 97.44% |
| F | Grade 8 | 2006 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| F | Grade 8 | 98.20% | Actual | 93.09% | 96.41% | 97.29% | 99.00% | 97.09% |
| G | HS | 2006 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| G | HS | 99.50% | Actual | 84.95% | 88.41% | 92.27% | 99.11% | 96.10% |
| H | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| H | | | Actual | | | | | |
| I | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| I | | | Actual | | | | | |
| J | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| J | | | Actual | | | | | |
| K | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| K | | | Actual | | | | | |
| L | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| L | | | Actual | | | | | |

Historical Data: Math

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

Targets

| | Group | Group Name | 2018 | 2019 |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade 5 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | D >= | Grade 6 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | E >= | Grade 7 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | F >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | G >= | HS | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | H >= | | | |
| Reading | I >= | | | |
| Reading | J >= | | | |
| Reading | K >= | | | |
| Reading | L >= | | | |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade 5 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | D >= | Grade 6 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | E >= | Grade 7 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | F >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | G >= | HS | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | H >= | | | |
| Math | I >= | | | |
| Math | J >= | | | |
| Math | K >= | | | |
| Math | L >= | | | |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Idaho finalized 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), which was accepted March 29, 2018. As required under the target for participation on statewide assessments for all students and subgroups is maintained at 95%.

For additional information on the Plan or stakeholder involvement, please see the Idaho Consolidated State Plan at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/topics/consolidated-plan/>.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

| Grade | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | HS |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| a. Children with IEPs | 2,886 | 2,792 | 2,889 | 2,774 | 2,532 | 2,560 | | | | | 2,105 |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 1,184 | 1,076 | 1,033 | 965 | 947 | 964 | | | | | 1,134 |

| Grade | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | HS |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|----|----|----|-----|
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 1,427 | 1,442 | 1,576 | 1,529 | 1,313 | 1,310 | | | | | 707 |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 231 | 236 | 243 | 244 | 219 | 216 | | | | | 188 |

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

| Grade | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | HS |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| a. Children with IEPs | 2,906 | 2,807 | 2,899 | 2,782 | 2,530 | 2,558 | | | | | 2,101 |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 2,249 | 2,004 | 1,990 | 1,838 | 1,673 | 1,657 | | | | | 1,482 |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 383 | 526 | 625 | 655 | 577 | 607 | | | | | 357 |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 231 | 238 | 246 | 243 | 219 | 218 | | | | | 190 |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|------------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 3 | 2,886 | 2,842 | 98.76% | 95.00% | 98.48% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 4 | 2,792 | 2,754 | 98.49% | 95.00% | 98.64% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade 5 | 2,889 | 2,852 | 98.58% | 95.00% | 98.72% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| D | Grade 6 | 2,774 | 2,738 | 97.44% | 95.00% | 98.70% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| E | Grade 7 | 2,532 | 2,479 | 97.44% | 95.00% | 97.91% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| F | Grade 8 | 2,560 | 2,490 | 97.09% | 95.00% | 97.27% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| G | HS | 2,105 | 2,029 | 96.10% | 95.00% | 96.39% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| H | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| I | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| J | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| K | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| L | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |

| Group | Group Name | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|-------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| A | Grade 3 | XXX |
| B | Grade 4 | XXX |

| Group | Group Name | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|-------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| C | Grade 5 | XXX |
| D | Grade 6 | XXX |
| E | Grade 7 | XXX |
| F | Grade 8 | XXX |
| G | HS | XXX |
| H | | XXX |
| I | | XXX |
| J | | XXX |
| K | | XXX |
| L | | XXX |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|------------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 3 | 2,906 | 2,863 | 98.47% | 95.00% | 98.52% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 4 | 2,807 | 2,768 | 98.54% | 95.00% | 98.61% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade 5 | 2,899 | 2,861 | 98.65% | 95.00% | 98.69% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| D | Grade 6 | 2,782 | 2,736 | 97.54% | 95.00% | 98.35% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| E | Grade 7 | 2,530 | 2,469 | 97.21% | 95.00% | 97.59% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| F | Grade 8 | 2,558 | 2,482 | 96.87% | 95.00% | 97.03% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| G | HS | 2,101 | 2,029 | 96.10% | 95.00% | 96.57% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| H | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| I | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| J | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| K | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| L | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |

| Group | Group Name | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|-------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| A | Grade 3 | XXX |
| B | Grade 4 | XXX |
| C | Grade 5 | XXX |
| D | Grade 6 | XXX |
| E | Grade 7 | XXX |
| F | Grade 8 | XXX |
| G | HS | XXX |
| H | | XXX |
| I | | XXX |
| J | | XXX |
| K | | XXX |
| L | | XXX |

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.

<https://idahoschools.org/>

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho has historically assessed more than 1% of the student population using the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). To comply with ESSA mandates, the ISDE developed oversight and support activities to ensure that only those students with the most significant cognitive impairments qualify to take the IDAA. As a result of the oversight and support activities listed below, which were informed by resources from the NCEO 1% Cap Community of Practice, Idaho's IDAA participation rates in all content areas dropped during the spring 2018 test administration and met the 1% cap in spring 2019. Oversight and support activities included, but are not limited to the following: training to help IEP teams better understand the three IDAA participation criteria by aligning the criteria with the Learner Characteristics Inventory (LCI); developing the IDAA Participation Decision-Making Matrix that embedded items from the LCI with the participation criteria; reviewing IDAA participation data with LEAs with high IDAA participation rates; and convening the Alternate Assessment (AA) Workgroup to draft a definition of significant cognitive impairment and revise the IDAA participation criteria.

The AA Workgroup convened in spring 2018 and included representatives from multiple LEAs, as well as other stakeholders around the state.

Participants represented speech-language pathologists, school psychologists, special education teachers, Life Skills teachers, parents, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), special education directors, Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA), and university faculty. The AA Workgroup utilized resources shared by other states through the NCEO 1% Cap Community of Practice. The resulting definition of significant cognitive impairment and revised IDAA participation criteria took effect on July 1, 2019.

As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and may have earned advanced proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking a general education Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and are likely not achieving proficient scores on the ISAT.

The ISDE Special Education and Assessment and Accountability teams continue to partner to provide LEA training through the regionally offered Assessment Roadshow and webinars related to the participation of students with disabilities on statewide assessments. The ISDE provides training to LEAs regarding assessment data and coding to LEA personnel through the regionally offered Data Drill Down training and special education director webinars. In the fall of 2019, the division of Special Education partnered with the Assessment and Accountability division to have breakout sessions on how to access statewide assessment data and accountability identifications. ISDE also developed multiple training videos on accessing statewide assessment data and doing simple analysis in Excel. These videos are posted on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse in the Excel Essentials for Educators resource.

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 is process-based and has the new IDAA participation criteria built into the system so that participation is automatically designated or ruled out based on responses to the IDAA criteria checklist. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that all necessary documentation is finalized and limits user coding error.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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 |
| H | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Historical Data: Reading

| Group | Group Name | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------|------------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | Grade 3 | 2014 | Target >= | 76.00% | 16.00% | 19.00% | 22.00% | 25.00% |
| A | Grade 3 | 20.10% | Actual | 66.90% | 20.10% | 19.59% | 18.37% | 20.31% |
| B | Grade 4 | 2014 | Target >= | 76.00% | 12.00% | 19.00% | 22.00% | 25.00% |
| B | Grade 4 | 15.82% | Actual | 71.11% | 15.82% | 17.80% | 16.72% | 17.56% |
| C | Grade 5 | 2014 | Target >= | 76.00% | 13.00% | 15.00% | 22.00% | 25.00% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| C | Grade 5 | 16.93% | Actual | 63.28% | 16.93% | 17.32% | 15.04% | 16.77% |
| D | Grade 6 | 2014 | Target >= | 76.00% | 10.00% | 16.00% | 18.00% | 25.00% |
| D | Grade 6 | 12.85% | Actual | 72.93% | 12.85% | 11.41% | 12.73% | 11.39% |
| E | Grade 7 | 2014 | Target >= | 76.00% | 8.00% | 13.00% | 19.00% | 21.00% |
| E | Grade 7 | 13.39% | Actual | 65.79% | 13.39% | 12.89% | 13.70% | 12.10% |
| F | Grade 8 | 2014 | Target >= | 76.00% | 8.00% | 11.00% | 16.00% | 22.00% |
| F | Grade 8 | 11.87% | Actual | 69.61% | 11.87% | 11.75% | 10.89% | 11.87% |
| G | HS | 2014 | Target >= | 76.00% | 11.00% | 11.00% | 14.00% | 19.00% |
| G | HS | 13.43% | Actual | 29.54% | 13.43% | 14.73% | 13.05% | 14.59% |
| H | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| H | | | Actual | | | | | |
| I | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| I | | | Actual | | | | | |
| J | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| J | | | Actual | | | | | |
| K | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| K | | | Actual | | | | | |
| L | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| L | | | Actual | | | | | |

Historical Data: Math

| Group | Group Name | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------|------------|----------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | Grade 3 | 2014 | Target >= | 74.00% | 18.00% | 21.00% | 24.00% | 27.00% |
| A | Grade 3 | 22.13% | Actual | 59.06% | 22.13% | 24.97% | 20.79% | 24.22% |
| B | Grade 4 | 2014 | Target >= | 74.00% | 13.00% | 21.00% | 24.00% | 27.00% |
| B | Grade 4 | 17.36% | Actual | 65.19% | 17.36% | 20.19% | 17.07% | 18.18% |
| C | Grade 5 | 2014 | Target >= | 74.00% | 10.00% | 16.00% | 24.00% | 27.00% |
| C | Grade 5 | 13.90% | Actual | 70.23% | 13.90% | 14.81% | 12.83% | 13.65% |
| D | Grade 6 | 2014 | Target >= | 74.00% | 7.00% | 13.00% | 19.00% | 27.00% |
| D | Grade 6 | 10.98% | Actual | 66.67% | 10.98% | 12.16% | 10.99% | 10.17% |
| E | Grade 7 | 2014 | Target >= | 74.00% | 6.00% | 10.00% | 16.00% | 22.00% |
| E | Grade 7 | 11.83% | Actual | 59.84% | 11.83% | 13.59% | 11.36% | 10.48% |
| F | Grade 8 | 2014 | Target >= | 74.00% | 4.00% | 9.00% | 13.00% | 19.00% |
| F | Grade 8 | 9.36% | Actual | 66.67% | 9.36% | 10.97% | 9.40% | 9.57% |
| G | HS | 2014 | Target >= | 74.00% | 3.00% | 7.00% | 12.00% | 16.00% |
| G | HS | 6.04% | Actual | 14.39% | 6.04% | 7.88% | 7.16% | 7.12% |
| H | | | Target >= | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| H | | | Actual | | | | | |
| I | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| I | | | Actual | | | | | |
| J | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| J | | | Actual | | | | | |
| K | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| K | | | Actual | | | | | |
| L | | | Target >= | | | | | |
| L | | | Actual | | | | | |

Targets

| | Group | Group Name | 2018 | 2019 |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3 | 28.00% | 31.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 4 | 28.00% | 31.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade 5 | 28.00% | 31.00% |
| Reading | D >= | Grade 6 | 28.00% | 31.00% |
| Reading | E >= | Grade 7 | 28.00% | 31.00% |
| Reading | F >= | Grade 8 | 24.00% | 25.00% |
| Reading | G >= | HS | 25.00% | 26.00% |
| Reading | H >= | | | |
| Reading | I >= | | | |
| Reading | J >= | | | |
| Reading | K >= | | | |
| Reading | L >= | | | |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3 | 30.00% | 33.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 4 | 30.00% | 33.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade 5 | 30.00% | 33.00% |
| Math | D >= | Grade 6 | 30.00% | 33.00% |
| Math | E >= | Grade 7 | 30.00% | 33.00% |
| Math | F >= | Grade 8 | 25.00% | 30.00% |
| Math | G >= | HS | 22.00% | 28.00% |
| Math | H >= | | | |
| Math | I >= | | | |
| Math | J >= | | | |
| Math | K >= | | | |
| Math | L >= | | | |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Idaho's targets for Indicator 3C, with baseline in FFY 2014, were developed based on the actual performance of students with disabilities rather than using the state's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) targets set for the general population of students, as AMO targets reflected a state average. Targets set for students with disabilities for purposes of the SPP/APR were more comprehensive of the student population served.

Idaho's finalized 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), was accepted March 29, 2018. The Plan established targets for all students and subgroups and is aimed at reducing the performance gap between students with disabilities and all other students. For additional information on the Plan or stakeholder involvement, please see the Idaho Consolidated State Plan at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/topics/consolidated-plan/>.

After comparing targets for the Plan and SPP/APR Indicator 3C targets, it was determined that goals through FFY 2018 set for Indicator 3C are generally higher than those set by the Plan for the same period. Also, the Plan's targets are at the subgroup level, while Indicator 3C has targets established for the students with disabilities subgroup by grade level. For these reasons, ISDE will not change targets to those listed in the Idaho State Consolidated Plan. Stakeholders involved in the target setting included the Special Education Advisory Panel and Directors Advisory Committee. Idaho's stakeholders agree that extending the current target rate progression for this indicator for the FFY 2019 submission is appropriate. Extending targets in this manner

will allow the state to focus efforts towards analyzing data to establish targets and baseline that properly reflect any changes in the new SPP/APR package.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

| Grade | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | HS |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned | 2,842 | 2,754 | 2,852 | 2,738 | 2,479 | 2,490 | | | | | 2,029 |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 345 | 267 | 250 | 176 | 154 | 113 | | | | | 143 |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 81 | 85 | 101 | 54 | 80 | 66 | | | | | 33 |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level | 89 | 98 | 93 | 89 | 89 | 61 | | | | | 75 |

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

| Grade | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | HS |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned | 2,863 | 2,768 | 2,861 | 2,736 | 2,469 | 2,482 | | | | | 2,029 |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 491 | 370 | 237 | 146 | 145 | 82 | | | | | 52 |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 25 | 38 | 18 | 16 | 12 | 9 | | | | | 5 |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above | 102 | 101 | 98 | 98 | 81 | 80 | | | | | 80 |

| Grade | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | HS |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| proficient against grade level | | | | | | | | | | | |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned | Number of Children with IEPs Proficient | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 3 | 2,842 | 515 | 20.31% | 28.00% | 18.12% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B | Grade 4 | 2,754 | 450 | 17.56% | 28.00% | 16.34% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C | Grade 5 | 2,852 | 444 | 16.77% | 28.00% | 15.57% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| D | Grade 6 | 2,738 | 319 | 11.39% | 28.00% | 11.65% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| E | Grade 7 | 2,479 | 323 | 12.10% | 28.00% | 13.03% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| F | Grade 8 | 2,490 | 240 | 11.87% | 24.00% | 9.64% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| G | HS | 2,029 | 251 | 14.59% | 25.00% | 12.37% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| H | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| I | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| J | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| K | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| L | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |

| Group | Group Name | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|-------|------------|---|
| A | Grade 3 | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| B | Grade 4 | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |

| Group | Group Name | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|-------|------------|---|
| C | Grade 5 | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| D | Grade 6 | XXX |
| E | Grade 7 | XXX |
| F | Grade 8 | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| G | HS | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| H | | XXX |
| I | | XXX |
| J | | XXX |
| K | | XXX |
| L | | XXX |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned | Number of Children with IEPs Proficient | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 3 | 2,863 | 618 | 24.22% | 30.00% | 21.59% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B | Grade 4 | 2,768 | 509 | 18.18% | 30.00% | 18.39% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

| Group | Group Name | Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned | Number of Children with IEPs Proficient | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| C | Grade 5 | 2,861 | 353 | 13.65% | 30.00% | 12.34% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| D | Grade 6 | 2,736 | 260 | 10.17% | 30.00% | 9.50% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| E | Grade 7 | 2,469 | 238 | 10.48% | 30.00% | 9.64% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| F | Grade 8 | 2,482 | 171 | 9.57% | 25.00% | 6.89% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| G | HS | 2,029 | 137 | 7.12% | 22.00% | 6.75% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| H | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| I | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| J | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| K | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |
| L | | | | | | | N/A | N/A |

| Group | Group Name | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|-------|------------|---|
| A | Grade 3 | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| B | Grade 4 | XXX |
| C | Grade 5 | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| D | Grade 6 | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| E | Grade 7 | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special</p> |

| Group | Group Name | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|-------|------------|---|
| | | <p>Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| F | Grade 8 | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| G | HS | <p>The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers.</p> <p>As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that students who may have previously qualified for the IDAA in the past and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations. Many of these students are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The proficiency rate by grade level was impacted at differing rates based on the percentage of students that participated and scored proficient on the IDAA in the 2017 -2018 test administration and shifted participation to the regular assessment with or without accommodations.</p> |
| H | | XXX |
| I | | XXX |
| J | | XXX |
| K | | XXX |
| L | | XXX |

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.

- <https://idahoschools.org/>
- <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/Accountability/results.html>
- <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of reading and math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers. ISDE is currently accessing national technical resource centers and leveraging internal resources to address this gap.

On March 29, 2018, Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan) was accepted, establishing targets for all students on statewide assessments. The Plan has increased the focus on improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities as a subgroup. Included as part of the Plan is the identification of buildings for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI). School buildings that meet or exceed a 35-percentage point achievement gap between all students and any subgroup are required to develop and follow a plan leveraging available resources to address the achievement gap for the specific subgroup.

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education also includes Indicator 3 and other performance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for

students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review the performance data of students with disabilities on an annual basis as part of the RDA system. In recognition of the achievement gap between students with disabilities and all other students, ISDE required all LEAs identified for differentiated support levels two and three to complete a self-assessment on policies, processes, and practices related to Indicator 3.

To address issues identified in instruction, ISDE continues to collaborate across Divisions. The of Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content Divisions are working in concert to provide teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and instruction in the Idaho Content Standards. In addition, training from Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) focuses on implementing instruction for students with disabilities with fidelity.

The ISDE provides training to LEAs regarding assessment data and coding through the regionally offered Data Drill Down training and special education director webinars. In the fall of 2019, the Division of Special Education partnered with the Assessment and Accountability Division to have joint training sessions on how to access statewide assessment data and accountability identifications. ISDE also developed multiple training videos on accessing statewide assessment data and practicing simple analysis in Excel. These videos are posted on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse in Excel Essentials for Educators resource.

As a result of training and a better understanding of the IDAA participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams are more accurately qualifying students to take the IDAA. One consequence of reducing the IDAA participation rate is that many of the students who previously assessed and earned advanced or proficient scores on the IDAA are now taking the regular Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), with or without accommodations and are no longer attaining proficient scores when assessed on the regular academic achievement standards.

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 is process-based and has the new IDAA participation criteria built into the system so that participation is automatically designated or ruled out based on responses to the IDAA criteria checklist. ISDE continues to examine processes and requirements needed to generate statewide assessment accommodation code extract directly from Idaho EDPlan. The process-based approach built into Idaho EDPlan improves data quality by ensuring that all necessary documentation is finalized and limits user coding errors.

Idaho recognizes that performance on statewide assessments needs improvement. To address low performance, Idaho has implemented initiatives around early literacy and developed new training and tools for LEA staff.

The ISDE has developed training to give administrators and those who support teachers the knowledge and tools to lead data-based decision-making discussions and support the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) in schools and classrooms. The IRI is an early reading screener and diagnostic assessment administered to all K-3 public school students. The screener is mandatory for Idaho public school students in the Fall and Spring with optional winter administration. Progress monitoring is also available for all students.

ISDE has also developed the IRI Mini-Series. The IRI Mini-Series is built around real-time learning for teachers as they use the IRI to plan and adjust instruction. New content is added on a monthly basis. Topics include; IRI Overview, Test Results-What Do They Mean? How to Talk to Parents About the IRI, Intro to Rate of Improvement, Goal Setting and Trend Lines, Deep Dive into Sub Tests and Skills.

The division of Content and Curriculum contracted to develop a 10-module course for Professional Development targeted at early literacy, "The Reading Teacher's Top Ten Tools." Through the partnership with the Assessment and Accountability Division, twenty-eight schools were identified for improvement based on the analysis of IRI scale score growth ranking. These schools were then offered course licenses for all teachers in grades K-3. In October of 2019, ISDE distributed licenses. Currently, twenty schools across seventeen LEAs have approximately 200 licenses. Access was also provided to SESTA and specific ISDE staff to support LEAs and schools. The IRI Mini-Series is embedded in the course to maximize the use of available tools and further assist teachers in developing data-based decision making.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 0.87% | | | |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-----------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

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 as a result of 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 have agreed that it is appropriate to extend the targets for this indicator for the FFY 2019 submission. Extending the targets will

allow the state to focus efforts towards establishing targets and baseline that will appropriately reflect changes in the SPP/APR package for data collected in the school year 2020-2021.

FFY 2018 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.

65

| Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy | Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 0 | 96 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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. In Idaho, "Significant discrepancy" is defined as one percentage point or more above the current year's State suspension/expulsion rate.

The formula for the 2017-2018 year's state average is:

$((\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2017-2018} > 10 \text{ days for SY 2017-2018}) / (\text{Total \# of SWDs in the state for SY 2017-2018})) * 100$

$\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2017-2018} > 10 \text{ days} = 45$

Total $\# \text{ of SWDs in the state for SY 2017-2018} = 32,908$

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = $(45/32,908) \times 100$

Application of data:

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = $(45/32,908) \times 100 = 0.136\%$

The state bar is $0.136\% + 1.00\% = 1.136\%$.

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 1.136% for FFY 2018 data.

For Indicator 4a, Idaho has established a minimum n-size of at least 40 students with IEPs enrolled in the LEA. Based on the application of this minimum n-size, 65 of 161 LEAs in Idaho were excluded ($161 - 65 = 96$) from the calculation for this indicator for FFY 2018.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 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.

Based on data collected during SY 2017-2018 and using Idaho's approved calculation for Significant Discrepancy, no LEAs were identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2018 for Indicator 4A.

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

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

| 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 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results 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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Baseline | 2009 | 0.00% | | | |
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|------------|-------------|-------------|

| | | |
|--------|----|----|
| Target | 0% | 0% |
|--------|----|----|

FFY 2018 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.

83

| 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 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 0 | 0 | 78 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

XXX

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. In Idaho, Significant Discrepancy is defined as one percentage point or more above the current year's State suspension/expulsion rate.

The formula for the 2017-2018 year's state average is:

$$((\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2017-2018} > 10 \text{ days for SY 2017-2018}) / (\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs in the state for SY 2017-2018})) * 100$$

$$\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2017-2018} > 10 \text{ days} = 45$$

$$\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs in the state for SY 2017-2018} = 32,908$$

$$\text{State-level suspension/expulsion rate} = (45/32,908) \times 100$$

Application of data:

$$\text{State-level suspension/expulsion rate} = (45/32,908) \times 100 = 0.136\%$$

$$\text{The state bar is } 0.136\% + 1.00\% = 1.136\%$$

An LEA will have Significant Discrepancy if its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.136% for FFY 2018 data.

For Indicator 4b, Idaho has established a minimum n-size of at least 40 children with IEPs enrolled in the LEA. This n-size is applied separately for each racial/ethnic group. Based on the application of this minimum n-size, 83 of 161 LEAs in Idaho were, for every racial/ethnic group, excluded from the calculation for this indicator for FFY 2018. The number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n-size for at least one racial/ethnic group was 161 - 83 = 78.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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.

Based on data collected during SY 2017-2018 and using Idaho's approved calculation for Significant Discrepancy, no LEAs were identified as having a Significant Discrepancy in FFY 2018 for Indicator 4B.

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

If YES, select one of the following:

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

| 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 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 65.00% | 66.00% | 67.00% | 68.00% | 69.00% |
| A | 63.80% | Data | 60.12% | 60.85% | 60.55% | 60.81% | 62.02% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 7.90% | 7.42% | 6.94% | 6.46% | 5.98% |
| B | 8.00% | Data | 10.83% | 10.10% | 9.86% | 9.48% | 9.13% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 1.50% | 1.50% | 1.50% | 1.50% | 1.50% |
| C | 1.60% | Data | 1.21% | 1.18% | 1.58% | 1.57% | 1.42% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-------------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 70.00% | 71.00% |
| Target B <= | 5.50% | 5.02% |
| Target C <= | 1.50% | 1.50% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) staff met with the Idaho Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Director's Advisory Council (DAC), and other ISDE divisions. Discussions were held related to Indicator 5 and input was used to determine targets. Broad stakeholder input was solicited at regional special education director meetings, the Idaho Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Conference, the annual Idaho Association of Special Education Administrators Conference, and regional Idaho School Superintendents Association (ISSA) meetings.

In the past, 618 educational environment categorizations have confused teachers working with students who are enrolled in Kindergarten at age five during child count but turn age six later in the school year. Idaho looks forward to reporting these students under school age codes as part of EDFacts FS002, but will not be able to take advantage of the change until the 2020-2021 data collection. Idaho's stakeholders agree that extending the targets for this Indicator for the FFY 2019 submission will allow the state to focus efforts towards analyzing data to establish targets and baseline to reflect changes in collection beginning in the school year 2020-2021.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|--------|
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 30,444 |

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|---|--------|
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 19,086 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 2,737 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 360 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 58 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/11/2019 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 22 |

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

Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| | Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 19,086 | 30,444 | 62.02% | 70.00% | 62.69% | 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 | 2,737 | 30,444 | 9.13% | 5.50% | 8.99% | 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] | 440 | 30,444 | 1.42% | 1.50% | 1.45% | Met Target | No Slippage |

| | Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

| | Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | | | | | | | |

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|------|-------------------------------------|
| A | XXX |
| B | XXX |
| C | XXX |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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. For the 2020-2021 data collection, ISDE will have increased training emphasis related to coding students age five enrolled in Kindergarten. 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 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. 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. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that all necessary documentation is finalized and limits user coding error.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 32.40% | 33.40% | 34.40% | 35.40% | 36.40% |
| A | 30.40% | Data | 30.28% | 29.57% | 29.33% | 28.73% | 24.43% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 49.30% | 48.30% | 47.30% | 46.30% | 45.30% |
| B | 50.30% | Data | 52.91% | 51.73% | 51.85% | 51.25% | 54.59% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-------------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 37.40% | 38.40% |
| Target B <= | 44.30% | 43.30% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Targets were set based on data analysis and stakeholder input. In setting targets and addressing the needs of students 3-5 years of age, Idaho utilized three (3) specific 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 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, charter schools, and State Department of Education staff. EC3 represents the following: the medical community, state legislators, higher education, Idaho Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind, Community Council of Idaho, IDEA Part C, parents, state child care, child welfare, judicial system, State Department of Insurance, infant/child mental health, mental health, Head Start, public health, early intervention providers, regional EC3 representative, Developmental Disabilities Council, and Medicaid. DAC consists of several special education directors in Idaho from large/small and rural/urban districts to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

Idaho's stakeholders agree that extending the targets for this indicator for the FFY 2019 submission will allow the state to focus efforts towards analyzing data to establish targets and baseline to reflect changes in collection beginning in the school year 2020-2021.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|--|------------|--|-------|
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 3,866 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | 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 | 980 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 1,752 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | ** |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/11/2019 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | ** |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| | Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 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 | 980 | 3,866 | 24.43% | 37.40% | 25.35% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 2,056 | 3,866 | 54.59% | 44.30% | 53.18% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Provide reasons for slippage for A

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|------|-------------------------------------|
| A | XXX |
| B | XXX |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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.

In the past, 618 educational environment categorizations have confused teachers working with students who are enrolled in kindergarten at age five during child count but turn age six later in the school year. Idaho looks forward to being able to report these students under school age codes as part of EDFacts FS002, but will not be able to take advantage of the change until the 2020-2021 data collection. Idaho's stakeholders agree that extending the targets for this indicator for the FFY 2019 submission will allow the state to focus efforts towards analyzing data to establish targets and baseline to reflect changes in collection beginning in the school year 2020-2021.

Idaho has made 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 6 include increased and improved communication and training, collaboration, and grant opportunities.

Communication and Training:

In the 2018-19 school year, ISDE developed training modules and recordings on the use of the Decision Tree for Reporting Educational Environments for Children Ages 3-5 with IEPs. The recordings are available for new teachers and existing staff who need additional training.

Starting in 2019, Idaho included Indicator 6 information as part of regional training for 2019 Data Drill Down, ISEE Roadshow, and Directors Webinar to improve LEA understanding of data and appropriate environment coding. Early Childhood and preschool data reporting was also an agenda item for DAC in 2019.

Collaboration/Partnerships:

ISDE is partnering with other agencies and resources to increase training around inclusionary practices. IdahoStar provides training and oversight of childcare providers across the state. ISDE is collaborating on inclusionary educational documents and training that will be accessible through IdahoStars Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) and shared with childcare providers. The new Head Start Interagency Agreement aims to improve partnerships between LEAs and Head Start to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

Grant Opportunities:

In the spring of 2019, ISDE worked with ECTA staff to develop a plan to improve early childhood data. The group met several times to discuss how to leverage different funding streams, Title 1, 21st Century Grant, and Preschool the Idaho Way. 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 three through five with disabilities.

Idaho was awarded its first Preschool Development Grant (PDG) in 2019. The PDG was applied for by the Office of the Governor and partners Idaho Department of Health and Welfare and ISDE to further efforts to improve Idaho's early childhood programs.

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. 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

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----|----------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1 | 2013 | Target >= | 84.70% | 85.20% | 84.70% | 84.20% | 85.70% |
| A1 | 84.70% | Data | 84.70% | 78.27% | 68.61% | 67.75% | 66.79% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A2 | 2013 | Target >= | 53.88% | 54.38% | 54.88% | 55.38% | 55.88% |
| A2 | 53.88% | Data | 53.88% | 53.65% | 49.09% | 51.16% | 49.51% |
| B1 | 2013 | Target >= | 78.05% | 78.55% | 79.05% | 79.55% | 80.05% |
| B1 | 78.05% | Data | 78.05% | 72.17% | 71.71% | 68.74% | 64.19% |
| B2 | 2013 | Target >= | 27.37% | 27.87% | 28.37% | 28.87% | 29.37% |
| B2 | 27.37% | Data | 27.37% | 22.92% | 19.16% | 19.10% | 19.61% |
| C1 | 2013 | Target >= | 83.31% | 83.81% | 84.31% | 84.81% | 85.31% |
| C1 | 83.31% | Data | 83.31% | 76.14% | 69.98% | 67.66% | 61.34% |
| C2 | 2013 | Target >= | 65.41% | 65.91% | 66.41% | 66.91% | 67.41% |
| C2 | 65.41% | Data | 65.41% | 61.46% | 60.32% | 60.53% | 57.45% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------------|--------|--------|
| Target A1 >= | 85.20% | 85.70% |
| Target A2 >= | 56.38% | 56.88% |
| Target B1 >= | 80.55% | 82.05% |
| Target B2 >= | 29.87% | 30.37% |
| Target C1 >= | 85.81% | 86.31% |
| Target C2 >= | 67.91% | 68.41% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Targets were set based on the analysis of state and national historical 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 three major 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 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, charter schools, 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, IDEA Part C, parents, state child care, child welfare, judicial system, State Department of Insurance, infant/child mental health, mental health, Head Start, public health, early intervention providers, regional EC3 representative, Developmental Disabilities Council, and Medicaid. DAC consists of special education directors in Idaho from large/small and rural/urban districts to reflect the demographic groups of the state.

EC3 has been reformed since the target setting to address the requirements of the Preschool Development Grant. Other stakeholders involved in early childhood indicators are the Idaho Child Care Advisory Panel and the Infant Toddler Coordinating Council.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,227

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

| | Number of children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 20 | 1.63% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 279 | 22.74% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 309 | 25.18% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 335 | 27.30% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 284 | 23.15% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 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> | 644 | 943 | 66.79% | 85.20% | 68.29% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| 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> | 619 | 1,227 | 49.51% | 56.38% | 50.45% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 11 | 0.90% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 351 | 28.61% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 650 | 52.97% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 193 | 15.73% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 22 | 1.79% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 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> | 843 | 1,205 | 64.19% | 80.55% | 69.96% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| 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> | 215 | 1,227 | 19.61% | 29.87% | 17.52% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 25 | 2.04% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 262 | 21.35% |

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|--|--------------------|------------------------|
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 229 | 18.66% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 365 | 29.75% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 346 | 28.20% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 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. | 594 | 881 | 61.34% | 85.81% | 67.42% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| 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. | 711 | 1,227 | 57.45% | 67.91% | 57.95% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|------|---|
| A1 | XXX |
| A2 | XXX |
| B1 | XXX |
| B2 | The Division of Special Education collaborated with the Division of Technology Services on the development of a new application for the collection of Early Childhood Outcome data to improve data quality and reduce time and effort. The 2018-2019 school year was the first year of full implementation using the new Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System. As a result of the change in systems, there was a substantial increase in the number of students reported. The new application has validations in place between entry and exit ratings and has resulted in improved data quality, security, and reduced duplication of effort. A contributing factor to slippage in ECO data is improved data quality, and an increase in the number of students reported. Idaho is showing consistent growth in the population of students with disabilities in early childhood. Since Idaho does not offer general education at the Pre-Kindergarten level students served in Idaho's early childhood programs tend to: lack exposure to typically developing peers and teams focus on targeted special education goals and related services that do not always include pre-academic activities. ISDE is working with one of Idaho's public universities to develop webinar series for next school year related to early childhood academic skills. High turnover for early childhood special education teachers continues to be a problem. In response, the ISDE has developed training modules and recordings related to early childhood outcome ratings and early childhood outcome data entry processes. |
| C1 | XXX |
| C2 | XXX |

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

Please explain why the State did not 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 |
|---|----------|
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | |
| If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan | |

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

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

YES

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

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. Elements of the ECO Child Outcome Process were embedded into Idaho's Early Childhood Individual Education Plan (ECO/IEP) in school year 2013. ISDE mandated that all LEAs utilize the updated ECO/IEP no later than the beginning of school year 2015-2016 with full integration into IEP platforms no later than start of school year 2018-2019. 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 school year 2017-2018, ISDE developed a new application for the collection of Early Childhood Outcome data to improve data quality and reduce time and effort. The new ECO application establishes records for students based on demographic data reported by the LEA to the statewide longitudinal data system. The new ECO application was piloted in the spring of 2018. All non-pilot group LEAs utilized the legacy tool for the 2017-2018 collection. The 2018-2019 school year was the first year of full implementation using the new Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System. As a result of the change in systems, there was a substantial increase in the number of students reported. The new application has validations in place between entry and exit ratings and has resulted in improved data quality, security, and reduced duplication of effort.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho has made 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, collaboration, and grant opportunities.

Communication and Training:

High turnover for early childhood special education teachers continues to be a problem. In response, ISDE developed training modules and recordings in school year 2018-2019 related to ECO ratings and ECO data entry processes. The recordings are available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse for new teachers and existing staff who need additional training.

Idaho includes Indicator 7 information as part of regional training for Data Drill Down and Directors Webinar to improve LEA understanding of ECO data and ECO ratings.

In October 2019, statewide training was provided to over 150 Speech-Language Pathologists and special education teachers in six locations around the state in the use of the intervention Visual Phonics. Visual Phonics is an intervention to help preschool students to improve their pre-literacy skills to specifically address Outcome 2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication).

Idaho applied and was accepted to the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations cohort to implement the Pyramid Model for supporting social-emotional competence in young children. Idaho is collaborating across Early Childhood Special Education programs, Head Start, and child care programs in pilot sites across the state. We are currently in the development stage and look to identify and start the first six implementation sites in the Fall of 2020. The Pyramid Project will directly impact Outcome 1: Social and Emotional Development.

Collaboration/Partnerships:

ISDE is partnering with other agencies and resources to increase training around inclusionary practices. Increases in inclusionary practices result in increased exposure to typically developing peers. Thus, enhancing students with disabilities opportunities to model and develop skills, behavior, and knowledge-based on observations and interactions with typically developing peers. IdahoStar provides training and oversight of childcare providers across the state. ISDE is collaborating on inclusionary educational documents and training that will be accessible through IdahoStar's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) and shared with childcare providers. The new Head Start Interagency Agreement aims to improve partnerships between LEAs and Head Start to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

Grant Opportunities:

In the spring of 2019, ISDE worked with ECTA, NCSI, and DaSy staff to complete a self-assessment and develop a plan to improve early childhood data. The group met several times to discuss infrastructure, processes, and how to leverage different funding streams, including the following: Title I, 21st Century Grant, and Preschool the Idaho Way. 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 three through five with disabilities.

Idaho was awarded its first Preschool Development Grant (PDG) in 2019. The PDG was applied for by the Office of the Governor and partners Idaho Department of Health and Welfare and ISDE to further efforts to improve Idaho's early childhood programs.

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. 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. For Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcome data, Idaho EDPlan routes users through the decision tree 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

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**7 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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

| | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |
| If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? | XXX |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

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% every two years. For FFY 2016, Idaho included an additional 0.06% 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 TAESE, IDEA Data Center, 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 calculation of responses was maintained on a 100-point scale. As no changes were made to the participant selection process, LEA participation cycle, or survey questions, ISDE and stakeholders maintained the baseline and targets established in FFY 2015. Idaho's stakeholders agree that extending the current target rate progression for this indicator for the FFY 2019 submission is appropriate. Extending targets in this manner will allow the state to focus efforts towards analyzing data to establish targets and baseline that properly reflect any changes in the new SPP/APR package.

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 districts 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 | 2015 | 55.44% | | | |
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target >= | 55.00% | 59.60% | 55.44% | 55.50% | 55.75% |
| Data | 60.41% | 61.16% | 55.44% | 59.88% | 70.26% |

Targets

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
| Target >= | 55.75% | 56.00% |

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 644 | 943 | 70.26% | 55.75% | 68.29% | Met Target | No Slippage |

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

5,850

Percentage of respondent parents

16.12%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 districts 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 was not a separate selection process for preschool students.

Historical Data

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Preschool | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| Preschool | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| School age | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| School age | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Targets

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
| Target A >= | XXX | XXX |
| Target B >= | XXX | XXX |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

| | 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 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| Preschool | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| School age | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

XXX

| | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Was sampling used? | YES |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | NO |
| If yes, provide sampling plan. | XXX |

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, districts were 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 based on the number of total students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA.

For those districts 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 district sizes. When calculating the state-level results, the district'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.

| | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. | XXX |
| 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 to increase participation and to encourage parents of all races/ethnicities 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. For the 2019-2020 collection, ISDE will use existing data related to limited English proficiency and home language to more purposefully direct communications translated into Spanish. 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.

The representativeness of the survey was assessed by comparing the demographic characteristics of the students whose parents responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all students with disabilities in the sample. This comparison indicates the survey results are representative by the following characteristics:

1. Size of the LEA where the child attends school
2. Grade level of the child and
3. Primary disability of the child

For example, 20% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a child with a specific learning disability, and 21% of students with disabilities in the entire sample have a Specific Learning Disability.

The analysis did show a difference in participation by racial/ethnic group. Parents of white students were more likely to respond than parents of non-

white students: 82% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a white student, whereas 75% of students with disabilities in the sample are white. Parents of Hispanic students were less likely to respond than parents of non-Hispanic students: 10% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a Hispanic student, whereas 17% of the students with disabilities in the sample are Hispanic.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 16.10% | | | |
|----------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2018 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.

77

| 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 and/or cell size | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 1 | 0 | 88 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 calculation 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 District. 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 disproportionality 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 disproportionality.

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 district data, ISDE identifies districts with ARR equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, as having disproportionate representation. Each of those districts must complete a Performance Response that includes an explanation of policies, practices, and procedures used to refer, evaluate, and identify students for special education. ISDE also selects student eligibility files to review. District responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by ISDE to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected, based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, ISDE looks for a preponderance of evidence-based on functional data collected to support eligibility for special education. ISDE also checks to see if the exclusionary factors have been adequately addressed. From this information, 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 District's identification policies, practices, and procedures.

The number of districts analyzed for FFY 2018 was 88 (those having 40 or more students with disabilities enrolled). One LEA was found to have disproportionate representation, but no districts were found to have disproportionate representation (using data from SY 2018-2019) as a result of inappropriate identification based on ISDE's review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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.

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. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate date fields based on finalization. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that all required documentation and processes are followed for evaluation.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

| 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 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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 2018, 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 16.10% | | | |
|----------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2018 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.

115

| 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 and/or cell size | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 8 | 0 | 50 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 calculation 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 District. 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.

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 disproportionality.

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 district data, ISDE identifies districts with ARR equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, as having disproportionate representation. Each of those districts must complete a Performance Response that includes an explanation of policies, practices, and procedures used to refer, evaluate, and identify students for special education. ISDE also selects student eligibility files to review. District responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by ISDE to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected, based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, ISDE looks for a preponderance of evidence-based on functional data collected to support eligibility for special education. ISDE also checks to see if the exclusionary factors have been adequately addressed. From this information, 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 District's identification policies, practices, and procedures.

The number of districts analyzed for FFY 2018 was 50 (those having 40 or more students with disabilities enrolled). Eight LEAs were found to have disproportionate representation, but no districts were found to have disproportionate representation (using data from SY 2018-2019) as a result of inappropriate identification based on ISDE's review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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.

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. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate date fields based on finalization. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that all required documentation and processes are followed for evaluation.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

| 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 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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

- # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- # 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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 | 2005 | 91.40% | | | |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.85% | 98.53% | 99.31% | 98.60% | 99.14% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 6,701 | 6,591 | 99.14% | 100% | 98.36% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage

XXX

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

110

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.

Of the 110 evaluations that exceeded the 60-day timeline from the date of consent; Ninety-three of the evaluations exceeded the 60-day timeline due primarily to scheduling difficulties. These evaluations were made within the range of 1-136 days over the 60-day timeline, with a mean of 22.4 days.

Seventeen evaluations were determined late, listing staffing issues as the primary reason for the delay. These evaluations were made within the range of 2-176 days over the 60-day timeline, with a mean of 42 days.

Idaho has identified a major staffing shortage for school psychologists. ISDE is coordinating with national resources to encourage certified individuals from around the nation to come to Idaho.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe 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).

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 is collected through the state's longitudinal database, ISEE. Districts are required to submit all 60-day timeline data at the student level. Data is available for review at all times through the Special Education (SPED) Data Application. The data is then reviewed annually by ISDE.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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. For this indicator's data, Idaho EDPlan includes calendar information providing timelines and reminders for staff related to compliance requirements. This allows teachers and supervisors to monitor caseloads and teams to ensure that compliance timelines are met. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate date fields based on finalization. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that all required documentation is finalized and teams have timely reminders to stay on track with IDEA compliance requirements. Idaho has identified a staffing shortage in School Psychologists and is partnering with the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) to recruit potential applicants. In a survey of 97 LEAs, approximately 8% of school psychologist positions remained unfilled after the beginning of the school year, and 30% were filled through outside contracts.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 56 | 56 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Fifty-six findings of noncompliance were identified from 30 LEAs. To ensure that the LEAs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, ISDE reviewed additional Child Find (60-day timeline) data collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for the 30 LEAs where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2017. As a result of this review, all 30 LEAs demonstrated that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c). Three LEAs have yet to finalize the submission of improvement activities and corrective actions taken to ensure compliance in the future.

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 all LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for Indicator 11 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c).

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

ISDE verified the correction of this noncompliance by reviewing the data and by verifying that all evaluations were completed, or that the student exited the LEA prior to completion. Each instance of noncompliance in FFY 2017 was investigated at the student level. 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).

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

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

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # 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.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 59.00% | | | |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.23% | 97.00% | 99.53% | 99.38% | 99.82% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|---|-------|
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 1,042 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 62 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 658 |
| 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. | 309 |

| | |
|---|----|
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | ** |
| 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. | ** |

| | Numerator (c) | Denominator (a-b-d-e-f) | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 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. | 658 | 665 | 99.82% | 100% | 98.95% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

7

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.

Seven students were reported as exceeding the Early Childhood Transition time-line by a range of 3-120 days with a mean of 35.1 days for eligibility determination and IEP development.

The majority of transitions exceeded the time-line due primarily to scheduling difficulties.

Other reasons for transitions exceeded the time-line due primarily to staffing issues, and one transition was delayed because of school closures as a result of inclement weather and illness.

Idaho has identified a major staffing shortage for school psychologists. ISDE is coordinating with national resources to encourage certified individuals from around the nation to come to Idaho.

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.

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

Idaho does not have an automated system notifying Part B of potentially eligible early childhood children transitioning from Part C. A manual notification process is in place between Part C and Part B, which provides

notification to LEAs concerning potentially eligible students. ISDE is copied on all notifications and receives a quarterly report of all students referred as potentially eligible. The quarterly information from Part C is then provided 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 Part B 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 to be entered into ISEE.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To further improve the timely transition and tracking of students from Part C to Part B, ISDE identified areas for improvement in communication, training, and revision of coding options. For SY 2018-2019, additional validations were included in ISEE to reduce coding errors and document reasons for transition delays.

The Divisions of Special Education and Technology Services continue to coordinate with the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare – Infant-Toddler Program (Idaho Part-C) to identify ways to improve data quality and collection processes. Changes to applications and/or process(es) may require an improved data sharing agreement with Idaho Part-C.

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. For this indicator's data, Idaho EDPlan includes calendar information providing timelines and reminders for staff related to compliance requirements. This allows teachers and supervisors to monitor caseloads and teams to ensure that compliance timelines are met. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate date fields based on finalization. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that all required documentation is finalized and teams have timely reminders to stay on track with IDEA compliance requirements.

Idaho has identified a staffing shortage in School Psychologists and is partnering with the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) to recruit potential applicants. In a survey of 97 LEAs approximately 8% of school psychologist positions remained unfilled after the beginning of the school year, and 30% were filled through outside contracts.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2017 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 LEA correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, ISDE reviewed additional Early Childhood Transition data collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for the LEA where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2017. As a result of this review, the LEA demonstrated that they were correctly implementing requirements under the IDEA. 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 the LEA corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for Indicator 12 and correctly implemented requirements under the IDEA.

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

ISDE verified the correction of this noncompliance by reviewing the data and by verifying that the early childhood transition was completed. The instance of noncompliance in FFY 2017 was investigated at the student level. ISDE verified that the eligible student had an evaluation and IEP developed, although late. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

In its description of correction of noncompliance, the State referenced an incorrect regulatory citation. Therefore, the State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of that finding consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (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.

12 - Required Actions

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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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 | 2009 | 63.00% | | | |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 55.00% | 67.37% | 98.43% | 90.30% | 98.62% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 137 | 143 | 98.62% | 100% | 95.80% | 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 Idaho State Department of Education (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 TA provided was very targeted and specific to individual LEAs including multiple site visits and video or audio conferencing. Slippage in this indicator is attributed to intensive one on one support to individual LEAs in FFY 2017 shifting to more sustainable processes with a greater effect size. Current training and technical assistance aim to balance compliance and performance and emphasizes how compliant high-quality transition plans can improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

High turnover is also a contributing factor. To mitigate the effects of high turnover of special education teachers, ISDE requires all LEAs to provide

assurances that new to LEA staff members have participated in New Teacher training provided by Idaho SESTA or an LEA-provided equivalent. ISDE continues to have substantial support on secondary transition, as documented in the additional information about the indicator section.

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 self-select three files, enter self-review results, and upload 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.

| | Yes / No |
|--|----------|
| Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | NO |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | |
| If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator | |

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In addition to training and support from the ISDE, the interagency collaboration resulted in a customized employment pilot with 3 Idaho LEAs as well as the expansion of LEAs accessing school to work counselors through the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR). ISDE's improved 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 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. For the 18-19 school year, this pilot resulted in 4 students obtaining at least part-time employment. Future expansion of the pilot work is currently under discussion.

Additional SDE/IDVR administrator training has resulted in LEA/IDVR funding partnerships to provide dedicated school to work counselors who are either full time or shared between smaller LEAs. Those LEAs that have engaged in this shared resource have begun to show an increase in their students connecting to IDVR offered pre-employment activities, which the ISDE believes will improve LEA Indicator 14 results in measurements B and C.

The Secondary Coordinator continues to participate as part of annual regional data training, Data Drill Down, providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data and indicators.

The Secondary Coordinator also 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, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare.

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 Department of Health and Welfare is making a concerted effort to provide training regarding benefits. Training is offered in multiple formats for accessibility purposes.

In November of 2019, ISDE, with partners from 10 state agencies and organizations as well as all of Idaho's public universities, held Idaho's second annual Transition Institute. Lead state partner agencies included IDVR, Idaho Department of Labor, Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities, 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 resource and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. There, participants divided into teams consisting of staff from all 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 school districts and charters. Feedback provided was overwhelmingly positive. Idaho plans to continue the Institute and expects to see growth for students with disabilities as a result of the Institute in future Post School Outcomes data.

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, 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 are designed to ensure compliance and promote quality transition planning that will result in positive post-school outcomes.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2017 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. The files submitted were reviewed by ISDE and Idaho SESTA. ISDE verified that subsequent data showed 100% compliance, indicating LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements. The review of additional files was tracked and documented in the 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 2017 for Indicator 13 and were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

ISDE verified the correction of each individual instance of noncompliance by a review of individual student files. ISDE verified that all student files where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2017 had been corrected to 100% compliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

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 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 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 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 20.00% | 22.50% | 23.00% | 23.50% | 24.00% |
| A | 17.00% | Data | 18.22% | 13.70% | 18.01% | 16.93% | 17.58% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 33.00% | 45.00% | 46.00% | 47.00% | 48.00% |
| B | 31.00% | Data | 41.30% | 41.11% | 41.71% | 38.19% | 50.59% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 77.00% | 77.50% | 78.00% | 78.50% | 79.00% |
| C | 71.00% | Data | 61.94% | 54.81% | 54.03% | 59.45% | 67.22% |

FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-------------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 24.50% | 25.00% |
| Target B >= | 49.00% | 50.00% |
| Target C >= | 79.50% | 80.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In FFY 2013, targets were set 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 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 school year 2017-2018 stakeholders including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Director Advisory Committee (DAC), along with special education directors and other special education personnel who attended the spring Data Drill Down, 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 14-21 who exited special education the prior school year. The follow-up mail-out survey moved to an emailed survey link to attend to issues related to change of physical address. 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 FFY 2017 Post-School Outcome survey administration, ISDE extended the LEA opt-in opportunity to conduct first-round surveying to all LEAs for FFY 2018.

Changing baseline and targets was determined unnecessary as the only changes were related to who initiated the first round of phone surveys and improved data quality for existing responders. Idaho's stakeholders have agreed that it is appropriate to extend the targets for this indicator for the FFY 2019 submission. Extending the targets will allow the state to focus efforts towards establishing targets and baseline that will appropriately reflect changes in the SPP/APR package for data collected in the school year 2020-2021.

FFY 2018 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 | 640 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 137 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 217 |
| 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) | 45 |
| 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). | 45 |

| | 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 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 137 | 640 | 17.58% | 24.50% | 21.41% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 354 | 640 | 50.59% | 49.00% | 55.31% | 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) | 444 | 640 | 67.22% | 79.50% | 69.38% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|------|-------------------------------------|
| A | XXX |
| B | XXX |
| C | XXX |

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.

| | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? | |
| If yes, provide sampling plan. | |

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

| | Yes / No |
|--|----------|
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, attach a copy of the survey | XXX |

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.

The response rates were analyzed by gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and type of exit to determine if one group was more likely to respond than another group. No significant differences existed in response rates by gender, race/ethnicity, or type of exit. Past students identified with the disability category of language impairment (64%) were significantly more likely to respond than students eligible under the category of autism (42%), intellectual disability (41%), emotional disturbance (40%), specific learning disability (39%), or other health impairment (38%).

| | 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 disability categories. ISDE is requesting additional input from stakeholders, including SEAP, Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities, and the Idaho Autism Project, to identify methods that will improve the response rate of exiters of specific disability categories.

ISDE continues to expand the Indicator 14 LEA opt-in opportunity and is encouraging all LEAs to conduct initial survey attempts. ISDE anticipates these efforts will further improve data quality and increase the response rate, particularly of students who dropped out. ISDE presented information from participating LEAs regarding strategies for contacting hard-to-reach exiters at regional Data Drill Down training. For additional information regarding Data Drill Down and other training opportunities please see the introduction section.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In spring 2018, Idaho piloted its new data collection method for Post-School Outcomes, allowing LEAs to conduct the first round of surveys. That year, fifteen LEAs participated in the pilot group. In school year 2018-2019, the LEA opt-in collection process was expanded with 58 LEAs in the state participating in conducting Post-School Outcomes surveying. Of the 640 surveys completed, 527 or roughly 82% were through contact initiated by an LEA representative. Participating LEAs reported that involvement in the Indicator 14 data collection process has improved their understanding and increased the importance of Post-School Outcome data for their LEA.

LEAs participating in the opt-in collection process received training developed in collaboration between ISDE and the survey vendor on survey collection and documentation, technical support, access to the survey protocol, and access to an online survey application to collect individual responses. Any student from an opt-in LEA who was not able to be contacted by the LEA was then placed back into the vendor's survey group and contacted through the regular Post School Outcomes survey process. Students who exited from a non-opt-in LEA were surveyed using the regular process—an initial phone survey from the vendor and a follow-up emailed survey link.

ISDE continues to coordinate with the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) to receive data on Post-School Outcomes survey participants related to enrollment in higher education. For responders to the survey indicating a value other than participating in higher education, Idaho prioritizes SBOE data, categorizing them into Measurement A. ISDE continues to pursue methods for connecting with other state agencies to improve the quality of information. The Secondary Coordinator continues to participate as part of annual regional data training, Data Drill Down, providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data and indicators.

The Secondary Coordinator also 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, and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare.

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 past students informed, so the Department of Health and Welfare is making a concerted effort to provide training regarding benefits. Training is offered in multiple formats for accessibility purposes.

In November of 2019, ISDE, with partners from the IDVR, Idaho Universities, Idaho Department of Labor, Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, and Idaho Parents Unlimited held Idaho's second annual Secondary Transition Institute. The Secondary Transition Institute links LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resource and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. There, participants divided into teams consisting of staff from all 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 300 personnel from the school, LEA, and agency levels participated in the Institute. Feedback provided was overwhelmingly positive. Idaho plans to continue the Institute and expects to see growth for students with disabilities as a result of the Institute in future Post School Outcomes data.

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. To improve transition planning and post-school outcomes, Idaho EDPlan provides teams with reminders and an organizational framework for transition goals and materials.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

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 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/11/2019 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 1 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/11/2019 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

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

Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

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 for the November 2019 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey.

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 100.00% | | | |
|-----------|-------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target >= | | | | | |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 33.33% | 50.00% | 66.67% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-----------|------|------|
| Target >= | | |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolutions sessions | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 0 | 1 | 66.67% | | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 (low) | 2018 (high) | 2019 (low) | 2019 (high) |
|--------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Target | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolutions sessions | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target (low) | FFY 2018 Target (high) | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. 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 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/11/2019 | 2.1 Mediations held | 2 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/11/2019 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/11/2019 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 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

Provide an explanation below

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

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) 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 this presentation, SEAP members asked questions, discussed possible numbers, and dialogued about the implications of their final recommendation.

Idaho's stakeholders have agreed that it is appropriate to extend the targets for this indicator for the FFY 2019 submission as Idaho continues to have a robust Dispute Resolution process. Extending the targets will allow the state to focus efforts towards establishing targets and baseline that will appropriately reflect changes in the SPP/APR package for data collected in the school year 2020-2021.

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | | | | |
|-----------|---------|---------|--------|--------|-----------------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 76.00% | 77.00% | 78.00% | 75.00% - 85.00% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 83.33% | 77.78% | 100.00% |

Targets

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
| Target >= | XXX | XXX |

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|--|------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 (low) | 2018 (high) | 2019 (low) | 2019 (high) |
|--------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Target | 75.00% | 85.00% | 75.00% | 85.00% |

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target (low) | FFY 2018 Target (high) | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|--|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------|-------------|
| 0 | 2 | 2 | 100.00% | 75.00% | 85.00% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

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:

Idaho Special Education Director

Email:

csilva@sde.idaho.gov

Phone:

2083326806

Submitted on:

04/30/20 11:05:04 AM