STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

For reporting on
FFY 2020

Idaho

PART B DUE February 1, 2022

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

The current strategic plan includes the following goals.

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

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

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

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

Strategies Include:

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

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

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

Strategies Include:

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

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

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

Strategies include:

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

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

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

Strategies include:

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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Starting March 17, 2020, Idaho went into a soft-closure due to the COVID-19 crisis. All local education agencies (LEAs) were required to follow national CDC guidelines pertaining to large gatherings and social distancing. Students were not allowed on school grounds, but LEAs were required to continue facilitating essential services and student learning. The soft-closure extended through the end of the school year with flexibilities starting April 20, 2020, which allowed LEAs to bring select students, selection criteria to be determined by the LEA, into school buildings or reopen based on compliance with specific criteria. In addition, Idaho's Governor issued a statewide stay-at-home order, which was in effect March 25, 2020 through May 1, 2020. The soft-closure, combined with the stay-at-home order, negatively impacted LEA teams' ability to conduct face-to-face assessments and observations in the regular education environment. For Idaho's FFY 2020 SPP/APR data, the impact of these COVID-19-related closures is most evident in Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, and 12. While these indicators showed impact due to COVID-19, the ISDE did not identify any impact on the data quality, reliability, or completeness.

To mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Division of Special Education immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. The ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services during the COVID-19 pandemic. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Webinars resumed in August of 2020, continuing through the end of the 2020-2021 school year on an as-needed basis. Information provided during the webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Division of Medicaid also presented as part of the webinar series. Throughout the soft-closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a question and answer guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

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

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

Listed below are Indicators 1-16 and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic for FFY 2020.

Indicators 1, 2: Data are lag year data. The ISDE showed that COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for these indicators. The COVID-19 health crisis impacted indicators 1 and 2 percentages in the FFY 2020 reporting year. Counts of students who were on track to graduate and meet regular state graduation were not affected, but the number of students who dropped out or completed adapted requirements was reduced due to the COVID-19 health crisis.

Indicator 3: For Indicator 3A, Idaho saw a reduced participation rate for students with disabilities. The ISDE attributes this reduction to parents opting students out of testing due to COVID-19 health concerns. For Indicator 3B, the ISDE attributes reduced performance of grade levels 4, 8, and HS to impact from COVID-19. The ISDE shows no impact on the validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 3 data as a result of COVID-19.

Indicator 4A, and 4B: Data are lag year data. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for these indicators. As a result of the COVID-19 related soft closure, students were shifted to remote learning environments. Schools were not in regular session and disciplinary actions for the 2019-2020 school year dropped by approximately 20%.

Indicators 5, 6, 9, and 10: The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for these indicators. Changes in these indicators are attributed to updates in reporting requirements and changes in calculation.

Indicator 7: The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of the data.

Indicator 8: The ISDE does not show evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted survey results' completeness, validity, or reliability.

Indicator 11: COVID-19 has had a direct impact on Indicator 11, though evidence does not indicate COVID-19 has impacted data validity, reliability, or completeness. The ISDE has a significant staffing shortage for school psychologists, which the COVID-19 health crisis has further exacerbated. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen substantial turnover and increases in the number of unfilled positions at all levels. These shortages result in a reduction of resources necessary to complete initial eligibility evaluations.

Indicator 12: For FFY 2020, the ISDE saw a substantial increase in the number of parents requesting to delay Early Childhood Transition (ECT) due to COVID-19 health concerns. Parents' initiation of delays to ECT has increased Idaho's compliance percentage.

Indicator 13: Idaho collects indicator 13 data as part of virtual monitoring activities. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for this indicator.

Indicator 14: Idaho hypothesizes that the COVID-19 crisis may have marginally impacted the survey response rate. In FFY 2019, social distancing rules resulted in less travel during the survey administration and increased availability, communication by phone, and awareness of emailed materials. The FFY 2020 collection did not have the same stay in place, travel, and distance restrictions. The ISDE anticipates this change in availability of responders had a negative impact but resulted in a more normalized response rate. Indicator 14 data do not suggest COVID-19 had an impact on the completeness, accuracy, or validity of data.

Indicator 15: The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 15 data.

Indicator 16: The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 16 data.

Indicator 17: Due to COVID, the SSIP LEAs were unable to collect and submit high-quality RESET Rubric data during the reporting period.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

172

General Supervision System:

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

The ISDE general supervision system for special education, the Result Driven Accountability (RDA) Monitoring System, includes policies, procedures, and practices designed to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements and improve results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. Elements of the system provide leadership, guidance, technical

assistance (TA), and helps build relationships with local education agencies (LEAs) to facilitate the implementation of high-quality educational programs.

General Supervision File Review (GSFR)

Annually Idaho requires all school districts and charters, also known as local education agencies (LEAs), to provide a selection of student files to review for compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The general supervision file review (GSFR) focuses LEAs processes and procedures around identification (eligibility) and service delivery (IEPs). The ISDE selects and reviews a sample of the student files to ensure compliance with the IDEA including Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition. All reviews, issuance of notifications of noncompliance, improvement activities, and verification of correction are completed within the compliance tracking tool (CTT). For additional information see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) at https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6 and access the GSFR (General Supervision File Review) under RDA Topics.

Equity in IDEA (Significant Disproportionality and Indicators 4, 9, and 10)

Since the revision to significant disproportionality regulations in December of 2016, Idaho has substantially increased focus on equity in IDEA. The ISDE has developed a robust system to assist LEAs in addressing factors contributing to significant disproportionality. The system focuses on a proactive approach and provides LEAs identified as at-risk with information and resources prior to identification. Idaho continues to improve systems of support to ensure equity in IDEA. The ISDE has developed webinars, guidance documents, and an online module series that includes short video recordings to increase the accessibility of information.

LEAs receive a copy of their Significant Disproportionality Report annually, documenting three years of calculations. If an LEA exceeds the threshold in one or more areas, they will also receive a notification specifying whether they are "at-risk" (exceeding the threshold for 1 or 2 years) or formally identified for significant disproportionality (exceeding the threshold for 3 or 3+ years). LEAs that have exceeded the state's threshold for three consecutive years and are identified as having significant disproportionality must comply with significant disproportionality requirements. LEAs will be required to submit a finalized CCEIS Plan Narrative, CCEIS budget, and track information through the CCEIS Tracking and Accounting form and LEA Data Form, and provide verification of public reporting requirements.

In FFY 2020 Idaho aligned systems to support equity. Indicator 4, 9, and 10 now better support proactive review of policies, practices, and procedures prior to identification of significant disproportionality. For additional information see the ITC at https://idahotc.com/Topics/N-Z/RDA-Monitoring-System/Significant-Disproportionality?page14353=1&size14353=6.

Monitoring

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

Prong 1 – the LEA corrects each student-level case of noncompliance unless the student is no longer within the LEA's jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. ISDE and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) review subsequent student level information through review of files or data submission, as appropriate, to verify that each instance of noncompliance was corrected.

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. LEAs are also required to address instances of noncompliance through improvement activities aimed at addressing factors contributing to the issue(s) of noncompliance. The ISDE and Idaho SESTA review improvement activities to make sure that the improvement activity(s) are designed to address the issue(s) of noncompliance and verify that the activities took place.

RDA Determination and Differentiated Levels of Support

The ISDE uses the RDA Monitoring System to evaluate LEAs and includes performance and compliance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. LEAs are placed into one of three differentiated levels of support: Level 1: Supporting and Guiding; Level 2: Assisting and Mentoring; Level 3: Directing.

Supports range from required attendance at specific ISDE-sponsored training, submission of letters of assurance, and more intensive supports, including up to three years of TA to address improvement areas. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA Monitoring System. For additional information see the ITC at https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6.

Dispute Resolution

Several mechanisms are available through the ISDE Dispute Resolution Office (DRO) to assist in resolving IDEA disputes. These processes include: facilitation, informal conflict resolution, mediation, state complaints, due process hearings, and expedited due process hearings. The DRO has a team of 16 highly-trained and experienced contractors who manage Idaho's caseload. Three of the 16 contractors are dedicated to the hearing officer role. Idaho makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve disputes at the least adversarial and most local level possible. Contractors and hearing officers are assigned on a rotational and geographic basis, and trained by the DRO. Contractors are given the opportunity to participate in the Complaint Investigator Workgroup offered through Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) as well as the opportunity to attend regional and national conferences. DRO regularly provides information on "hot topic" or "trending issues" as part of monthly webinars to local special education directors and presents at the annual New Superintendents Orientation. The team has developed resources for local school principals related to discipline, IEP and evaluation processes, accommodations, etc. The DRO offers regular updates to stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and works closely with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) and Idaho SESTA to develop resources and training for parents and school districts.

Facilitations accounted for the majority (68%) of the caseload in dispute resolution. In FFY 2020 (SY 2020-2021) Idaho had 95 facilitation requests and held 88 facilitations, resulting in an 94% agreement rate. The FFY 2020 count represents a decrease of 32% from FFY 2019. In FFY 2020, Idaho had 20 mediation requests with 15 accepted. Idaho had a total of 30 state complaints filed with 24 reports issued, the remaining 6 complaints were withdrawn or dismissed.

Technical Assistance System:

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

Two websites house special education resources for LEAs, the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) https://idahotc.com/ and ISDE's Special Education webpage https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/index.html. Instructional webinars, training modules, and quick guides are available on the ITC website on a variety of special education topics, including: Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA); Accessible Educational Materials; Assistive Technology; Autism and Low Incidence; Behavior; Comprehensive Evaluation; Cultivating Readers (SSIP); Early Childhood; Educational Services for Deaf and Blind; Idaho Tiered Behavior Supports; IEP (Individualized Education Program); Paraprofessionals; Parent Resources, Principals Corner; Pyramid Collaborative; RDA Monitoring System; School-Based Medicaid; Secondary Transition; Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities; and Universal Design for Learning. 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) is a statewide training and technical assistance project

funded through the ISDE. Idaho SESTA assists the ISDE by providing professional development and monitoring supports to build the capacity of district administrators and school-based personnel to (a) increase positive student outcomes in inclusive environments through evidence-based practices and (b) increase achievement on IDEA indicators. Idaho SESTA provides support to school district personnel across the state and serves as a primary point of contact for LEAs. Idaho SESTA coordinators have expertise in instruction or behavior and IDEA compliance and oversight. Each LEA is assigned an Idaho SESTA coordinator per topic area so that they have a clear point of contact to access TA and support. Idaho SESTA collects data on each request throughout the year. The data are compiled annually and are an essential component of the information gathered to identify the training and professional development needed for the following year. The ISDE develops technical assistance training for statewide initiatives, Corrective Action Plans, and LEA program requests. Character limits did not allow for a full description of Idaho's technical assistance system. FFY 2020 represents an increase in the usage and development of online training modules and resources. For additional information regarding technical assistance and training provided by the ISDE to special educators throughout the state, please see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at https://idahotc.com/ and SESTA Home at https://idahotc.com/SESTA?page13548=1&size13548=6. For a list of face-to-face training provided in FFY 2020, please access the following web addresses: https://mailchi.mp/uidaho/zh62zd2cts-4805926 ; https://mailchi.mp/uidaho/zh62zd2cts-4779610.

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

1. 1.New Teacher (Essential Components of the Special Education Process) https://idahotc.com/SESTA/Essential
2. Secondary Transition (https://idahotc.com/Topics/ST?page13547=1&size13547=6)
3. Funding and Fiscal Accountability (https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/funding/)
4. Early Childhood (https://idahotc.com/Topics/EC?page13538=1&size13538=6)
5. Data and Reporting (https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6)
6. Stakeholders (https://idahotc.com/Topics/Parents?page14423=1&size14423=6)
7. New Directors - Includes training and resources from all of the above training specifically tailored to new special education directors.

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 children with disabilities.

Professional development opportunities were funded by special education grants through the ISDE Special Education Division and made available through the following centers:
Idaho SESTA;
 • Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHD), University of Idaho, 875 Perimeter Drive MS 4061, Moscow, ID 83844-4061, Phone: (208) 885-6132, Fax: (208) 885-6145; and
 • Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies, Boise State University, Ron and Linda Yanke Family Research Park 220 E. Parkcenter Blvd., Boise, ID 83706-3940.

Professional Development Projects hosted by the ISDE and Idaho SESTA:

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

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

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

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

Training and professional development opportunities provided by the ISDE Division of Special Education through collaboration with other ISDE Divisions and State agencies:

1. Annually, the Division of Special Education, in collaboration with the Assessment and Accountability, provides information regarding data on students with disabilities as part of the Data Drill Down, conducted in multiple regional sites around the state.

2. The Division of Special Education participates as an active partner in the Assessment Roadshow with the Division of Assessment and Accountability. The Assessment Roadshow provides LEAs with information regarding the importance of statewide and interim assessments, available accommodations, the 1% cap on alternate assessment participation, and statewide assessment processes.

3. The ISDE Division of Special Education collaborates with the IDHW on the biannual Early Years Conference, promoting networking and strengthening early childhood partnerships, programs, and systems-building initiatives.

4. The ISDE collaborates with the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) and the National Technical Assistance Center for Transitions to provide regional and customized training to improve post-secondary outcomes for low incidence disabilities and connect students to competitive employment options.

5. The ISDE collaborates with the Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL) to train and educate secondary transition teachers on how to utilize information regarding trends in employment, available training, and job requirements to benefit and promote successful student transitions.

6. The ISDE is collaborating with the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW) to create a new system of care, Youth Empowerment Services (YES), designed to support the mental health needs of children and youth.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

The ISDE solicited input regarding improvements and/or revisions to Idaho's target, baseline, policies, practices, and procedures from various stakeholders. The Idaho Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Idaho Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Head Start Collaboration Office, Idaho Association of the Education of Young Children, the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) (including community partners), individuals with disabilities, representatives from higher education, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Information Center, and the

Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC) all took an active role in the development of this SPP/APR and provided the ISDE with quality input on improving performance on SPP/APR priority indicators including Indicator 17 the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

SEAP membership represents parents and families of students with disabilities, self-advocates, and representatives from higher education, Idaho Department of Corrections (IDOC), Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (IDJC), LEA superintendents, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), IPUL, and the ISDE.

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

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. The ISDE encouraged stakeholders including parents, SEAP, and LEAs to further examine the changes and submit comments during the 60-day, and 30-day open comment periods.

In the spring of 2021, the ISDE Special Education division began reaching out to ISDE coordinators and other state agencies representing parents, minorities, and underrepresented stakeholder groups, including Migrant, Homeless and McKinney Vento, English Learners (EL), and Indian Education. The ISDE Special Education tried to connect with existing stakeholder group events for these areas. ISDE was unable to secure an invitation from these stakeholders. Many of the events were canceled due to COVID-19 and related travel restrictions.

The ISDE then developed English and Spanish surveys to identify potential stakeholders to involve in SPP/APR indicator discussions and target setting beyond existing stakeholder groups. The ISDE sent out surveys through each coordinator supporting the underrepresented population to increase participation. In follow-up, coordinators cautioned that special education team members would be considered outsiders and that stakeholders would be reticent to participate. The concern voiced by these coordinators was reflected in survey responses as ISDE received zero responses for the Spanish version of the survey, and only two responses total indicated a race/ethnicity other than White. ISDE coordinators for Migrant and EL later noted that Idaho needs to carefully consider the design of future stakeholder involvement for these groups because the stakeholders would bias their response when in the presence of outsiders. The ISDE is considering further opportunities to increase the capacity of systems and create opportunities for underrepresented stakeholder groups to have genuine unbiased involvement. The ISDE anticipates providing training and developing new resources for teams supporting these populations and relationship building with stakeholders.

LEA directors and staff received regular updates on changes to the SPP/APR through monthly directors' webinars. During these webinars' LEAs requested clarification, voiced concerns, and provided feedback on the changes to calculations. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to all stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

The ISDE used feedback collected through directors' webinars to craft training and data visualizations for the regional Data Drill Down training. In the Data Drill Down training conducted in the fall of 2021, ISDE provided LEA and state-level comparison information to LEA representatives, including special education directors, consulting teachers, and data enterers. In the training, participants had opportunities to review the data, which incorporated changes to FFY 2020 reporting for Indicators 1, 2, 5, and 6 and showed impacts on their LEA(s) versus the state. Participants asked clarifying questions, provided feedback on changes and target setting, discussed supports and obstacles to improvement, and developed strategies for improving performance within their LEA(s).

The ISDE discusses SPP/APR priority indicators and data with stakeholders as part of face-to-face or virtual regular meetings, conferences, webinars, and training. In fall of 2021, Idaho developed updated layouts for indicator information based on stakeholder requests. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help stakeholders better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. The ISDE plans to expand the use of these infographics to all SPP/APR priority indicators to

improve communication and further facilitate stakeholder involvement.

Stakeholders are integral to Idaho's processes and provide valuable, diverse input on SPP/APR priority indicators and general supervision processes. The ISDE is considering further opportunities to increase the capacity of systems and create opportunities for underrepresented stakeholder groups to have genuine unbiased involvement. The ISDE anticipates providing training and developing new resources for teams supporting underrepresented populations and relationship building with stakeholders.

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

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

NO

Number of Parent Members:

38

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. SEAP membership represents parents and families of students with disabilities, self-advocates, higher education, Idaho correctional facilities, LEA superintendents, special education directors, teachers, Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Parents Unlimited, and State Department of Education. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided clarified descriptions of the proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for Idaho's educational systems. The ISDE encouraged stakeholders including parents, SEAP, and LEAs to further examine the changes and submit comments during the 60-day, and 30-day open comment periods. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and about future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the spring of 2021, the ISDE Special Education division began reaching out to ISDE coordinators and other state agencies representing parents, minorities, and underrepresented stakeholder groups, including Migrant, Homeless and McKinney Vento, English Learners (EL), and Indian Education. The ISDE Special Education tried to connect with existing stakeholder group events for these areas. ISDE was unable to secure an invitation from these stakeholders. Many of the events were canceled due to COVID-19 and related travel restrictions.

The ISDE then developed English and Spanish surveys to identify potential stakeholders to involve in SPP/APR indicator discussions and target setting beyond existing stakeholder groups. The ISDE sent out surveys through each coordinator supporting the underrepresented population to increase participation. In follow-up, coordinators cautioned that special education team members would be considered outsiders and that stakeholders would be reticent to participate. The concern voiced by these coordinators was reflected in survey responses as ISDE received zero responses for the Spanish version of the survey, and only two responses total indicated a race/ethnicity other than White. ISDE coordinators for Migrant and EL later noted that Idaho needs to carefully consider the design of future stakeholder involvement for these groups because the stakeholders would bias their response when in the presence of outsiders. The ISDE is considering further opportunities to increase the capacity of systems and create opportunities for underrepresented stakeholder groups to have genuine unbiased involvement. The ISDE anticipates providing training and developing new resources for

teams supporting these populations and relationship building with stakeholders.

Each SSIP participating LEA is required to have at least one parent as part of the leadership team providing input on SSIP. In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

In September of 2021 the ISDE contracted with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) to provide training to new SEAP parent members regarding the purpose and function of the advisory panel.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information (i.e., description of changes to indicators, historical data, potential baseline, etc.), and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. For Indicator 3, stakeholders questioned the use of school year 2015-16 data for baseline, noting that the data were too old and did not accurately reflect Idaho's current educational system.

Idaho scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. In response to SEAP members' concern about the proposed baseline data for Indicator 3 being old, ISDE also updated the baseline year to school year 2018-19. The 2018-19 school year represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and reflected changes in Idaho processes based on Idaho Consolidated State Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training.

The work session began in a large group, with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets. After establishing norms in the large group, the work session participants were divided into three small-group breakouts facilitated by an ISDE staff and a SEAP leadership member to discuss data and target setting. The SEAP leadership member of each group was assigned to be a notetaker. After discussions in the small group, participants returned to the large group to share about their conversations.

In the small group discussions, SEAP members approved of the change in the baseline year for Indicator 3 and expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. For many indicators, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative, moderate, or challenging target increases depending on the indicator. Stakeholders also recommended increased consistency in

targets and across Idaho's systems supporting equity, noting that this will promote communication and limit confusion. To learn more specifics, please go to the target's sections for each performance indicator.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

Idaho plans to continue and expand opportunities to participate in the Serving on Groups training. Before reviewing performance indicators, members of the state advisory panel, Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP, received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process.

The ISDE developed English and Spanish surveys to identify potential stakeholders to involve in SPP/APR indicator discussions and target setting beyond existing stakeholder groups. The ISDE sent out surveys through ISDE coordinators supporting underrepresented populations, including Migrant, Indian Education, English Learners (EL), and Homeless and McKinney Vento.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho developed updated layouts for indicator information based on stakeholder requests. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help stakeholders better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. The ISDE is expanding the use of these infographics to all SPP/APR priority indicators to improve communication and further facilitate stakeholder involvement.

Through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and State Professional Development Grant (SPDG), Idaho has developed a plan to use additional funds to establish stipends for parent participation, add enhancements to the SSIP work, and expand community partners. The ISDE plans to contract with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's parent center, to support parent participation on the building leadership teams. Funds are to be allocated for parent stipends with the intent that LEAs will provide stipends to parents for attending project PD and monthly calls with Idaho's parent center, IPUL. IPUL plans to facilitate monthly parent calls to support the parents as part of the LEA leadership team. The ISDE's planned synchronous and asynchronous training will be offered to principals and special education directors (Leading by Convening), parents (Serving on Groups), and librarians (Cultivating Readers through Inclusion and Connection in the Library) with follow up calls throughout the year. Providing training to parents (Serving on Groups) and administrators (Leading by Convening) will increase the respective understanding of parents and administrators on the importance of collaboration for closing the reading proficiency gap. IPUL's ongoing support of parents will increase their engagement and sustain parent involvement.

The Idaho Assistive Technology Project (IATP): The IATP is a federally funded program administered by the CDHD. The goal of the IATP is to increase the availability of assistive technology devices and services for older persons and Idahoans with disabilities.

Idaho AT4All: The Idaho AT4All website (https://idaho.at4all.com/) lists a variety of used equipment available for sale, give-away, or loan, including wheelchairs and scooters, walkers, personal care items, items for those with vision and hearing impairments, hospital beds, computers, adapted vehicles, etc.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The ISDE solicited input regarding improvements and/or revisions to Idaho's target, baseline, policies, practices, and procedures from various stakeholders. The Idaho Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Idaho Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Head Start Collaboration Office, Idaho Association of the Education of Young Children, the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) (including community partners), individuals with disabilities, representatives from higher education, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Information Center, and the Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC) all took an active role in the development of this SPP/APR and provided the ISDE with quality input on improving performance on priority indicators.

SEAP membership represents parents and families of students with disabilities, self-advocates, and representatives from higher education, Idaho Department of Corrections (IDOC), Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (IDJC), LEA superintendents, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), IPUL, and the ISDE.

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

The ISDE discusses SPP/APR priority indicators and data with stakeholders regularly and began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for Idaho's educational systems. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and about future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the spring of 2021, the ISDE Special Education division began reaching out to ISDE coordinators and other state agencies representing parents, minorities, and underrepresented stakeholder groups, including Migrant, Homeless and McKinney Vento, English Learners (EL), and Indian Education. The ISDE Special Education attempted to connect with existing stakeholder group events but could not secure stakeholders' invitation to attend. In addition, stakeholders canceled many regular events due to COVID-19 and related travel restrictions.

The ISDE then developed English and Spanish surveys to identify potential stakeholders to involve in SPP/APR indicator discussions and target setting beyond existing stakeholder groups. The ISDE sent out surveys through each coordinator supporting the underrepresented population to increase participation. In follow-up, coordinators cautioned that special education team members would be considered outsiders and that stakeholders would be reticent to participate. The concern voiced by these coordinators was reflected in survey responses as ISDE received zero responses for the Spanish version of the survey, and only two responses total indicated a race/ethnicity other than White. ISDE coordinators for Migrant and EL later noted that Idaho needs to carefully consider the design of future stakeholder involvement for these groups because the stakeholders would bias their response when in the presence of outsiders. The ISDE is considering further opportunities to increase the capacity of systems and create opportunities for underrepresented stakeholder groups to have genuine unbiased involvement. The ISDE anticipates providing training and developing new resources for teams supporting these populations and relationship building with stakeholders.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information (i.e., description of changes to indicators, historical data, potential baseline, etc.), and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. Stakeholders also encouraged the ISDE to, when appropriate, utilize the most current data available as a baseline so that targets would more accurately reflect Idaho's current educational system.

Idaho scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. The ISDE also made updates to the baseline as appropriate.

The work session began in a large group, with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets. After establishing norms in the large group, the work session participants were divided into three small-group breakouts facilitated by an ISDE staff and a SEAP leadership member to discuss data and target setting. The SEAP leadership member of each group was assigned to be a notetaker. After discussions in the small group, participants returned to the large group to share about their conversations. The process was followed for multiple indicators.

In the small group discussions, SEAP members expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. For many indicators, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative, moderate, or challenging target increases depending on the indicator. Stakeholders also recommended increased consistency between targets and Idaho's educational systems, which will promote communication and limit confusion. Please go to the target's sections for each performance indicator to learn more specifics.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

Idaho reports to the public in a variety of means. Information is posted to the ISDE website after the close of the SPP/APR clarification period and includes reporting for all LEAs compared to state targets for all SPP/APR indicators as well as local determination levels in an accessible Excel document posted to https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/. Additional information is made available on https://idahoschools.org/ and https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/Accountability/results.html.

Information is also shared out to LEAs through RDA determinations and Data Drill Down training.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

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

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

As directed by the Department and per its determination received in June of 2021, the ISDE is reporting on: (1) the technical assistance (TA) 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 TA resources accessed and actions taken by Idaho as a result of that TA to meet the requirements pursuant to 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a). Please see specific indicators for additional information on how TA interactions contributed to Idaho's systems.

Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Education (CADRE)

Attended CADRE Webinars

Consulted CADRE staff for information about resources for dispute resolution

Participated in list-serve exchanges on dispute resolution topics

Used dispute resolution materials in advising parents and LEAs about dispute resolution

Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcome (CEELO)

Consulted CEELO staff for information about resources for early childhood comprehensive assessment systems

Utilized resources to coordinate policies across statewide systems

Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)

Consulted with CIFR staff on improvements to update the content of our IDEA Part B application

Shared the Idaho fiscal monitoring system with other states

Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID)

Developed improved processes across ISDE Divisions in regards to special education data

The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy)

Added processes to improve data quality around Early Childhood Transition and Early Childhood Outcomes

Improved collaboration and communication between Part C and Part B providers at the SEA-level

Developed data visualizations for data training as a result of available DaSy tools and resources

IDEA Data Center (IDC)

Participated in Stakeholder Cadre Meetings

Coordinated to review and improve the clarity of descriptions in the SPP/APR

Utilized resources for stakeholder input

Define parameters appropriate for Idaho regarding reasonable progress

Update policies, practices, and procedures to align significant disproportionality and indicators 4, 9, and 10

Develop guidance for LEAs regarding federal requirements and tracking

Aligned and improved processes across ISDE Divisions in regards to the reporting of 618 data

Added validations to the longitudinal data system linking demographic and Special Education Program Exit data

Improved timelines for processing and submitting 618 data

Utilized 618 Pre-submission edit check tools

Provided feedback on Data Drill Down training for LEAs

Utilized Data Meeting Toolkit to inform Data Drill Down training content

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

Consulted NAECS-SDE staff member for information about the curriculum and inclusive practices for early childhood programs

Utilized resources to coordinate policies across statewide systems

National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)

Coordinated to reduce a state shortage of School Psychologists by setting up a recruiting booth at the National NASP Conference

National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER)

Consulted NIEER staff for information about resources for early childhood research-based practices

Utilized resources to coordinate policies and practices across statewide systems

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)

Accessed resources provided by NASDSE that contributed to multiple actions listed above.

State Director participated in monthly technical assistance calls

619 National Association of State Directors of Special Education Affinity Group (619 NASDSE)

Shared resources cross-state

Participated in twice-monthly technical assistance calls

Provided technical assistance for new 619 Coordinators

Collaborated to provide comments during the open comment period for SPP/APR, EC LRE, and other early childhood topics

Special Education Data Managers Affinity Group (SEDMAG)

Improved data quality

Participated in monthly calls (technical assistance, leadership, and OSEP)

Received technical assistance for Part B Data Managers

Collaborated to provide comment during the open comment period for SPP/APR, EDFacts files, and Determinations

National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO)

NCEO 1% Cap Community of Practice

Participated in bi-monthly calls

Shared resources cross-state regarding alternate assessment

Obtained resources to help provide oversight and support to LEAs that exceed the 1.0% Cap on Alternate Assessment participation specific to monitoring disproportional representation.

National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL)

Provided TA and PD to the ISDE and LEAs related to evidence-based literacy practices for Idaho's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Partnered to develop evaluation and fidelity tools to measure literacy practices for Idaho's SSIP

Developed sustainable training materials on Multi-Tiered Systems of Support-Reading for ISDE to house on its SSIP/SPDG

website

Developed resources for LEAs and parents related to the foundations of reading

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)

Continued participation in Cross-State Learning Collaboratives

Utilized resources to support LEAs in the implementation of language and literacy practices

Met with Idaho's NCSI state lead for SSIP/SPDG problem solving

Results-Based Accountability (RBA) (RBAS) Learning Collaborative

Participated in problem-solving RBA

Refined Idaho Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Monitoring System

Discussed improving communications with LEAs

Identified needs for improving Data Drill Down training and creating LEA Data Meetings

Collaborated to provide comment during the open comment period for SPP/APR, EDFacts files, and state Determinations

Evidence-Based Practices Learning Collaborative

Maintained ongoing consultation with NCSI state contact

Continued refinement of the logic model

Supported the development and usage of evaluation tools

Continued refinement of the evaluation plan

Improved stakeholder engagement plan

Collaborated on evaluation data and reporting

Collaborated on the evidence-based practices implementation timeline

Learned about effective PD related to stages, implementation, rubric, data collection

National Implementation Research Network (NIRN)

Used resources to inform the scale-up of Idaho's Pyramid Model implementation

Used information and resources to inform training provided to SSIP LEAs on implementation science

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT: C)

Collaborated with the IDVR and NTACT: C to develop programs to improve secondary transition

Received one-on-one consultation and support from designated TA center representative

Utilized web tools related to evidence-based practices and training shared with LEAs, schools, and service providers

B14 Community of Practice

Participated in TA calls

Shared resources and strategies for improvement cross-state

Identified opportunities to improve Indicator 14 data quality

Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE)

Accessed resources provided by TAESE that contributed to multiple actions listed above

Training and Assessment System for K-12 Educational Interpreters Program (TASK12)

Participated in quarterly training workshops for dispute resolution complaint investigators

Consulted regarding dispute resolution processes

Established and maintained a national assessment and training system for educational sign language interpreters

Provided skill-improvement training program for educational sign language interpreters with a progress assessment

WestEd

Consulted for training development, fiscal monitoring assistance, fiscal oversight, and federal statute support

Workforce Innovation Technical Assistance Center (WITAC)

Facilitated customized job supports

Youth Technical Assistance Center (YTAC)

Facilitated customized job supports

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

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) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	63.84%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	65.40%	65.48%	70.70%
Data	58.41%	60.46%	60.95%	65.48%	62.45%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	63.84%	63.85%	63.90%	65.05%	66.21%	67.37%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. Discussions beginning in September of 2020 included clarified descriptions of the proposed changes and anticipated impacts for the state and an overview of state historical data. The ISDE encouraged stakeholders including parents, SEAP, and LEAs to further examine the changes and submit comments during the 60-day, and 30-day open comment periods.

LEA directors and staff received regular updates on changes to the SPP/APR through monthly directors' webinars. During these webinars' LEAs requested clarification, voiced concerns, and provided feedback on the changes to calculations. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to all stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

The ISDE used feedback collected through directors' webinars to craft training and data visualizations for the regional Data Drill Down training. In the Data Drill Down training conducted in the fall of 2021, ISDE provided LEA and state-level comparison information to LEA representatives, including special education directors, consulting teachers, and data enterers. In the training, participants had opportunities to review the data, which incorporated changes FFY 2020 to reporting for Indicator 1 and showed impacts on their LEA(s) versus the state. Participants asked clarifying questions, provided feedback on changes and target setting, discussed supports and obstacles to improvement, and developed strategies for improving graduation within their LEA(s).

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were grouped based on areas of interest and participated in discussions regarding indicators. Each group had an SDE staff member who provided additional information on the indicators, clarified questions, and functioned as the discussion facilitator. Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after group session discussions were complete.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. Consensus was established for the use of FFY 2019 data as baseline. The FFY 2019 data represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and was the first year that reflected changes in Idaho's aggregation for 618 Program Exit.

Idaho scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

The work session began in a large group, with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of

conservative and aggressive targets. After establishing norms in the large group, the work session participants were divided into three small-group breakouts facilitated by an ISDE staff and a SEAP leadership member to discuss assessment data and target setting. The SEAP leadership member of each group was assigned to be a notetaker. After discussions in the small group, participants returned to the large group to share about their conversations.

In the small group discussions, stakeholders expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. For graduation, stakeholders recommended maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, recognizing that students' path to graduation reflects multiple years of effort from both educational teams and families. Stakeholders justified the recommendation indicating that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline presents a challenging target. Stakeholders then recommended more challenging targets for the last three years, noting that Idaho needs to address gaps in graduation between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,082
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	NA
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	189
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	17
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	225

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1,082	1,513	62.45%	63.84%	71.51%	Met target	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

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

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

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Please note that the Historical Data table provides data and targets FFY 2015 through FFY 2019 for Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate and does not reflect the current Indicator 1 measure.

Based on the analysis of Idaho's data with input from stakeholders Idaho is establishing baseline using FFY 2019 data. The FFY 2019 data represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and was the first year that reflects Idaho's current aggregation processes for 618 Program Exit.

The COVID-19 health crisis impacted percentages for Indicator 1 in the FFY 2020 reporting year. Counts of students who were on track to graduate and meet regular state graduation were not affected, but the count of students who dropped out or completed adapted requirements were impacted as a result of the COVID-19 health crisis.

In the spring of 2020, Idaho went into COVID-19 health crisis-related soft closure. LEAs were required to continue to provide educational and special education services, but the majority operated through virtual and distanced layouts for the remainder of the school year. The change in delivery format resulted in process changes related to attendance data collection and made it more challenging to determine dropout status. LEAs also indicated that students who were more prone to drop out from traditional face-to-face format were less apt to drop out in the virtual or distance format.

In addition to impacts on Idaho's education system, COVID-19 closures in Idaho substantially reduced the availability of entry-level job openings. ISDE anticipates this lessened the alleged monetary incentive for ending educational services before completing the secondary program. Students who may have been on a trajectory to exit through the Received a Certificate (Completed - Adapted Requirements) category for 2019-2020 remained in education and continued services in the 2020-2021 school year to ensure they completed their goals. Idaho continues to improve data quality through LEA training and collaboration with the Technology Services team.

Idaho recognizes a substantial statewide gap between the graduation rate of students with disabilities and all other students. The ISDE is accessing national technical resource centers and leveraging internal resources to address this gap. National technical assistance providers that have contributed to Idaho's system improvements for Indicator 1 include IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID), the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT),and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES).

Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (Idaho's Plan) is designed to identify schools performing among the lowest 5% in the state for subgroup graduation rates. These school leaders are then required to develop and follow a plan to address the specific area of improvement. While Indicator 1 no longer directly ties to Idaho's Plan target areas Idaho's Plan has increased focus on graduation for students with disabilities. Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes graduation and other performance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs receive their determination and are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct root-cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including graduation rate. The self-

assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

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

The ISDE provides exit data and coding training to LEA personnel through the annual Data Drill Down training, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, Secondary Institute, and monthly special education director webinars. The Secondary Coordinator participates as part of the Data Drill Down, providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data, available supports, and indicators. Starting in the 2020-2021 school year, ISDE holds monthly webinars focusing on secondary transition topics.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and rules of completion to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. Idaho EdPlan has rules and validations embedded to generate appropriate exit coding based on evaluation and written notice processes. The process-based approach improves program exit data quality by ensuring the completion of all necessary documentation and limiting user coding errors.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	17.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	4.08%	3.58%	3.08%	2.58%	2.08%
Data	29.93%	6.42%	4.32%	7.63%	5.18%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	17.70%	17.50%	17.30%	16.73%	16.17%	15.61%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. Discussions beginning in September of 2020 included clarified descriptions of the proposed changes and anticipated impacts for the state and an overview of state historical data. The ISDE encouraged stakeholders including parents, SEAP, and LEAs to further examine the changes and submit comments during the 60-day, and then 30-day open comment periods. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

LEA directors and staff received regular updates on changes to the SPP/APR through monthly directors' webinars. During these webinars' LEAs requested clarification, voiced concerns, and provided feedback on the changes to calculations. The ISDE used feedback collected through directors' webinars to craft training and data visualizations for the regional Data Drill Down training. In the Data Drill Down training conducted in the fall of 2021, ISDE provided LEA and state-level comparison information to LEA representatives, including special education directors, consulting teachers, and data enterers. In the training, participants had opportunities to review the data, which incorporated changes FFY 2020 to reporting for Indicator 2 and showed impacts on their LEA(s) versus the state. Participants asked clarifying questions, provided feedback on changes and target setting, discussed supports and obstacles to improvement, and developed strategies for improving graduation within their LEA(s).

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were grouped based on areas of interest and participated in discussions regarding indicators. Each group had an SDE staff member who provided additional information on the indicators, clarified questions, and functioned as the discussion facilitator. Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after group session discussions were complete.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. Consensus was established for the use of FFY 2019 data as baseline. The FFY 2019 data represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and was the first year that reflected changes in Idaho's aggregation for 618 Program Exit.

Idaho scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

The work session began in a large group, with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets. After establishing norms in the large group, the work session participants were divided into three small-group breakouts facilitated by an ISDE staff and a SEAP leadership member to discuss assessment data and target setting. The SEAP leadership member of each group was assigned to be a notetaker. After discussions in the small group, participants returned to the large group to share about their conversations.

In the small group discussions, stakeholders expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. For Indicator 2 stakeholders felt that dropout was an area of need that should show improvement directly from baseline. Stakeholders recognized stresses on Idaho's education system and families and indicated that it was appropriate to start at a more conservative improvement and then progress to more challenging end targets as Idaho's system recovers from COVID-19 impacts.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,082
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	NA
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	189
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	17
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	225

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
225	1,513	5.18%	17.70%	14.87%	Met target	N/A

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

Dropouts are defined as students who:

1. were enrolled in school and exited, but;

2. did not graduate from high 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Please note that the Historical Data table provides data and targets FFY 2015 through FFY 2019 for Option 2 and does not reflect the current Indicator 2 measure using Option 1.

Based on the analysis of Idaho's data with input from stakeholders Idaho is establishing baseline using FFY 2019 data. The FFY 2019 data represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and was the first year that reflects Idaho's current aggregation processes for 618 Program Exit.

The COVID-19 health crisis impacted percentages for Indicator 2 in the FFY 2020 reporting year. Counts for Program Exit for students who were on track to graduate and meet regular state graduation were not affected, but the count of students who dropped out or completed adapted requirements were impacted as a result of the COVID-19 health crisis. The 2019-2020 data reflected in FFY 2020 reporting year represents an outlier in Idaho's historical information. The 2020-2021 school year data shows Idaho's information returning to more typical trend.

In the spring of 2020, Idaho went into COVID-19 health crisis-related soft closure. LEAs were required to continue to provide educational and special education services, but the majority operated through virtual and distanced layouts for the remainder of the school year. The change in delivery format resulted in process changes related to attendance data collection and made it more challenging to determine dropout status. LEAs also indicated that students who were more prone to drop out from traditional face-to-face format were less apt to drop out in the virtual or distance format. Many students who were on a trajectory to exit through the Received a Certificate (Completed - Adapted Requirements) category for 2019-2020 remained in education and continued services in the 2020-2021 school year to ensure they completed their goals. The 2019-2020 reporting year represents an outlier in Idaho's historical information. The 2020-2021 reporting shows data returning to more typical trend.

In addition to impacts on Idaho's education system, COVID-19 closures in Idaho substantially reduced the availability of entry-level job openings. ISDE anticipates this lessened the alleged monetary incentive for ending educational services before completing the secondary program. Idaho continues to improve data quality through LEA training and collaboration with the Technology Services team.

The ISDE is accessing national technical resource centers and leveraging internal resources to reduce the percentage of students exiting special education and related services through dropout. National technical assistance providers that have contributed to Idaho's system improvements for Indicator 2 include IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID), the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT),and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES).

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

Communication between ISDE internal teams is a continued area of focus. The ISDE has seen several positive outcomes

as a result of improved internal communication, including enhanced communication to LEAs regarding timelines and training, development of a quick reference crosswalk between LEA exit reasons and program exit reasons, and cross-team collaboration on LEA training.

The ISDE provides exit data and coding training to LEA personnel through the annual Data Drill Down training, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, Secondary Institute, and monthly special education director webinars. The Secondary Coordinator participates as part of the Data Drill Down, providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data, available supports, and indicators. Starting in the 2020-2021 school year, ISDE holds monthly webinars focusing on secondary transition topics.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. Idaho EdPlan has rules and validations embedded to generate appropriate exit coding based on evaluation and written notice processes. The process-based approach improves program exit data quality by ensuring the completion of all necessary documentation and limiting user coding errors.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	97.19%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	95.37%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	90.34%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	97.22%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	95.50%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	90.14%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for Idaho's educational systems. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and about future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

• How to get involved;

• Types of groups;

• Understanding data;

• Roles of families on groups; and

• Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest,

reviewed indicator information, and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students.

Idaho scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

The work session began in a large group, with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets. After establishing norms in the large group, the work session participants were divided into three small-group breakouts facilitated by an ISDE staff and a SEAP leadership member to discuss assessment data and target setting. The SEAP leadership member of each group was assigned to be a notetaker. After discussions in the small group, participants returned to the large group to share about their conversations.

In the small group discussions, SEAP members recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. Stakeholders approved of the continued alignment of assessment participation (Indicator 3A) with ESEA and the Idaho Consolidated State Plan at 95% per year for each grade level. The baseline was established using data from the 2020-2021 administration as this is the only year that includes the current Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). The change in assessment has resulted in a change in the collection methodology. Idaho will continue to provide data in infographics and other user-friendly accessible formats to help stakeholders relate to the information and better facilitate meaningful input.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	2,990	2,763	2,330
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,285	2,087	1,698
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	469	398	254
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	155	150	153

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	2,990	2,758	2,332
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,920	1,447	1,292
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	830	1,036	658
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	157	151	152

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,909	2,990		95.00%	97.29%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	2,635	2,763		95.00%	95.37%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	2,105	2,330		95.00%	90.34%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,907	2,990		95.00%	97.22%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	2,634	2,758		95.00%	95.50%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	2,102	2,332		95.00%	90.14%	N/A	N/A

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.

Please note, Idaho's waiver request to the U.S. Department of Education from administering statewide assessments, accountability and school identification requirements, and certain reporting requirements was approved for FFY 2019. As a result, there is a gap in participation and performance data between school year 2018-2019 and 2020-2021. Public reporting of participation and performance is located on the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), Special Education, Public Reporting page https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/, https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2020-2021-State-Performance-Plan/2020-2021-Assessment-Participation-and-Performance-SWD.xlsx, Assessment and Accountability page https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/accountability/files/accountability-results/2021/2021-ISAT-Assessment-Results.xlsx, and Idaho's Report Card at https://idahoschools.org/.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline was established using data from the 2020-2021, FFY2020, administration as this is the only year that includes the current Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). The change in assessment has resulted in a change in the collection methodology. Idaho will continue to provide data in infographics and other user-friendly accessible formats to help stakeholders relate to the information and better facilitate meaningful input.

The ISDE hypothesizes that the substantial reduction in the participation rate for students in high school is a result of an increased number of parent opt-out requests on the basis of COVID-19 health concerns. The Spring 2021 test

administration for regular and regular with accommodations also allowed remote assessment administration, but not all accommodations were allowed in the remote format as they would invalidate assessment results. Students with accommodations that were not allowed in the remote layout would need to come on-site to administer the assessments. Rather than potentially risk their student's health, many parents of students with disabilities elected to opt-out of the assessment for both Math and Reading. The ISDE did not offer a remote option for the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). The ISDE continues to analyze available information to determine the reasons for the decrease in participation and develop strategies to improve participation.

Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan) established targets for all students on statewide assessments. The Plan has increased the focus on improving participation and outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities as a subgroup.

Idaho's identified Annual Measurement of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)) reads as follows:

Idaho understands that in order to provide a fair and accurate picture of school success, and to help parents, teachers, school leaders, and state officials understand where students are struggling and how to support them, the state must ensure high participation in statewide assessments.

According to current Idaho Administrative Code (IDAPA 08.02.03.112(e)), "failure to include ninety-five percent (95%) of all students and ninety-five percent (95%) of students in designated subgroups automatically identifies the school as not having achieved measurable progress in ISAT proficiency." For the purposes of this plan, "measurable progress on ISAT proficiency" is defined as not having met the school's interim progress measure toward its long-term goals in any group where 95% participation is not attained. Additionally, "If a school district does not meet the ninety-five percent (95%) participation target for the current year, the participation rate can be calculated by the most current three (3) year average of participation." Should a school or LEA not meet the 95% participation minimum standard, the local school board will be notified by the State Board of Education that the school or district has failed to meet the minimum standard of reporting and that this will be reflected on the state report card. The ISDE will support the school or LEA to write a parent outreach plan that addresses how it will engage parents and community members in order to meet the 95% participation minimum standard. In addition, ISDE will develop policies requiring the LEA to use a portion of its funds pursuant to 33-320, Idaho Code (Continuous Improvement Plans) for local school board and superintendent training on data-driven decision-making and assessment literacy.

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education uses performance and compliance indicators, including Indicator 3 as part of LEA level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help conduct a root cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including Indicator 3. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals.

The ISDE provides training to LEAs regarding assessment data and coding through the regionally offered Data Drill Down training and special education director webinars. The fall of 2020 was the third year that the Division of Special Education partnered with the Assessment and Accountability Division to have joint training sessions on accessing statewide assessment data, analysis techniques, and conducting root-cause analysis.

Idaho expanded training on IDAA developing participation criteria training, online training vignettes, and an IDAA participation worksheet designed to assist IEP team member discussions during the IEP meeting. As a result of training and a better understanding of the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA) participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams more accurately qualify students to take the IDAA. The ISDE continues to improve systems to address the needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities. Idaho has developed online training

modules cross walking Idaho's extended content standards. For more information on these modules and training related to students with significant cognitive disabilities please go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at https://idahotc.com/Topics/SCD?page14378=1&size14378=6. For resources related to IDAA available on the ISDE website please go to https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/sped/.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. Idaho EdPlan is process-based and has the IDAA participation criteria built into the system. Participation is automatically designated or ruled out based on the IDAA criteria checklist responses. The process-based approach built into Idaho EdPlan improves the data quality and ensures that teams have appropriately considered and documented criteria requirements for participation on the IDAA.

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." Twenty-eight schools were identified for improvement based on IRI scale score growth ranking analysis. The ISDE then offered these schools course licenses for all teachers in grades K-3.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept the baseline revision for HS Reading because the State's FFY 2020 baseline data reported in the Historical Data table is not consistent with the State's FFY 2020 data reported in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data table.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP notes the State included a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) in the Introduction of the State's FFY 2020 SP/APR, however, the State did not provide the link within the information provided for this indicator.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	13.98%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	7.87%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	9.56%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	16.13%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	4.02%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	3.10%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.10%	14.20%	14.30%	14.40%	14.60%	14.80%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	8.00%	8.10%	8.20%	8.53%	8.86%	9.20%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	10.25%	10.30%	10.35%	10.65%	10.96%	11.27%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	16.14%	16.15%	16.16%	16.39%	16.64%	16.89%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	4.03%	4.04%	4.05%	4.28%	4.53%	4.78%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.11%	3.12%	3.13%	3.51%	3.91%	4.31%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for Idaho's educational systems. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and about future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

- How to get involved;
- Types of groups;
- Understanding data;
- Roles of families on groups; and
- Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. The ISDE provided examples of target options using FFY 2015 assessment data as a baseline to establish better alignment with Idaho's Consolidated State Plan. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information, and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. Stakeholders questioned the use of school year 2015-16 data for baseline, noting that the data were too old and did not accurately reflect Idaho's current educational system.

Idaho scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. In response to SEAP members' concern about the proposed baseline data being old, ISDE also

updated the baseline year to school year 2018-19. The 2018-19 school year represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and reflected changes in Idaho processes based on Idaho Consolidated State Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training.

The work session began in a large group, with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets. After establishing norms in the large group, the work session participants were divided into three small-group breakouts facilitated by an ISDE staff and a SEAP leadership member to discuss assessment data and target setting. The SEAP leadership member of each group was assigned to be a notetaker. After discussions in the small group, participants returned to the large group to share about their conversations.

In the small group discussions, SEAP members approved of the change in the baseline year and expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. Overall for assessment, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative target increases.

Current Math assessment results are well below baseline data, and stakeholders noted that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline for multiple years would present challenging targets. Reading assessments did not show the same decrease in proficiency, but stakeholders indicated that consistency between target progression would be beneficial. The aligned target progressions between Math and Reading would be easier to communicate to stakeholders and reduce their confusion while still promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Idaho will continue to provide data with estimates on student counts to help stakeholders relate to the information and provide meaningful input.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	2,754	2,485	1,952
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	345	191	191
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	48	24	19

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	2,750	2,483	1,950
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	355	87	44
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	37	**	**

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	393	2,754		14.10%	14.27%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	215	2,485		8.00%	8.65%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	210	1,952		10.25%	10.76%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	392	2,750		16.14%	14.25%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	96	2,483		4.03%	3.87%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	48	1,950		3.11%	2.46%	Did not meet target	N/A

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.

Please note, Idaho's waiver request to the U.S. Department of Education from administering statewide assessments, accountability and school identification requirements, and certain reporting requirements was approved for FFY 2019. As a result, there is a gap in participation and performance data between school year 2018-2019 and 2020-2021. Public reporting of participation and performance is located on the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), Special Education, Public Reporting page https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/ and Idaho's Report Card at https://idahoschools.org/.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ISDE based on review of data and stakeholder input is establishing the baseline using data from the 2018-2019, FFY 2018, test administration. The 2018-19 school year represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and reflects changes in Idaho processes based on the Idaho Consolidated State Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training. The ISDE and stakeholders considered and rejected use of FFY 2020 data as baseline as there were nominal changes in processes between FFY 2018 and FFY 2020 for Indicator 3B.

Idaho hypothesizes that COVID-19 was a contributing factor to decreases in proficiency for grade levels 4, 8, and HS on the Math assessment. Analysis of the gap in proficiency indicates that all students in grades 4, 8, and HS showed reduced proficiency in Math. Grades 4, 8, and HS introduce new concepts and increase the difficulty of standards. Grade level 8 especially has substantial shifts in Math concepts as learning transitions from arithmetic and computation to algebraic and reasoning. Students tested in these grades for FFY 2020 experienced changes in content delivery from March 17, 2020, to the end of the 2019-2020 school year. The spring semester is often when students begin preparation for these new concepts. Instead of moving towards new concepts, LEA teams focused on addressing learning loss in remote learning environments. Idaho saw improved outcomes for 4, 8, and HS on the Reading assessment. The ISDE attributes these increases to proficiency on the Reading assessment to Idaho's reading initiatives and increased focus on improving instruction fidelity and reading outcomes. In addition, parents and families are typically better equipped to support reading than math, especially as grade levels and concept difficulty increase.

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.

Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan) established 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 uses performance and compliance indicators, including Indicator 3 as part of LEA level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs

are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help conduct a root cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including Indicator 3. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals.

To address issues identified in instruction, ISDE continues to collaborate across Divisions. The Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content divisions cooperate in providing teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and teaching of the Idaho Content Standards. In addition, training from Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) provides additional support for 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. The fall of 2020 was the third year that the Division of Special Education partnered with the Assessment and Accountability Division to have joint training sessions on accessing statewide assessment data, analysis techniques, and conducting root-cause analysis. 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.

Idaho expanded training on IDAA developing participation criteria training, online training vignettes, and an IDAA participation worksheet designed to assist IEP team member discussions during the IEP meeting. As a result of training and a better understanding of the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA) participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams more accurately qualify 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.

Idaho recognizes that performance on statewide assessments needs improvement. Idaho has implemented initiatives around early literacy including Idaho's Indicator 17 SSIP to address low performance and developed new training and tools for LEA staff. See Indicator 17 and resources at https://idahotc.com/Topics/Readers .

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 IRI scale score growth ranking analysis. The ISDE then offered these schools course licenses for all teachers in grades K-3. 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.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	35.48%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	43.33%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	39.22%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	22.29%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	44.37%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	26.32%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	35.48%	35.49%	35.50%	35.75%	36.00%	36.25%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	43.33%	43.40%	43.50%	43.75%	44.00%	44.25%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	39.22%	39.23%	39.24%	39.50%	39.75%	40.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	22.29%	22.30%	22.31%	22.50%	22.75%	23.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	44.37%	44.38%	44.39%	44.50%	44.75%	45.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	26.32%	26.33%	26.34%	26.50%	26.75%	27.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for Idaho's educational systems. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and about future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

• How to get involved;

• Types of groups;

• Understanding data;

• Roles of families on groups; and

• Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. FFY 2020 was the first administration of the current assessment. No additional data were available to review for Indicator 3C. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information, and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students.

Idaho scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

The work session began in a large group, with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets. After establishing norms in the large group, the work session participants were divided into three small-group breakouts facilitated by an ISDE staff and a SEAP leadership member to discuss assessment data and target setting. The SEAP leadership member of each group was assigned to be a notetaker. After discussions in the small group, participants returned to the large group to share about their conversations.

In the small group discussions, SEAP members expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. Overall for assessment, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative target increases.

Stakeholders indicated that consistency between target progression across assessment indicators would be beneficial. Reasoning that the aligned target progressions would be easier to communicate to stakeholders and reduce their confusion while still promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Idaho's stakeholders noted that a similar progression should be used for IDAA as well for both Reading and Math. Stakeholders noted that further review

will be necessary once additional information is available to show a trend for IDAA in Math and Reading. The baseline was established using data from the 2020-2021, FFY2020, administration as this is the only year that includes the current Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). The change in assessment has resulted in a change in the collection methodology for 3C. Idaho will continue to provide data in infographics and other user-friendly accessible formats to help stakeholders relate to the information and better facilitate meaningful input.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	155	150	153
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	55	65	60

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	157	151	152
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	35	67	40

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	55	155		35.48%	35.48%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	65	150		43.33%	43.33%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	60	153		39.22%	39.22%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	35	157		22.29%	22.29%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	67	151		44.37%	44.37%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	40	152		26.32%	26.32%	N/A	N/A

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.

Please note, Idaho's waiver request to the U.S. Department of Education from administering statewide assessments, accountability and school identification requirements, and certain reporting requirements was approved for FFY 2019. As a result, there is a gap in participation and performance data between school year 2018-2019 and 2020-2021. Public reporting of participation and performance is located on the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), Special Education, Public Reporting page https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/ and Idaho's Report Card at https://idahoschools.org/ .

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The baseline was established using data from the 2020-2021, FFY2020, administration as this is the only year that includes the current Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). The change in assessment has resulted in a change in the collection methodology for Indicator 3C. Idaho will continue to provide data in infographics and other user-friendly accessible formats to help stakeholders relate to the information and better facilitate meaningful input.
The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of Reading and Math for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Idaho has developed online training modules cross walking Idaho's extended content standards. Idaho also partnered with state and national resources to develop training on establishing high expectations for students with significant cognitive disabilities. For more information on these modules and training related to students with significant cognitive disabilities please go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at https://idahotc.com/Topics/SCD?page14378=1&size14378=6 and https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/970 . 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 area of need. For resources related to IDAA available on the ISDE website please go to https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/sped/.
Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education uses performance and compliance indicators, including Indicator 3 as part of LEA level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help conduct a root cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including Indicator 3. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.
To address issues identified in instruction, ISDE continues to collaborate across Divisions. The Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content divisions cooperate in providing teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and teaching of the Idaho Content Standards. In addition, training from Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) provides additional support for 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. The fall of 2020 was the third year that the Division of Special Education partnered with the Assessment and Accountability Division to have joint training sessions on accessing statewide assessment data, analysis techniques, and conducting root-cause analysis. 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.

Idaho expanded training on IDAA developing participation criteria training, online training vignettes, and an IDAA participation worksheet designed to assist IEP team member discussions during the IEP meeting. As a result of training and a better understanding of the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA) participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams more accurately qualify 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.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. Idaho EdPlan is process-based and has the IDAA participation criteria built into the system. Participation is automatically designated or ruled out based on the IDAA criteria checklist responses. The process-based approach built into Idaho EdPlan improves the data quality and ensures that teams have appropriately considered and documented criteria requirements for participation on the IDAA.

Idaho recognizes that performance on statewide assessments needs improvement. Idaho has implemented initiatives around early literacy, including Idaho's Indicator 17 SSIP, to address low performance and developed new training and tools for LEA staff. For additional information, see Indicator 17. Resources are available at the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at https://idahotc.com/Topics/Readers.

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 IRI scale score growth ranking analysis. The ISDE then offered these schools course licenses for all teachers in grades K-3. 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

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	38.00
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	45.93
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	49.83
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	33.86
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	36.66
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	30.27

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	37.96	37.94	37.92	37.21	36.50	35.79
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	45.89	45.87	45.85	44.98	44.12	43.25
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	49.79	49.77	49.75	48.81	47.86	46.92
Math	A <=	Grade 4	33.82	33.80	33.78	33.15	32.52	31.89
Math	B <=	Grade 8	36.62	36.60	36.58	35.89	35.21	34.52
Math	C <=	Grade HS	30.23	30.21	30.19	29.63	29.07	28.51

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for Idaho's educational systems. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and about future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

• How to get involved;

• Types of groups;

• Understanding data;

• Roles of families on groups; and

• Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. The ISDE provided examples of target options using FFY 2015 assessment data as a baseline to establish better alignment with Idaho's Consolidated State Plan. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information, and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. Stakeholders questioned the use of school year 2015-16 data for baseline, noting that the data were too old and did not accurately reflect Idaho's current educational system.

Idaho scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to

help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. In response to SEAP members' concern about the proposed baseline data being old, ISDE also updated the baseline year to school year 2018-19. The 2018-19 school year represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and reflected changes in Idaho processes based on Idaho Consolidated State Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training.

The work session began in a large group, with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets. After establishing norms in the large group, the work session participants were divided into three small-group breakouts facilitated by an ISDE staff and a SEAP leadership member to discuss assessment data and target setting. The SEAP leadership member of each group was assigned to be a notetaker. After discussions in the small group, participants returned to the large group to share about their conversations.

In the small group discussions, SEAP members approved of the change in the baseline year and expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. Overall for assessment, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative target increases.

Current Math assessment results are well below baseline data, and stakeholders noted that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline for multiple years would present challenging targets. Reading assessments did not show the same decrease in proficiency, but stakeholders indicated that consistency between target progression would be beneficial. The aligned target progressions between Math and Reading would be easier to communicate to stakeholders and reduce their confusion while still promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Stakeholders further encouraged alignment of progression across assessment indicators including Indicator 3D with the same justification. Idaho will continue to provide data with estimates on student counts to help stakeholders relate to the information and provide meaningful input.

The ISDE based on the review of data and stakeholder input is establishing the baseline using data from the 2018-2019, FFY 2018, test administration. The 2018-19 school year represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and reflects changes in Idaho processes based on the Idaho Consolidated State Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training. The ISDE and stakeholders considered and rejected the use of FFY 2020 data as the baseline as there were nominal changes in processes between FFY 2018 and FFY 2020 for Indicator 3D.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	22,838	24,236	22,534
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	2,754	2,485	1,952
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11,239	13,393	13,507
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	83	59	34
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	345	191	191
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	48	24	19

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	22,831	24,190	22,564
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	2,750	2,483	1,950
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10,295	8,654	7,341
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	61	**	**
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	355	87	44
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	37	**	**

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14.27%	49.58%		37.96	35.31	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	8.65%	55.50%		45.89	46.85	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	10.76%	60.09%		49.79	49.33	Met target	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14.25%	45.36%		33.82	31.10	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	3.87%	35.87%		36.62	32.00	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	2.46%	32.59%		30.23	30.13	Met target	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ISDE based on the review of data and stakeholder input is establishing the baseline using data from the 2018-2019, FFY 2018, test administration. The 2018-19 school year represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and reflects changes in Idaho processes based on the Idaho Consolidated State Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training. The ISDE and stakeholders considered and rejected the use of FFY 2020 data as the baseline as there were nominal changes in processes between FFY 2018 and FFY 2020 for Indicator 3D. The school year 2020-2021 data demonstrated that students with disabilities showed improvement over 2018-2019 for grade 8 proficiency in ELA. This data indicates that Idaho's initiatives are improving results for all students, but that students without disabilities are progressing at a higher rate than their disabled peers on the higher difficulty standards and concepts introduced in grade level 8. Overall, students with disabilities showed a reduction in the proficiency gap compared to all students. The ISDE continues to analyze available data to understand the gap in proficiency by grade

level and understand the educational impacts from COVID-19. Idaho has not identified any COVID-19 related impacts on the reliability, validity, or completeness of Indicator 3D data.

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.

Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan) established 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 uses performance and compliance indicators, including Indicator 3 as part of LEA level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help conduct a root cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including Indicator 3. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals.

To address issues identified in instruction, ISDE continues to collaborate across Divisions. The Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content divisions cooperate in providing teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and teaching of the Idaho Content Standards. In addition, training from Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) provides additional support for 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. The fall of 2020 was the third year that the Division of Special Education partnered with the Assessment and Accountability Division to have joint training sessions on accessing statewide assessment data, analysis techniques, and conducting root-cause analysis.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. Idaho EdPlan is process-based and has the IDAA participation criteria built into the system. Participation is automatically designated or ruled out based on the IDAA criteria checklist responses. The process-based approach built into Idaho EdPlan improves the data quality and ensures that teams have appropriately considered and documented criteria requirements for participation on the IDAA. The process also helps to make sure that students' accommodations are accurately recorded for statewide assessments.

Idaho recognizes that performance on statewide assessments needs improvement. Idaho has implemented initiatives around early literacy, including Idaho's Indicator 17 SSIP, to address low performance and developed new training and tools for LEA staff. For additional information, see Indicator 17. Resources are available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at https://idahotc.com/Topics/Readers.

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 IRI scale score growth ranking analysis. The ISDE then offered these schools course licenses for all teachers in grades K-3. 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.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State established baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

> B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs

from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.08%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Since the revision to significant disproportionality regulations in December of 2016, Idaho has substantially increased focus on equity in IDEA. The ISDE has developed webinars, guidance documents, and an online module series that includes short video recordings to increase the accessibility of information.

When discussing the differences between SPP/APR equity indicators and significant disproportionality, Idaho's stakeholders have consistently expressed confusion. To address this confusion, Idaho began examining how to create a more unified system to support equity.

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

In the spring of 2021, the ISDE provided further information on SPP/APR equity indicators, noting that the lack of a defined cell size resulted in false positives where a single instance constituted a significant discrepancy. The stakeholder's discussion included potential changes to calculation (i.e., n-size, cell size, the number of years of analysis, and target setting) and processes to address disproportionality in a more cohesive system. ISDE and stakeholders continued discussing SPP/APR equity measures in November 2021. Stakeholders recommended further alignment and consistency between equity indicators and significant disproportionality, including establishing a cell of 10, n-size of 30, and increasing to two years of data analysis while maintaining a target of 0%. Discussion participants felt the changes would help establish a unified support system for equity, address false positives, and reduce confusion between measures. The ISDE will continue to provide stakeholders with access to information. Targets for performance indicators will be considered for further review as additional information becomes available.

After further review of data for out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities, the ISDE has determined that Idaho's data do not support increasing the cell size to 10. Stakeholders did not have access to this information as the majority of LEA data for out-of-school suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days for students with disabilities do not meet Idaho's public reporting requirements. The ISDE is implementing the recommended change to n-size but is reducing cell size to five, the minimum count required per the Idaho Data Management Council public reporting requirements. Idaho will also maintain one year of data analysis for Indicator 4 as increasing to two years of analysis would further impact the number of LEAs reviewed for Indicator 4.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

168

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	2.08%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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 calculation for disproportionate representation uses the following criteria:

Cell size = 5

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 1

Threshold = 1 percentage point over the state bar.

The ISDE has maintained the use of a state-level suspension/expulsion rate bar measure for students with disabilities (SWD). Idaho has defined Significant Discrepancy as one percentage point or more above the reporting year's State suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities.

The formula for FFY2020 is as follows:

((# of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2019-2020 > 10 days)/(Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2019-2020))*100

Total # of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2019-2020 > 10 days = 37

Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2019-2020 = 35,846

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = (37 / 35,846) x 100

Application of data:

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = (37 / 35,846) x 100 = 0.10%

The state bar is 0.10% + 1.00% = 1.10%.

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 1.10% for FFY 2020 data.

For Indicator 4A, Idaho has established a minimum cell size of 5 and n-size of at least 30. 40 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size of 30 students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA, and only 1 LEA met the minimum cell size of 5 instances of out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days. 168 LEAs in Idaho were excluded (169 - 168 = 1) from the calculation for Indicator 4A for FFY 2020. As a result of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen a substantial decrease in the number of disciplinary instances, including the number of students reported as receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2020 is the first year implementing cell size of 5 and n-size of 30. Per stakeholder recommendation, Idaho is resetting the baseline to FFY 2020 to reflect these changes in calculation methodology.

Indicator 4A data for the FFY 2020 reporting year are from the 2019-2020 school year. Idaho went into a soft closure in March of 2020 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result of the COVID-19 related soft closure, students were shifted to remote learning environments. Schools were not in regular session and disciplinary actions for the 2019-2020 school year dropped by approximately 20%. Idaho saw a reduction in the number of reported instances but did not note any impact on data validity, reliability, or completeness.

To mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Division of Special Education immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. The ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services during the COVID-19 pandemic. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Webinars resumed in August of 2020, continuing through the end of the 2020-2021 school year on an as-needed basis. Information provided during the webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as Office of Special Education Programs

(OSEP) guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Division of Medicaid also presented as part of the webinar series. Throughout the soft-closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a question and answer guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website.

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

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

ISDE developed several resources for educators related to disciplinary action specific to students with disabilities. Training and documents are available to all levels, but an emphasis is placed on new principals and superintendents. For additional information and to view available resources related to disciplinary action, go to https://idahotc.com/ and search for discipline. For materials specific to principals please see the Discipline Resources for Principals Module at https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#/ and The Educators Guide to Student Discipline and Supports at https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/738.

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

• Training resources on best practices;

• Guidance, training, and technical assistance related to policy development;

• Collecting data about youth risk behaviors, including bullying and harassment;

• Assisting schools with the implementation of prevention programs;

• Providing funding to address bullying and harassment; and

• Hosting an annual conference focused on prevention.

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

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

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. The process-based approach improves systems by linking

validations and completion rules across the IEP and Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP). Idaho developed EdPlan to ensure IEPs and BIPs meet IDEA compliance requirements, include necessary details, and have processes finalized.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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.

Idaho did not identify any instances of significant discrepancy for FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data.

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

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported that one district met the minimum n size requirement in the FFY 2020 data table, however in the State's narrative it reports, "Each of the two LEAs that exceeded the state bar for significant discrepancy were found to have policies, practices, and procedures compliant with IDEA requirements." Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State's FFY 2020 data are not valid and reliable.

OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for this indicator because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State's baseline data, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above. The State must ensure its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and   expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

> B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs 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 "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-

2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

169

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

FFY 2020 is the first year implementing cell size of 5 and n-size of 30. These changes were made based on analysis of state data and input from stakeholders.

The calculation for disproportionate representation uses the following criteria:

Cell size = 5

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 1

Threshold = 1 percentage point over the state bar.

The ISDE has maintained the use of a state-level suspension/expulsion rate bar measure for students with disabilities (SWD). Idaho has defined Significant Discrepancy as one percentage point or more above the reporting year's State suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities.

The formula for FFY2020 is as follows:

((# of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2019-2020 > 10 days)/(Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2019-2020))*100

Total # of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2019-2020 > 10 days = 37

Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2019-2020 = 35,846

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = (37 / 35,846) x 100

Application of data:

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = (37 / 35,846) x 100 = 0.10%

The state bar is 0.10% + 1.00% = 1.10%.

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 1.10% for FFY 2020 data.

For Indicator 4B, Idaho has established a minimum cell size of 5 and n-size of at least 30. 59 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size of 30 in one or more race/ethnicity categories for students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA, and zero

LEAs met the minimum cell size of 5 instances of out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days. 169 LEAs in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for Indicator 4B for FFY 2020. As a result of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen a substantial decrease in the number of disciplinary instances, including the number of students reported as receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Since the revision to significant disproportionality regulations in December of 2016, Idaho has substantially increased focus on equity in IDEA. The ISDE has developed webinars, guidance documents, and an online module series that includes short video recordings to increase the accessibility of information.

When discussing the differences between SPP/APR equity indicators and significant disproportionality, Idaho's stakeholders have consistently expressed confusion. To address this confusion, Idaho began examining how to create a more unified system to support equity.

In the Fall of 2020, stakeholders from the SEAP and DAC recommended that the ISDE adopt the Self-Assessment for Discipline as part of the process to determine if the identification of significant discrepancy is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Discipline was developed as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. Using the same tool for Indicator 4 and significant disproportionality will improve alignment and reduce confusion for LEAs and stakeholders.

In the spring of 2021, the ISDE provided further information on SPP/APR equity indicators, noting that the lack of a defined cell size resulted in false positives where a single instance constituted a significant discrepancy. The stakeholder's discussion included 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. ISDE and stakeholders continued discussing SPP/APR equity measures in November 2021. Stakeholders recommended further alignment and consistency between equity indicators and significant disproportionality, including establishing a cell of 10, n-size of 30, and increasing to two years of data analysis. Discussion participants felt the changes would help establish a unified support system for equity, address false positives, and reduce confusion between measures. The ISDE will continue to provide stakeholders with access to the available information.

After further review of data for out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities, the ISDE has determined that Idaho's data do not support increasing the cell size to 10. Stakeholders did not have access to this information as the majority of LEA data for out-of-school suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days for students with disabilities do not meet Idaho's public reporting requirements. The ISDE is implementing the recommended change to n-size but is reducing cell size to five, the minimum count required per the Idaho Data Management Council public reporting requirements. Idaho will also maintain one year of data analysis for Indicator 4 as increasing to two years of analysis would further impact the number of LEAs reviewed for Indicator 4.

FFY 2020 is the first year implementing cell size of 5 and n-size of 30. Per stakeholder recommendation, Idaho is resetting the baseline to FFY 2020 to reflect these changes in calculation methodology.

Indicator 4B data for the FFY 2020 reporting year are from the 2019-2020 school year. Idaho went into a soft closure in March of 2020 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result of the COVID-19 related soft closure, students were shifted to remote learning environments. Schools were not in regular session and disciplinary actions for the 2019-2020 school year dropped by approximately 20%. Idaho saw a reduction in the number of reported instances but did not note any impact on data validity, reliability, or completeness.

To mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Division of Special Education immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. The ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services during the COVID-19 pandemic. These webinars targeted local special education directors and continued through June of 2020. Webinars resumed in August of 2020, continuing through the end of the 2020-2021 school year on an as-needed basis. Information provided during the webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as Office of Special Education Programs

(OSEP) guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Division of Medicaid also presented as part of the webinar series. Throughout the soft-closure, LEA questions and ISDE responses were documented regularly and organized by topic area in a question and answer guidance document made available to the public on the ISDE website. For additional information or to access available resources, go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at https://idahotc.com/COVID19 or https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/sped-manual/.

ISDE developed several resources for educators related to disciplinary action specific to students with disabilities. Training and documents are available to all levels, but an emphasis is placed on new principals and superintendents. For additional information and to view available resources related to disciplinary action, go to https://idahotc.com/ and search for discipline. For materials specific to principals please see the Discipline Resources for Principals Module at https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#/ and The Educators Guide to Student Discipline and Supports at https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/738.

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

 Training resources on best practices;

 Guidance, training, and technical assistance related to policy development;

 Collecting data about youth risk behaviors, including bullying and harassment;

 Assisting schools with the implementation of prevention programs;

 Providing funding to address bullying and harassment; and

Hosting an annual conference focused on prevention.

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

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules across the IEP and Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP). Idaho developed EdPlan to ensure IEPs and BIPs meet IDEA compliance requirements, include necessary details, and have processes finalized.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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.

Idaho did not identify any instances of significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B in FFY 2020 based on the review of 2019-2020 data.

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

As part of the General Supervision File Review (GSFR), the ISDE reviews student files from each LEA annually. The review ensures that LEAs comply with IDEA requirements and are consistently applying policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and

procedural safeguards. GSFR results help to determine if policies, practices, and procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy. The overall results for GSFR are also used to determine statewide training and professional development needs for the upcoming school year.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%
A	63.75%	Data	60.55%	60.81%	62.02%	62.69%	64.77%
B	2020	Target <=	6.94%	6.46%	5.98%	5.50%	5.02%
B	9.58%	Data	9.86%	9.48%	9.13%	8.99%	8.64%
C	2020	Target <=	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
C	1.11%	Data	1.58%	1.57%	1.42%	1.45%	1.33%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	63.75%	63.80%	63.85%	64.90%	66.00%	67.05%
Target B <=	9.58%	9.55%	9.52%	9.18%	8.87%	8.55%
Target C <=	1.11%	1.10%	1.09%	1.05%	1.01%	0.97%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Throughout the 2019-2020 school year Idaho provided training and discussed changes to data collection for Indicator 5 as part of updates for Child Count reporting, EDFacts FS002 and FS089. During these discussions' stakeholders provided positive feedback regarding the changes in reporting. Stakeholders indicated that the shift of students who are kindergarten age eligible from early childhood environment coding to school age environment coding would improve communications and reduce confusion between local education agencies (LEAs) and families. Educators also noted that it would greatly reduce the reporting burden on staff as age 5 kindergarten students would no longer require amendments or changes to environment categories as a result of turning age 6. FFY 2020 is the first year of implementing the changes in collection which constitutes a change in collection methodology.

In the spring and fall of 2020, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) again discussed changes for the FFY 2020 reporting year with stakeholders. Discussion topics included setting targets and baseline for FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR submissions and data collection and reporting changes. ISDE informed stakeholders that it anticipated inclusion rates, reported under indicator 5 to experience minimal change based on updated reporting requirements as part of EDFacts FS002 starting in FFY 2020. The ISDE presented that Indicator 5, which previously captured information for educational environments data for students ages 6-21, included most students with disabilities in Idaho. Students age five and eligible for the kindergarten grade level have historically represented a small portion of the students with disabilities population. The addition of these students would only have minimal impact on percentages for Indicator 5. Stakeholders reacted positively to the changes in collection and reporting, indicating the shifts would reduce confusion and reflect information and data for students in school-age environments more accurately. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the Data Drill Down training conducted in the fall of 2021, ISDE provided LEA and state-level comparison information to LEA representatives, including special education directors, consulting teachers, and data enterers. During the training, participants had opportunities to review the data, which incorporated changes FFY 2020 to reporting for Indicator 5 and showed impacts on their LEA versus the state. Participants asked clarifying questions, provided feedback on changes and target setting, discussed supports and obstacles to improvement, and developed strategies for improving inclusion within their LEA.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest,

reviewed indicator information, and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. Stakeholders also noted concern that listing specific targets for inclusive environments could result in teams establishing inclusion quotas. ISDE clarified that Idaho's training and guidance for the least restrictive environment (LRE) reflect that placement is based on the IEP team's decisions specific to the student's individual needs. In addition, ISDE supports compliance with IDEA requirements regarding placement through the annual General Supervision File Review process. The ISDE scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

The work session began with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

In the discussions, SEAP members expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. Overall for assessment, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding towards challenging targets. Stakeholders justified the recommendation indicating that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline will allow general and special education staff time to train and implement system changes. Another major reason stakeholders recommended maintaining targets near baseline was to encourage communication with families. Parents especially noted that their students experienced frequent changes in placement in the last two years. Additional changes without time to plan and communicate between LEAs and families would strain parent/family involvement in education.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	33,164
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	21,143
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,176
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	280
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	58
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	30

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	21,143	33,164	64.77%	63.75%	63.75%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,176	33,164	8.64%	9.58%	9.58%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements *[c1+c2+c3]*	368	33,164	1.33%	1.11%	1.11%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 5 data.

FFY 2020 is the first year of implementing the changes in collection for 618 reporting which constitutes a change in collection methodology. Based on the change in collection methodology and stakeholder input the ISDE is establishing FFY 2020 data as the baseline for Indicator 5.

Idaho includes Indicator 5 information as part of regional training for Data Drill Down, New and Experienced Federal Directors Conference, and Directors Webinars to improve LEA understanding of data and appropriate environment coding. In FFY 2019 and FFY 2020 training, ISDE emphasized environment coding changes for students age five enrolled in kindergarten. The ISDE also developed changes to validations for the 2020-2021 collection within Idaho's statewide longitudinal data system, ISEE.

Idaho developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan, released in March of 2019. For Indicator 5: Educational Environments (students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten through age 21) data, Idaho EdPlan uses information entered into the service grid and enrollment type. The system automatically generates the appropriate educational environment code once the user finalizes the service grid and enrollment sections. This process-based approach improves educational environment data quality by limiting user coding errors and ensuring the finalization of all necessary documentation. LEAs are provided support to improve Indicator 5 data through Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education. ISDE uses performance and compliance indicators as part of LEA level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for

students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help conduct a root cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including low inclusion rates. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

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

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

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

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

   C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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

   A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 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 ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times   100.

   B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)   divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

   C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of   children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).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 IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	34.40%	35.40%	36.40%	37.40%	38.40%
A	Data	29.33%	28.73%	24.43%	25.35%	27.01%
B	Target <=	47.30%	46.30%	45.30%	44.30%	43.30%
B	Data	51.85%	51.25%	54.59%	53.18%	53.14%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho established the current targets based on data analysis and stakeholder input. In setting targets and addressing the needs of students 3-5 years of age, Idaho engaged broad stakeholder groups: Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Head Start Collaboration Office, Idaho Child Care Program Advisory Panel, Early Childhood Advisory Committee, Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), and Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC). Each stakeholder group represents different stakeholder members. SEAP membership represents parents and families of students with disabilities, self-advocates, higher education, Idaho correctional facilities, local education agency (LEA) superintendents, special education directors, teachers, vocational rehabilitation, department of health and welfare, Idaho parents unlimited, and state department of education staff. Early Childhood Advisory Committee is a Governor's appointed Early Childhood Committee representing the following: the medical community, state legislators, Department of Health and Welfare; Head Start and Early Head Start, Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Medicaid, Title V Maternal and Child Health programs, Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program, Idaho children's Trust Fund, and IDEA Part C, membership also included representatives from private child care facilities, the judicial system, State Department of Insurance, early intervention providers, tribal relations, and the Council on Developmental Disabilities. DAC represents LEA directors of special education from all regions in Idaho.

In the spring and fall of 2020, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) discussed changes for the FFY 2020 reporting year with stakeholders. Topics of discussion included setting targets and baseline for FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR submissions and data collection and reporting changes. Stakeholders were informed that ISDE anticipates inclusion rates, reported under indicator 6a preschool environments, to decrease substantially and a corresponding increase for indicator 6b as students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten shift to reporting under school age environment codes as part of EDFacts FS002 starting in FFY 2020. Idaho does not have a state-funded preschool program. Without support from state funding, many local educational agencies (LEA) early childhood programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in higher numbers of students participating in less inclusive environments. As a result, students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten contributed substantially to Idaho's indicator 6a inclusion rate. As part of these discussions, stakeholders noted that while reducing percentages for indicator 6a, the change will more accurately reflect information and data on students age 3-5 enrolled in early childhood programs. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the Data Drill Down training conducted in the fall of 2021, ISDE provided LEA and state-level comparison information to LEA representatives, including special education directors, consulting teachers, and data enterers. During the training, participants had opportunities to review the data, which incorporated changes FFY 2020 to reporting for Indicator 5 and showed impacts on their LEA versus the state. Participants asked clarifying questions, provided feedback on changes and target setting, discussed supports and obstacles to improvement, and developed strategies for improving inclusion within their LEA.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified

to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information, and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students.

The ISDE scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders one month later. In preparation, the ISDE developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

The work session began with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

In the discussions, members expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders identified that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system such as staffing losses, shifting between virtual and in-person learning, and a lack of universal preschool. Also, Idaho's legislature refused to accept the Preschool Development funds applied for and received. For Indicator 6, stakeholders advocated for maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding towards conservative target increases. FFY 2020 is the first year of implementing the changes in collection for 618 reporting which constitutes a change in collection methodology. Based on the change in collection methodology and stakeholder input the ISDE is establishing FFY 2020 data as the baseline for Indicator 6. For early childhood placement, stakeholders unanimously recommended that Idaho maintain targets near the baseline for multiple years and then proceed towards conservative increases for end-year targets. Idaho's lack of universal preschool and the state legislators' refusal to accept additional federal preschool funds was cited as major reasons for stakeholders recommending conservative targets.

Group discussions noted that in Idaho, current inclusion issues are less about students with disabilities being placed in restrictive environments and more about finding and encouraging typically developing peers to attend available early childhood programs. Stakeholders are interested and encouraged by developments in the Idaho pyramid model collaborative and improved training regarding inclusion practices.

Idaho is not required to establish targets for indicator 6c until counts exceed 10 for this category. Targets are established inclusive for ages 3-5 as Idaho has small n-sizes especially when observed at the LEA level.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	12.56%
B	2020	71.04%
C		

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	12.56%	12.57%	12.58%	12.85%	13.12%	13.35%
Target B <=	71.04%	71.03%	71.02%	70.75%	70.50%	70.25%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=						

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	684	1,308	380	2,372
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	65	169	64	298
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	434	707	196	1,337
b2. Number of children attending separate school	92	210	46	>343
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	**	**	**	**
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	**	**	**	**

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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	298	2,372	27.01%	12.56%	12.56%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	>1,680	2,372	53.14%	71.04%	71.04%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	**	2,372			<0.5%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2020 is the first year of implementing the changes in collection for 618 reporting which constitutes a change in collection methodology. Based on the change in collection methodology and stakeholder input the ISDE is establishing FFY 2020 data as the baseline for Indicator 6.

Per the SPP/APR Measurement table, for Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. Idaho has not met or exceeded a count of 10 for the early childhood environment category of home. Idaho stands ready to collaborate with stakeholders to establish a baseline and targets for 6C during the reporting period that the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater. Idaho will develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 6 data. Data analysis for both students with disabilities and typically developing peers shows that Idaho saw counts below projected amounts for both child count and membership for students in the preschool grade level. The reduced counts are attributed to families moving students to homeschooling as a result of COVID-19 health concerns.

Idaho does not have a state-funded preschool program. LEAs are encouraged to develop inclusive programs through the use of Title I funds, collaborating with local Head Start, and private preschool programs. Without support from state funding, many LEA programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in higher numbers of students participating in less inclusive environments. Historically, students age 5 enrolled in Kindergarten have contributed substantially to Idaho's Indicator 6A inclusion rate. ISDE showed substantial decreases in inclusion rates, reported under Indicator 6A Preschool Environments, with a corresponding increase in Indicator 6B as students age 5 enrolled in Kindergarten shifted to reporting under school age environment codes as part of EDFacts FS002. Idaho LEAs are also communicating an increased number of families electing to homeschool their students during

the COVID-19 health crisis. Idaho anticipates this has also further impacted inclusion rates for FFY 2020. ISDE notes that the change in data and reporting more accurately reflects information for students age 3-5 enrolled in early childhood programs.

ISDE regularly accesses national technical resources to improve understanding of strategies to improve systems and implementation. The information gained from national centers has enabled ISDE to increase partnerships with fellow agencies and leverage internal resources. Strategies to address data quality and performance for Indicator 6 include increased and improved communication and training developed through collaboration with other state agencies and grant opportunities.

Communication and Training:

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

ISDE team made changes to annual data training to integrate early childhood information fully. By including early childhood data, ISDE increased awareness and understanding of data and appropriate environment coding. Data-related training that incorporated early childhood information included the Data Drill Down, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, and the Director's Webinars.

The annual Data Drill Down training now provides additional information, reports, and break-out sessions specific to early childhood. Early childhood and preschool data reporting were also agenda items for DAC and SEAP for school year 2020-2021.

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

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

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

Data Quality:

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and rules of completion to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. For Indicator 6: Preschool Environments data, Idaho EDPlan routes users through the decision tree process to determine the student's educational environment. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate educational environment code based on responses to decision tree questions. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that all necessary documentation is finalized and limits user coding error.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for indicators 6A and 6B, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State did not establish a baseline for indicator 6C. The State must establish a baseline data for indicator 6C

The State provided targets for indicators 6A and 6B, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for indicator 6C. The State must provide targets for years after the first year in which the State reported at least ten children receiving special education and related services in the home through FFY 2025.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2020	Target >=	84.70%	84.20%	85.70%	85.20%	
A1	70.12%	Data	68.61%	67.75%	66.79%	68.29%	64.25%
A2	2020	Target >=	54.88%	55.38%	55.88%	56.38%	
A2	48.76%	Data	49.09%	51.16%	49.51%	50.45%	45.95%
B1	2020	Target >=	79.05%	79.55%	80.05%	80.55%	
B1	69.49%	Data	71.71%	68.74%	64.19%	69.96%	62.88%
B2	2020	Target >=	28.37%	28.87%	29.37%	29.87%	
B2	16.14%	Data	19.16%	19.10%	19.61%	17.52%	13.75%
C1	2020	Target >=	84.31%	84.81%	85.31%	85.81%	
C1	65.60%	Data	69.98%	67.66%	61.34%	67.42%	64.89%
C2	2020	Target >=	66.41%	66.91%	67.41%	67.91%	
C2	55.76%	Data	60.32%	60.53%	57.45%	57.95%	54.75%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	70.12%	70.32%	70.52%	70.72%	70.92%	71.12%
Target A2 >=	48.76%	48.96%	49.16%	49.36%	49.56%	49.76%
Target B1 >=	69.49%	69.69%	69.89%	70.09%	70.29%	70.49%
Target B2 >=	16.14%	16.34%	16.54%	16.74%	16.94%	17.14%
Target C1 >=	65.60%	65.80%	66.00%	66.20%	66.40%	66.60%
Target C2 >=	55.76%	55.96%	56.16%	56.36%	56.56%	56.76%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Early Childhood Outcome data is also shared with the Idaho Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Head Start Collaboration Office, Idaho Child Care Program Advisory Panel, and Early Childhood Advisory Committee on an ongoing bases to gather input from other early childhood programs throughout the state. These groups include Infant Toddler Programs, Regional Early Childhood Coordinating Council members, parents, State Medicaid staff, Head Start programs, child care providers, Idaho Association of the Education of Young Children, as well as other state and local early childhood programs and advocacy groups.

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

In preparation for the target and baseline reset, communication and training with stakeholders began early in the spring of 2020 and included discussions regarding the proposed FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. The soft-closure of Idaho schools beginning March 17, 2020, due to the COVID-19 crisis, which shifted students to remote learning substantially impacted outcomes for early childhood students and LEA team's ability to conduct face-to-face assessments. Idaho's results in all outcome measures dropped dramatically. Throughout the Fall of 2020, ISDE presented data and information and held discussions with stakeholders regarding the Indicator 7 target and baseline reset. Discussions carefully considered the potential consequence of resetting targets based on COVID-19 impacted data. Stakeholder groups discussed options, including delaying target resetting until FFY 2020 and establishing targets as part of the new SPP/APR package. Stakeholder groups independently determined that resetting the baseline and target for FFY 2019 was the most appropriate action, citing that the targets established in 2013 were not relevant to current collection processes, targets were unattainable based on existing data, and that COVID-19 would have a residual impact on ECO

results. In accordance with stakeholder feedback, Idaho established the baseline and target for Indicator 7 utilizing FFY 2019 data. OSEP did not accept these targets based on COVID-19 impact, and Idaho began reexamining data with stakeholders in the spring of 2021. The ISDE recommended using FFY 2018 or FFY 2020 data as a baseline as data were collected through normal processes through the current tool.

Information and feedback was also sought at the regional Data Drill Down training and the New and Experienced Federal Directors meeting in fall of 2021.

Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators for review in November. The packet was sent to SEAP members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular meeting. Members were grouped based on areas of interest and participated in discussions regarding indicators. Each group had an SDE staff member who provided additional information on the indicators, clarified questions, and functioned as the discussion facilitator. Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions. Stakeholders unanimously agreed that Idaho should pursue conservative targets for Indicator 7 with a yearly percentage point increase of 0.2. Idaho's lack of universal preschool was noted as a significant obstacle towards making large gains in early childhood outcomes. Members noted that impacts from COVID-19 would be long-lasting. For these reasons, stakeholders supported the use of the most recent year's data from FFY 2020 for baseline.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,171

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	22	1.88%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	252	21.52%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	326	27.84%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	317	27.07%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	254	21.69%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	643	917	64.25%	70.12%	70.12%	N/A	N/A
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	571	1,171	45.95%	48.76%	48.76%	N/A	N/A

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	13	1.11%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	340	29.04%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	629	53.71%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	175	14.94%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	14	1.20%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	804	1,157	62.88%	69.49%	69.49%	N/A	N/A
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	189	1,171	13.75%	16.14%	16.14%	N/A	N/A

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	20	1.71%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	282	24.08%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	216	18.45%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	360	30.74%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	293	25.02%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	576	878	64.89%	65.60%	65.60%	N/A	N/A
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	653	1,171	54.75%	55.76%	55.76%	N/A	N/A

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

Early Childhood Outcome rating data and information are collected and incorporated into the Early Childhood IEP using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process. ISDE mandated that all IEP platforms fully integrate the update no later than FFY 2018.

Once documented as part of the ECO/IEP, ECO entry ratings are then reported to the ISDE in the Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System. The ECO application establishes records for students based on demographic data reported to the statewide longitudinal data system. Using demographic and enrollment data helps guarantee that students are recorded under the correct LEA and eliminates records duplication. Upon student exit, LEA staff finalize the student record by submitting 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.

The 2018-2019 school year was the first year of full implementation using the new Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System. The change in systems resulted in improved data quality, security, reduced duplication of effort, and a substantial increase in the number of students with ECO ratings recorded. In addition to the Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan, released in March of 2019. For Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcome data, Idaho EdPlan routes users through the Early Childhood Outcome Decision Tree for Summary Ratings process for each outcome area. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate rating based on the user's responses to decision tree questions. The process-based approach reduces the risk of recording errors and ensures that progress is tracked appropriately for exit ratings.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Based on the analysis of Idaho's data with input from stakeholders Idaho is establishing the baseline using FFY 2020 data. The FFY 2020 data represents the most recent data with consideration of changes in processes to address COVID-19 health crisis. Stakeholders felt that it is important to use the FFY 2020 data for the baseline as it most accurately reflects current supports, processes, and other years of data would not accurately reflect the lasting impacts of COVID-19 on student learning.

Idaho does not show any evidence that COVID-19 impacted the collection, validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 7 data for the FFY 2020 reporting year.

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

Communication and Training:

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

In October 2021, ISDE provided a third round of statewide training in the use of Visual Phonics intervention. Visual Phonics is an intervention to help preschool students improve their pre-literacy skills and specifically address Outcome

2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication). ISDE staff annually conduct the training in multiple sessions. Over the last three years, 330 Speech-Language Pathologists and special education teachers across the state participated.

A new Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Process online training is available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse - https://idahotc.com/Resources/view/ID/959 with a new Indicator 7 Guidance document. This training outlines the Idaho ECO process that includes updated state-approved anchor assessments, entrance and exit activities, data collection, and reporting requirements. In addition, an ECO module specific for speech-language pathologists was created and will go live in February 2022.

ISDE team has fully integrated early childhood information into annual data training. By including early childhood data, ISDE increased awareness and understanding of data and appropriate environment coding. Data-related training that incorporated early childhood information included the Data Drill Down, the New and Experienced Federal Programs Directors meeting, and the Director's Webinars.

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

Idaho continues to scale up Idaho's Pyramid Model Collaborative, a social and emotional program for early childhood settings. Idaho joined a national initiative to address inclusive policies and practices at the state, local program leadership, and early care and education environments levels. The State Department of Education, Idaho SESTA (Special Education Support & Technical Assistance), Head Start Collaborative Office, Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHC/University of Idaho), IdahoSTARS, and Boise State University are working together to improve early childhood outcomes and increase positive social-emotional competencies for all children. There are currently 20 programs in this project, 11 school districts, three Head Start programs, and six child care early education programs. Idaho's Pyramid Model follows the guidance from the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI), a federally-funded project established to disseminate effective use of the Pyramid Model to support young children's social, emotional, and behavioral development through a variety of training and technical assistance activities. The Pyramid Model focuses on program leadership, creating internal coaching capacity, and building knowledge for teachers to support the development of social and emotional competencies in young children. The project provides technical assistance and professional development to teams, identified practitioner coaches, and instructional staff as part of the project.

Data Quality:

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan, released in March of 2019.

For Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcome data, Idaho EdPlan routes users through the Early Childhood Outcome Decision Tree for Summary Ratings process for each outcome area. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate rating based on the user's responses to decision tree questions. The process-based approach reduces the risk of recording errors and ensures that progress is tracked appropriately for exit ratings.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP notes that the State did not provide targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special

education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) was directly involved in developing questions, processes, and targets for the Indicator 8 collection. SEAP membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, 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.

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the SEAP and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. Discussions beginning in September of 2020 included descriptions of the basic proposed changes and anticipated impacts for the state and an overview of state historical data. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021. Changes made to Indicator 8 in the new package were negligible as Idaho was already conducting representative analysis on multiple demographic areas and regional and LEA size-based comparisons.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

In September of 2021 the ISDE contracted with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) to provide training to new SEAP parent members regarding the purpose and function of the advisory panel.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information (i.e., description of changes to indicators, historical data, potential baseline, etc.), and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

Upon reviewing historical Indicator 8 Parent Involvement survey processes, data, and national comparisons, stakeholders recommended resetting the baseline and targets. In the 2017-2018 school year, Idaho made a concerted effort to improve its response rate. The ISDE reviewed Indicator 8 processes from other states with input from Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), IDEA Data Center (IDC), and stakeholders. Idaho 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. For the FFY 2017 collection year, the survey was also modified to a four-option Likert scale, removing the neutral option, so that survey responses clearly illustrated agreement or disagreement of family engagement. Stakeholders also approved the inclusion of emoji icons to communicate response options further through visual cueing. ISDE also added a N/A option for questions that focused on specific age groups per stakeholder request. At the time, these changes were considered nominal and deemed not to constitute a change to the collection methodology. The ISDE maintained the calculation of responses on a 100-point scale and made no changes to the participant selection process, LEA participation cycle, or survey questions. After reviewing subsequent data, the ISDE and stakeholders determined that the changes made for the FFY 2017 data collection resulted in increased response rates and substantially impacted the data trend. Updating the baseline to FFY 2017 captures the change in process and better aligns targets to current data.

With stakeholder input, the ISDE selected FFY 2017 as the baseline year; the data was at 70.26%. Targets were established with a .25% percentage point increase every two years. A minimal adjustment in target increase was established between baseline and FFY 2020 to create a more orderly target progression. Idaho surveys LEAs on a two-year rotation, so increasing targets every two years better aligns indicator results and targets, allowing both sample groups to be evaluated against the same objectives.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	70.26%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	55.44%	55.50%	55.75%	55.75%	56.00%
Data	55.44%	59.88%	70.26%	68.29%	71.74%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	70.50%	70.75%	70.75%	71.00%	71.00%	71.25%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
833	1,165	71.74%	70.50%	71.50%	Met target	No Slippage

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 105 students with disabilities or less, all families are selected for participation. For those LEAs with more than 105 students with disabilities, that have a sample selection process, the population is stratified by grade pre-k-12, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender to ensure the representativeness of the resulting sample by these characteristics. Sampling procedures were applied to families of all students ages 3-21, and there was not a separate selection process for preschool students.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

4,481

Percentage of respondent parents

26.00%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	18.31%	26.00%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

ISDE provides reminders to LEAs through email and webinars regarding the importance of communicating with families about the survey and encouraging participation. The ISDE Special Education Team has enhanced communications with its parent center and ISDE internal teams focusing on Parental Involvement, Migrant, Indian Education, and McKinney Vento to improve the response rate for under-represented populations. Before survey opening, communications notify these groups about the specific LEAs involved so local coordinators and liaisons may assist with communication to families regarding the survey.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Analysis of survey response was determined based on statistical significance testing with a confidence interval of 95%. The demographic characteristics of students whose parents responded to the survey were compared to the demographics of all students in the stratified, representative sample to determine any over or under-representation of subgroups in the response rate. This comparison indicates the results are representative by the grade level of the student. Significant differences were found in the response rates by race/ethnicity and disability category. Parents of Hispanic students (17% response rate) were less likely to respond than parents of White students (28% response rate) and parents of students with two or more races indicated (30% response rate).
Parents of students with Autism (34% response rate) were more likely to respond than parents of students with a Health Impairment (26% response rate), an Intellectual Disability (23% response rate), or a Specific Learning Disability (22% response rate).
Idaho examined three criteria to determine nonresponse bias.
The first criteria examined was the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias occurred. Idaho's response rate is 26%, which is relatively high for surveys. FFY 2020 response rate represents over 7.5 percentage point improvement over the prior year at 18.31%. The increased rate of response indicates that Idaho's processes for improving participation are having a positive impact.

Second, ISDE examined the representativeness of the responses. As described in the analysis for representativeness, ISDE found no significant differences by grade. Although some significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity and by primary disability, the results did not identify any significant differences in the positivity of the actual responses for these groups.

Third, ISDE compared the response of parents who responded early in the process to those who responded later in the process. This comparison targets the idea that parents who did not immediately respond and need multiple prompts to respond are different in some meaningful way from those who respond immediately. These results showed no statistically significant differences between parents who responded earlier and parents who responded later.

Based on the analysis of these three criteria, ISDE concludes that nonresponse bias was not present.

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

Analysis of survey response was determined based on statistical significance testing with a confidence interval of 95%. The demographic characteristics of students whose parents responded to the survey were compared to the demographics of all students in the stratified, representative sample to determine any over or under-representation of subgroups in the response rate. This comparison indicates the results are representative by the grade level of the student. Significant differences were found in the response rates by race/ethnicity and disability category. Parents of Hispanic students (17% response rate) were less likely to respond than parents of White students (28% response rate) and parents of students with two or more races indicated (30% response rate).

Parents of students with Autism (34% response rate) were more likely to respond than parents of students with a Health Impairment (26% response rate), an Intellectual Disability (23% response rate), or a Specific Learning Disability (22% response rate).

Although there were significant differences in the rates of response between groups of parents by race/ethnicity and primary disability, there were no significant differences in the parent involvement percentage between these groups of parents. For example, there were no significant differences in the parent involvement rate between parents of Hispanic students, parents of White students, and parents of students with two or more races.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

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.

The ISDE Special Education Team has enhanced communications with its parent center and ISDE internal teams focusing on Parental Involvement, Migrant, Indian Education, and McKinney Vento to improve the response rate for under-represented populations. Before survey opening, communications notify these groups about the specific LEAs involved so local coordinators and liaisons may assist with communication to families regarding the survey.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Statistical significance testing was used to determine representativeness with a confidence interval of 95%.

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

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

As outlined in the sampling plan submitted and approved in FFY 2013, LEAs are separated out into two-cycle groups for participation in the Parent Involvement Survey. The selection process for participants is dependent on the size of the population of students with disabilities within the LEA. For LEAs with 105 students with disabilities or less, all families are selected for participation. LEAs with more than 105 students with disabilities have a stratified, representative sample of families selected proportionate to the number of total students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA.

For those LEAs that have a sample selection process, the population is stratified by grade, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender to ensure the representativeness of the resulting sample by these characteristics. Sampling procedures included all students ages 3-21, and there is no separate selection process for preschool students. The sample sizes ensure roughly similar margins of error across the different LEA sizes. The LEA's responses are weighted according to their student population size when calculating the state-level results.

To determine the percent of parents who report that schools facilitated parent involvement, a percent of the maximum score was calculated based on all 21 survey items. A percent of the 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, 71.50% of parents had a percent of the maximum score of 66% or above. Thus, 71.50% of parents reported the school facilitated parent involvement.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

After reviewing subsequent data, ISDE and stakeholders determined that the changes made for the FFY 2017 data collection resulted in increased response rates and substantially impacted the data trend. Updating the baseline to FFY 2017 captures the change in process and better aligns targets to current data and processes.

With stakeholder input, the ISDE selected FFY 2017 as the baseline year; the data was at 70.26%. Targets were established with a .25% percentage point increase every two years. Idaho surveys LEAs on a two-year rotation, so increasing targets every two years better aligns indicator results and targets, allowing both sample groups to be evaluated against the same objectives.

The ISDE does not show evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted survey results' completeness, validity, or reliability.

To mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Division of Special Education has resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. During FFY 2019 the ISDE established ongoing weekly webinars to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services during the COVID-19 pandemic. These webinars targeted local special education (LEA) directors and continued through June of 2020. Webinars resumed again in August of 2020, continuing through the end of the 2020-2021 school year on an as-needed basis. Information provided during the webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as Office of Special Education Programs

(OSEP) guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Division of Medicaid also presented as part of the webinar series.

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Analysis of survey response was determined based on statistical significance testing with a confidence interval of 95%. The demographic characteristics of students whose parents responded to the survey were compared to the demographics of all students in the stratified, representative sample to determine any over or under-representation of subgroups in the response rate. This comparison indicates the results are representative by the grade level of the student. Significant differences were found in the response rates by race/ethnicity and disability category. Parents of Hispanic students (17% response rate) were less likely to respond than parents of White students (28% response rate) and parents of students with two or more races indicated (30% response rate).

Parents of students with Autism (34% response rate) were more likely to respond than parents of students with a Health Impairment (26% response rate), an Intellectual Disability (23% response rate), or a Specific Learning Disability (22% response rate).

Although there were significant differences in the rates of response between groups of parents by race/ethnicity and primary disability, there were no significant differences in the parent involvement percentage between these groups of parents. For example, there were no significant differences in the parent involvement rate between parents of Hispanic students, parents of White students, and parents of students with two or more races.

The ISDE Special Education Team has enhanced communications with its parent center and ISDE internal teams focusing on Parental Involvement, Migrant, Indian Education, and McKinney Vento to improve the response rate for under-represented populations. Before survey opening, communications notify these groups about the specific LEAs involved so local coordinators and liaisons may assist with communication to families regarding the survey.

8 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State reported that sampling was used to collect data for this indicator and that the previously approved sampling plan had not changed. In order to report data for this indicator using sampling for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, the State must submit its sampling plan to OSEP and provide data consistent with the approved sampling plan

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 the reporting year, 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 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.

19

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	153	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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).

Idaho's stakeholders recommended further alignment and consistency between equity indicators and significant disproportionality. Updates included setting a cell of 10, n-size of 30, and increasing to two years of data analysis, calculated using a risk ratio first, followed by an alternate risk ratio consistent with significant disproportionality calculations.

The current calculation for disproportionate representation utilizes a risk ratio and an alternate risk ratio formula.

Risk ratio = DLR/DLRC

Alternate risk ratio = DLR/SLRC

Where:

DLR = District-level risk for the racial/ethnic group

DLRC = District-level risk for comparison group

SLRC = State-level risk for comparison group

The calculation for disproportionate representation uses the following criteria:

Cell size = 10

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 2

Threshold = 3

For examples of the risk and alternate risk ratio calculations, please see Idaho's Significant Disproportionality Module Series, Module 2: The Data, on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/915. Note that significant disproportionality and disproportionate representation vary in the years of analysis and the specific population under review.

The number of LEAS analyzed for FFY 2020 was 153 (those meeting minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30 for at least one category of analysis). Analysis of data showed zero instances of disproportionate representation. The change in calculation represents a substantial increase in the number of LEAs included in the analysis.

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 risk and alternate risk ratio formula to LEA-level data, the ISDE identifies LEAs with a ratio equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, for two consecutive years in the same category of analysis as having disproportionate representation. Based on this analysis no LEAs were flagged as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services for FFY 2020.

No LEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services for FFY 2020. When an LEA is flagged for disproportionate representation, the LEA must complete the Self-Assessment for Identification. The LEA must review policies, practices, and procedures related to referral as part of the self-assessment. The ISDE also selects student eligibility files to review. LEA responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by ISDE staff to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, the ISDE looks for a preponderance of evidence based on data collected to support eligibility for special education. The ISDE also verifies if the LEA has adequately addressed exclusionary factors. From this information, the ISDE determines whether the disproportionate

representation is the result of inappropriate identification and, if it is, makes a finding of noncompliance in regards to the appropriateness of the LEA's identification policies, practices, and procedures. No LEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services for FFY 2020.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 health crisis had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 9 data.

Since the revision to significant disproportionality regulations in December of 2016, Idaho has substantially increased focus on equity in IDEA. The ISDE has developed webinars, guidance documents, and an online module series that includes short video recordings to increase the accessibility of information.

When discussing the differences between SPP/APR equity indicators and significant disproportionality, Idaho's stakeholders have consistently expressed confusion. To address this confusion, Idaho began examining how to create a more unified system to support equity.

In the Fall of 2020, stakeholders from the SEAP and DAC recommended that the ISDE adopt the Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification as part of the process to determine if disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification was developed as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. The self-assessment protocol replaces the Performance Response as part of the review. Using the same tool for Indicators 9, 10, and significant disproportionality will improve alignment and reduce confusion for LEAs and stakeholders. The self-assessment protocol works in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

In the spring of 2021, the ISDE provided further information on SPP/APR equity indicators, noting that the current n-size excluded a substantial number of LEAs from the analysis. The stakeholder's discussion included 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. Discussions of SPP/APR equity measures were continued in November 2021. Stakeholders recommended further alignment and consistency between equity indicators and significant disproportionality. Updates included setting a cell of 10, n-size of 30, and increasing to two years of data analysis, calculated using a risk ratio first, followed by an alternate risk ratio consistent with significant disproportionality calculations. Discussion participants felt the changes would help establish a unified support system for equity, increase the number of LEAs reviewed, and reduce confusion between measures.

FFY 2020 is the first year implementing cell size of 10, n-size of 30, and the use of two years of data analysis. Per stakeholder recommendation Idaho is resetting baseline to FFY 2020 to reflect these changes in calculation methodology.

The changes in calculation also promote alignment across Idaho's equity systems and leverage compliance requirements for Indicators 9 and 10 as proactive review processes prior to significant disproportionality.

Idaho continues to develop evidence-based training to support LEAs and families through identification processes, including the creation of online training modules, quick guides, and guidance documents.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules from referral through eligibility determination. Ensuring LEA teams meet compliance requirements for evaluation and finalize all necessary documentation.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2005; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

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 2020, 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 specific disability categories 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 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.

61

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
9	0	111	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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).

Idaho's stakeholders recommended further alignment and consistency between equity indicators and significant disproportionality. Updates included setting a cell of 10, n-size of 30, and increasing to two years of data analysis, calculated using a risk ratio first, followed by an alternate risk ratio consistent with significant disproportionality calculations.

The current calculation for disproportionate representation utilizes a risk ratio and an alternate risk ratio formula.

Risk ratio = DLR/DLRC

Alternate risk ratio = DLR/SLRC

Where:

DLR = District-level risk for the racial/ethnic group

DLRC = District-level risk for comparison group

SLRC = State-level risk for comparison group

The calculation for disproportionate representation is applied to each of the seven racial/ethnic groups for the six disability categories and uses the following criteria:

Cell size = 10

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 2

Threshold = 3

For examples of the risk and alternate risk ratio calculations, please see Idaho's Significant Disproportionality Module Series, Module 2: The Data, on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/915. Note that significant disproportionality and disproportionate representation vary in the years of analysis and the specific population under review.

The number of LEAS analyzed for FFY 2020 was 111 (those meeting minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30 for at least one category of analysis). Analysis of data showed nine LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation. The change in calculation represents a substantial increase in the number of LEAs included in the analysis.

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.

No LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation based on inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures.

By applying the risk and alternate risk ratio formula to LEA-level data, the ISDE flags LEAs with a ratio equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, for two consecutive years in the same category of analysis as having disproportionate representation. Based on this analysis nine LEAs were flagged as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in specific disability categories for FFY 2020.

LEAs flagged as having disproportionate representation were required to complete the Self-Assessment for Identification. The LEA must review policies, practices, and procedures related to referral as part of the self-assessment. The ISDE also reviewed student eligibility documents. LEA responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by ISDE staff to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, the ISDE looks for a preponderance of evidence based on data collected to support eligibility for special education. The ISDE also verifies if the LEA has adequately addressed exclusionary factors. From this information, the ISDE determines whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification and, if it is, makes a finding of noncompliance in regards to the appropriateness of the LEA's identification policies, practices, and procedures. No LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation based on inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Since the revision to significant disproportionality regulations in December of 2016, Idaho has substantially increased focus on equity in IDEA. The ISDE has developed webinars, guidance documents, and an online module series that includes short video recordings to increase the accessibility of information.

When discussing the differences between SPP/APR equity indicators and significant disproportionality, Idaho's stakeholders have consistently expressed confusion. To address this confusion, Idaho began examining how to create a more unified system to support equity.

In the Fall of 2020, stakeholders from the SEAP and DAC recommended that the ISDE adopt the Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification as part of the process to determine if disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification was developed as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. The self-assessment protocol replaces the Performance Response as part of the review. Using the same tool for Indicators 9, 10, and significant disproportionality will improve alignment and reduce confusion for LEAs and stakeholders. The self-assessment protocol works in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive supports have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

In the spring of 2021, the ISDE provided further information on SPP/APR equity indicators, noting that the current n-size excluded a substantial number of LEAs from the analysis. The stakeholder's discussion included 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. Discussions of SPP/APR equity measures were continued in November 2021. Stakeholders recommended further alignment and consistency between equity indicators and significant disproportionality. Updates included setting a cell of 10, n-size of 30, and increasing to two years of data analysis, calculated using a risk ratio first, followed by an alternate risk ratio consistent with significant disproportionality calculations. Discussion participants felt the changes would help establish a unified support system for equity, increase the number of LEAs reviewed, and reduce confusion between measures. The changes in calculation also promote alignment across Idaho's equity systems and leverage compliance requirements for Indicators 9 and 10 as proactive review processes prior to significant disproportionality

FFY 2020 is the first year implementing cell size of 10, n-size of 30, and the use of two years of data analysis. Per stakeholder recommendation Idaho is resetting baseline to FFY 2020 to reflect these changes in calculation

methodology.

Idaho continues to develop evidence-based training to support LEAs and families through identification processes, including the creation of online training modules, quick guides, and guidance documents.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules from referral through eligibility determination. Ensuring LEA teams meet compliance requirements for evaluation and finalize all necessary documentation.

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

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY2005; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	91.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.31%	98.60%	99.14%	98.36%	98.58%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
6,826	6,688	98.58%	100%	97.98%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

138

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.

Ninety-one initial evaluations exceeded the timeline due primarily to scheduling difficulties between the LEA and parent(s). These evaluations were made within the range of 1-374 days over the 60-day timeline, with a median of 34 days.

Twenty-three initial evaluations exceeded the timeline due primarily to the need for additional assessments to determine eligibility. These evaluations were made within the range of 8-243 days over the 60-day timeline, with a median of 7 days.

Twenty-four initial evaluations exceeded the timeline due primarily to staffing issues. These evaluations were made within the range of 1-289 days over the 60-day timeline, with a median of 26.5 days.

Idaho has identified a major staffing shortage for school psychologists, which the COVID-19 health crisis has further

exacerbated. The ISDE is coordinating with national resources to encourage certified individuals from around the nation to come to Idaho. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen substantial turnover and increases in the number of unfilled positions at all levels (special education teachers, administrators, consulting teachers, substitute teachers, related service providers, paraprofessionals, etc.). These shortages result in a reduction of resources necessary to complete evaluations in a timely manner.

Delays and count of days listed above reflect the total timeline from the date of receipt of written parental consent for an initial evaluation to the date of determination of eligibility for special education and related services. Periods, when regular school was not in session for five (5) or more consecutive school days (see Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03), were not factored into the ranges of days listed above.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03 states;

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 has had a direct impact on Indicator 11, though evidence does not indicate COVID-19 has impacted data validity, reliability, or completeness. Idaho has identified a major staffing shortage for school psychologists, which the COVID-19 health crisis has further exacerbated. The ISDE is coordinating with national resources to encourage certified individuals from around the nation to come to Idaho. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen substantial turnover and increases in the number of unfilled positions at all levels. These shortages result in a reduction of resources necessary to complete evaluations in a timely manner. The ISDE recognizes there is a need for further training regarding timelines. The staffing shortages have reduced LEA teams' ability to secure time for professional development. To address needs for training without pulling staff away from the LEA, the ISDE and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) have developed online training modules, quick guides, and short informative videos.

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes Indicator 11 and other compliance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs receive their determination and are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct a root-cause analysis and assist LEAs to identify factors contributing to low performance in specific areas, including initial evaluation. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with Specific, Measurable, Achievable,

Realistic, and Timely (SMART) Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training on the process to SESTA coordinators and LEAs.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. For Indicator 11 data, Idaho EdPlan includes calendar information with timelines and reminders to LEA staff related to compliance requirements. The system allows teachers and supervisors to monitor caseloads and IEP teams to ensure compliance with timeline requirements. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate date fields based on finalization. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules from referral through eligibility determination.

The ISDE is currently collaborating with the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education (IOSBE) and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Infant-Toddler Program (ITP) to develop an application that will improve Indicator 12 data quality. The application will allow LEAs improved tracking of students referred as potentially eligible, enhance communication between Part C and Part B through automated nightly uploads from ITP, and interface with ISEE data to reduce duplication. The ISDE is considering how this change in data collection for Indicator 12 may impact Indicator 11 and if the release of the application will constitute a change in collection methodology for Indicator 11 as well as Indicator 12. Idaho has an anticipated release date of August of 2022.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
41	41	0	0

FFY 2019 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 forty-one LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The ISDE reviewed updated Child Find 60-day timeline data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the ISDE identified noncompliance in FFY 2019. As a result of this subsequent review of updated data, the ISDE determined that each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to the noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely identification for special education and related services. ISDE and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed.

The ISDE confirmed correction of noncompliance passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the ISDE's review of subsequent updated data, the ISDE determined that the LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for Indicator 11 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

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

The ISDE verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the forty-one LEAs had completed all 79 initial eligibility evaluations. The ISDE investigated all instances of noncompliance in

FFY 2019 at the student level. The ISDE verified that all eligible students had an evaluation, although late, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

To ensure that the forty-one LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The ISDE reviewed updated Child Find 60-day timeline data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the ISDE identified noncompliance in FFY 2019. As a result of this subsequent review of updated data, the ISDE determined that each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to the noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely identification for special education and related services. ISDE and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed.

The ISDE confirmed correction of noncompliance passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the ISDE's review of subsequent updated data, the ISDE determined that the LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for Indicator 11 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

The ISDE verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the forty-one LEAs had completed all 79 initial eligibility evaluations. The ISDE investigated all instances of noncompliance in FFY 2019 at the student level. The ISDE verified that all eligible students had an evaluation, although late, and if eligible,

an IEP was developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

11 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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.

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

 a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

 b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

 c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

 d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

 e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

 f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	59.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.53%	99.38%	99.82%	98.95%	96.95%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	951
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	40
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	<390
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.	508
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	8
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.	NA

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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.	<390	395	96.95%	100%	99.24%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

**

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.

The ISDE identified ** instances of noncompliance where LEAs did not meet the Early Childhood Transition timeline. Delays ranged between 12 and 52 days beyond the students' third birthday. Each case indicated confusion between Early Childhood Transition timeline requirements that require determination of initial eligibility and if eligible IEP development and implementation by the students third birthday and Child Find, which Idaho allows for certain state-defined exceptions. Idaho's state-established timeframe for Child Find addressed in Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03, states; The total timeline from the date of receipt of written parental consent for an initial evaluation to the date of determination of eligibility for special education and related services must not exceed sixty (60) calendar days, excluding periods when regular school is not in session for five (5) or more consecutive school days, unless all parties agree to an extension.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID-19 has had a direct impact on Indicator 12, though evidence does not indicate COVID-19 has impacted data validity, reliability, or completeness. Idaho has seen an increase in the number of families that have elected to hold off on pursuing initial eligibility for Part B special education and related services due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, Idaho has identified a major staffing shortage for school psychologists, which the COVID-19 health crisis has further exacerbated. The ISDE is coordinating with national resources to encourage certified individuals from around the nation to come to Idaho. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen substantial turnover and increases in the number of unfilled positions at all levels (special education teachers, administrators, consulting teachers, substitute teachers, related service providers, paraprofessionals, etc.). These shortages result in a reduction of resources necessary to complete evaluations in a timely manner. The staffing shortages have also reduced LEA teams' ability to secure time for training and professional development. The ISDE recognizes there is a need for further training regarding timelines

and the differences between Early Childhood Transition and Child Find. To address needs for training without pulling staff away from the LEA, the ISDE and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) have developed online training modules, quick guides, and short informative videos.

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

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. For Indicator 12 data, Idaho EdPlan includes calendar information with timelines and reminders to LEA staff related to compliance requirements. The system allows teachers and supervisors to monitor caseloads and IEP teams to ensure compliance with timeline requirements. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate date fields based on finalization. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules from referral through eligibility determination.

The ISDE is currently collaborating with the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education (IOSBE) and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Infant-Toddler Program (ITP) to develop an application that will improve Indicator 12 data quality. The application will allow LEAs improved tracking of students referred as potentially eligible, enhance communication between Part C and Part B through automated nightly uploads from ITP, and interface with ISEE data to reduce duplication. The release of the application will constitute a change in collection methodology. Idaho has an anticipated release date of August of 2022.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2019 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 six LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The ISDE reviewed updated Early Childhood Transition data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the ISDE identified noncompliance in FFY 2019. As a result of this review of updated data, each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely transition from Part C to Part B. ISDE and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address

the area noncompliance and were completed.

The ISDE confirmed correction of noncompliance passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the ISDE's review of subsequent updated data, the ISDE determined that the LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for Indicator 12 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

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

The ISDE verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the six LEAs had completed all 19 early childhood transitions. The ISDE investigated all instances of noncompliance in FFY 2019 at the student level. The ISDE verified that all eligible students had an evaluation and IEP developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement, although late, and were either receiving special education and related services or had exited. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

To ensure that the six LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The ISDE reviewed updated Early Childhood Transition data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the ISDE identified noncompliance in FFY 2019. As a result of this review of updated data, each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely transition from Part C to Part B. ISDE and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area noncompliance and were completed.

The ISDE confirmed correction of noncompliance passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the ISDE's review of subsequent updated data, the ISDE determined that the LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for Indicator 12 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

The ISDE verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the six LEAs had completed all 19 early childhood transitions. The ISDE investigated all instances of noncompliance in FFY 2019 at the student level. The ISDE verified that all eligible students had an evaluation and IEP developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement, although late, and were either receiving special education and related services or had exited. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

12 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	95.35%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.43%	90.30%	98.62%	95.80%	90.48%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
123	129	90.48%	100%	95.35%	N/A	N/A

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). Idaho's GSFR is completed in a virtual layout. As a result, the COVID-19 health crisis had minimal impact on data collection. In 2020-2021 Idaho implemented additional requirements for GSFR, including a more formalized LEA internal review process. To complete GSFR, LEAs conduct an internal file review and provide the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) with an assurance of the review. The LEA then provides a list of the students who underwent the internal review on the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT) application for the Idaho State Department of Education to select for GSFR. The required sample is based on child count and represents a broad representation of the students served by the LEA, including a range of disability categories, environments, etc. ISDE staff then select one or more student files for review. The LEA provides self-review results, uploads all required materials to the CTT application, or grants access to student files through the optional statewide IEP software. In prior years LEA teams had the authority to self-select files for GSFR. In FFY 2020, the ISDE established the change in process from self-selection to ISDE selection to improve internal review processes and compliance with IDEA. Based on this change in collection methodology Idaho is establishing the baseline using FFY 2020 data.

For the 2020-2021 GSFR process, all LEAs with secondary programs provided a minimum of one secondary file for review. Small groups of ISDE staff and Idaho SESTA staff conducted a desk review of all individual student files and

documents submitted by LEAs. ISDE and SESTA staff entered data gathered during the desk review into the CTT student-by-student. 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 not addressed by providing existing documentation, 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 on February 14, 2021, for Indicator 13.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data for Indicator 13 - Secondary Transition is collected as part of state monitoring in a process called General Supervision File Review (GSFR). Idaho's GSFR is completed in a virtual layout. Idaho does not specify an age younger than 16 that public agencies must meet these requirements. Idaho rules establish that the IEP in effect when the student turns age 16 must meet these requirements. LEA teams may elect to include secondary transition elements prior to age 16 and include them for review as part of the State's monitoring. All files submitted for secondary transition review as part of the State's monitoring are included as part of the indicator and held to these requirements. As a result, the COVID-19 health crisis had minimal impact on the indicator and did not impact the validity or reliability of data collection. ISDE anticipates that access to community-based employment and training opportunities was less plentiful due to the COVID-19 health crisis.

In FFY 2020, the ISDE established the change in process from self-selection to ISDE selection to improve internal review processes and compliance with IDEA. Based on this change in collection methodology Idaho is establishing the baseline using FFY 2020 data.

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

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

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

Joint ISDE and IDVR administrator training have resulted in LEA/IDVR funding partnerships to provide dedicated school-to-work counselors who are full-time or shared between smaller LEAs. Those LEAs engaged in this shared resource have

begun to show an increase in their students connecting to pre-employment activities offered by IDVR. The ISDE anticipates the interaction will improve post-school outcome results in measurements 14B and 14C.

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

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

In the spring of 2021, the ISDE partnered with other state agencies, organizations, and all of Idaho's public universities to hold Idaho's annual Transition Institute. The spring 2021 institute was the first year offering of the Transition Institute in a virtual layout. It was shortened from the regular two-day format to one and one half-day of sessions to limit participant fatigue. In November of 2021, the Transition Institute was provided in both face-to-face and virtual format to facilitate health and safety recommendations from the CDC. The virtual format also helped LEA teams experiencing staffing shortages to be involved without travel. Lead state partner agencies included the IDVR, IDOL, ICDD, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, and Idaho Parents Unlimited. The Transition Institute links LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. Idaho plans to continue the Transition Institute and expects to see growth for students with disabilities in future Post School Outcomes data as a result.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EDPlan was released in March of 2019. Idaho EDPlan provides teams with reminders and an organizational framework for transition assessments, goals, and other materials to improve transition planning. The embedded layout and processes ensure compliance and promote quality transition planning.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	12	1	1

FFY 2019 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 14 LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, LEAs identified with compliance issues were required to develop improvement activities that document the LEA's plans to address underlying factors contributing to noncompliance. Twelve LEAs then showed completion of these activities in a timely manner through assurances and documentation, and one LEA subsequently provided all necessary documentation. All improvement activities and documentation was recorded in the CTT. LEAs were also required to submit additional student files subsequent to the notification of noncompliance, to demonstrate 100% compliance and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. ISDE and Idaho SESTA reviewed improvement activities and implementation documentation to ensure the activities addressed contributing factors to noncompliance. ISDE verified that subsequent information provided through additional student files showed 100% compliance, indicating LEAs implemented the regulatory requirements correctly. The review of additional files was tracked and documented in the Compliance

Tracking Tool (CTT).

ISDE passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on ISDE's review of subsequent information, ISDE determined that all but two LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for Indicator 13 within 365 days and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements.

The ISDE, through the Office of Dispute Resolution, investigated one LEA for a state complaint. The individual and systemic correction and verification of this case of noncompliance is still not yet resolved and is incorporated as part of a stringent Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for the LEA.

The second LEA has experienced several COVID-19 related closures, and the ISDE and Idaho SESTA have verified the correction of noncompliance since the initial submission of the SPP/APR. The LEA is now shown to have 100% compliance, indicating that the LEA has implemented the regulatory requirements correctly.

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

The ISDE verified the correction of 12 of the 14 instances of noncompliance through the review of individual student files in a timely manner. LEAs submitted student files showing correction of noncompliance at the student level. The ISDE verified that all but two student files where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2019 had been corrected to 100% compliance within 365 days of notification. The two remaining cases of noncompliance occurred in two separate LEAs.

The ISDE, through the Office of Dispute Resolution, investigated one LEA for a state complaint. The systemic and individual correction and verification of this case of noncompliance is not yet resolved and is incorporated as part of a stringent Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for the LEA.

The second LEA has experienced several COVID-19 related closures and the ISDE and Idaho SESTA have verified the correction of noncompliance since the initial submission of the SPP/APR. The LEA exceeded 365 days from the point of notification of noncompliance but is now shown to have 100% compliance through the review of individual student files.

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

In the event that the noncompliance remains after 365 days from notification of noncompliance the ISDEs sends a notification to the LEA and holds funding until correction of noncompliance is verified at the student and systems level. The ISDE and Idaho SESTA provide intensive support and technical assistance to the LEA team as necessary to address the noncompliance. When noncompliance is not corrected within 365 days from notification of noncompliance this is also reflected in the LEA's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Determination. RDA Determinations that are in the bottom 5%, based on the rank ordering of all LEAs, are placed into the Level 3 – Directing differentiated level of support, a three-year improvement process aimed to address factors contributing to low performance and or compliance with IDEA.

Two items of noncompliance exceeded 365 days from the notification of noncompliance.

The ISDE, through the Office of Dispute Resolution, investigated one LEA for a state complaint. The systemic and individualized correction and verification of this case of noncompliance are incorporated as part of a stringent Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for the LEA.

In the case of the second LEA, since the initial submission of the SPP/APR, all noncompliance has been corrected and verified as 100% compliant. The ISDE and Idaho SESTA conducted a subsequent review of the individual file and additional files to confirm 100% compliance with IDEA requirements. Idaho communicated directly with LEA leadership and provided reminders regarding the outstanding noncompliance. The LEA provided all necessary documentation of correction of noncompliance on the 365th day so no notification regarding holding funds was issued.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

To ensure that the 14 LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, LEAs identified with compliance issues were required to develop improvement activities that document the LEA's plans to address underlying factors contributing to noncompliance. Twelve LEAs then showed completion of these activities in a timely manner through assurances and documentation, and one LEA subsequently provided all necessary documentation. All improvement activities and documentation was recorded in the CTT. LEAs were also required to submit additional student files subsequent to the notification of noncompliance, to demonstrate 100% compliance and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. ISDE and Idaho SESTA reviewed improvement activities and implementation documentation to ensure the activities addressed contributing factors to noncompliance. ISDE verified that subsequent information provided through additional student files showed 100% compliance, indicating LEAs implemented the regulatory requirements correctly. The review of additional files was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

ISDE passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on ISDE's review of subsequent information, ISDE determined that all but two LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for Indicator 13 within 365 days and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements.

The ISDE, through the Office of Dispute Resolution, investigated one LEA for a state complaint. The individual and systemic correction and verification of this case of noncompliance is still not yet resolved and is incorporated as part of a stringent Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for the LEA.

The second LEA has experienced several COVID-19 related closures, and the ISDE and Idaho SESTA have verified the correction of noncompliance since the initial submission of the SPP/APR. The LEA is now shown to have 100% compliance, indicating that the LEA has implemented the regulatory requirements correctly.

The ISDE verified the correction of 12 of the 14 instances of noncompliance through the review of individual student files in a timely manner. LEAs submitted student files showing correction of noncompliance at the student level. The ISDE verified that all but two student files where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2019 had been corrected to 100%

compliance within 365 days of notification. The two remaining cases of noncompliance occurred in two separate LEAs. The ISDE, through the Office of Dispute Resolution, investigated one LEA for a state complaint. The systemic and individual correction and verification of this case of noncompliance is not yet resolved and is incorporated as part of a stringent Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for the LEA.

The second LEA has experienced several COVID-19 related closures and the ISDE and Idaho SESTA have verified the correction of noncompliance since the initial submission of the SPP/APR. The LEA exceeded 365 days from the point of notification of noncompliance but is now shown to have 100% compliance through the review of individual student files.

13 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

>C. 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 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 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":

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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*

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).
Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.
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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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 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. States should consider categories such as race/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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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 must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	23.00%	23.50%	24.00%	24.50%	25.00%
A	15.75%	Data	18.01%	16.93%	17.58%	21.41%	20.41%
B	2020	Target >=	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%
B	58.87%	Data	41.71%	38.19%	50.59%	55.31%	55.72%
C	2020	Target >=	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	79.50%	80.00%
C	74.50%	Data	54.03%	59.45%	67.22%	69.38%	71.89%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	15.75%	15.85%	15.95%	16.05%	16.15%	16.25%
Target B >=	58.87%	59.27%	59.67%	60.07%	60.47%	60.87%
Target C >=	74.50%	75.39%	76.29%	77.18%	78.08%	78.97%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. SEAP membership represents parents and families of students with disabilities, self-advocates, higher education, Idaho correctional facilities, LEA superintendents, special education directors, teachers, Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Parents Unlimited, and State Department of Education. DAC consists of a minimum of 14 special education directors nominated regionally by their peers. There are two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter local education agencies (LEAs) to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for Idaho's educational systems. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and about future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

• How to get involved;

• Types of groups;

• Understanding data;

• Roles of families on groups; and

• Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information, and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

Based on small group discussions, stakeholders recommended using the most current data available FFY 2020 as it best reflects current higher education and employment information and is the only year of data that captures information from both the Office of the State Board of Education and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. Based on this change in collection methodology and stakeholder recommendations Idaho is establishing the baseline for Indicator 14 using FFY 2020 data. Stakeholders recommended an annual percentage point increase of 0.1 for Indicator 14A and 0.4 for Indicator 14B these small percentage point increase encourages rigorous yet achievable increases given Idaho's historical data. As Idaho's current economy offers a wide range of job opportunities, stakeholders recommended a more rigorous target for Indicator 14C to improve 6% over baseline, equaling a 0.89 percentage point increase annually. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact

on student outcomes. Idaho will continue to provide information using these updated formats moving forward and provide opportunities for stakeholders to evaluate the appropriateness of targets and recommend strategies for improvement of Indicator 14.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	**1,477**
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	851
Response Rate	57.62%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	134
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	367
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)	64
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).	69

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	134	851	20.41%	15.75%	15.75%	N/A	N/A
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	501	851	55.72%	58.87%	58.87%	N/A	N/A
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)	634	851	71.89%	74.50%	74.50%	N/A	N/A

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.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	61.01%	57.62%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

ISDE continues to expand the Indicator 14 LEA opt-in opportunity and encourages all LEAs to conduct initial survey attempts. In FFY 2020, the ISDE provided LEAs participating in the opt-in survey process access to additional funds through the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Grant. LEAs participating in the opt-in survey collection noted that response rates increased when contact was initiated by staff directly connected to the student's secondary program, i.e., case manager, teacher, secondary transition coordinator, etc. In future training, ISDE will strongly encourage that LEAs have staff involved in the past student's education conduct survey instead of general staff members. LEAs will also encourage LEAs to collaborate between programs including special education, migrant, English Learner, and school counselors to determine the best individuals to involve in the survey process. ISDE anticipates these efforts will improve data quality and increase the response rate, particularly for past students who dropped out.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Idaho examined three criteria to determine nonresponse bias.
The first criteria examined was the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias occurred. Idaho's response rate is over 56%, a very high response rate for surveys.
Second, the ISDE examined the representativeness of the responses. As described in the analysis for representativeness, ISDE found no significant differences by disability category. Significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity and by exit type, but the results did not identify any significant differences in the responses by race/ethnicity (see the section on representativeness)
Third, ISDE compared the responses of exiters who responded early to those who responded later in the process. This comparison focuses on the idea that individuals who did not immediately respond and need multiple prompts to respond are different in some meaningful way from those who respond immediately. These results showed that exiters who responded after July 1st (either by email or professional interviewers) had a lower Measurement C rate (58%) than exiters who responded before July 1st (via LEA interviewers) (74%). Note that we limited this analysis to only districts with "early" and "late" respondents. The data illustrates the importance of Idaho conducting follow-up emails and phone calls with exiters as a majority, but not all exiters wish to communicate with LEA representatives.

In addition, in a review of supplementary data collected through the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education, the ISDE identified a substantial percentage of youth participating in higher education, Measurement A, that did not respond to the survey. The ISDE continues to analyze this information to better understand the lack of response.

Idaho has a very high response rate, but there are areas for improvement, especially for youth exiting as drop out. Information indicates that youth with less positive outcomes are less likely to respond. However, as a substantial

number of nonrespondents are involved in higher education, this suggests that lack of response is not exclusive to outcome values. The ISDE anticipates that some nonrespondents do not identify themselves as individuals with disabilities. The ISDE hypothesizes that receiving communication indicating that the collection is specific to students with disabilities reduces the likelihood of response for individuals that do not identify as an individual with a disability. The ISDE is reviewing protocols and training materials to improve the likelihood of response from these individuals. Another area identified for improvement is maintaining accurate contact information. The ISDE is working with stakeholder groups to identify and discuss ways to improve the collection of contact information. ISDE provides reminders to LEAs through email and webinars regarding the importance of communicating with families and past students about the survey and encouraging participation. The ISDE Special Education Team has enhanced communications with its parent center and ISDE internal teams focusing on Migrant, Indian Education, and McKinney Vento to improve the response rate for under-represented populations.

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 State used statistical significance testing with a confidence interval of 95% to determine if one group was over- or under-represented based on the response rate. No significant differences were found by the disability of the youth. Significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity and basis of exit. Exiters with a race/ethnicity of Hispanic were less likely to respond (response rate of 49%) than exiters with a race/ethnicity of White (response rate of 60%). Exiters who graduated were more likely to respond (response rate of 62%) than exiters who dropped out (response rate of 33%) or completed adapted requirements (response rate of 51%).

Although significant differences are present in the response rates by race/ethnicity, there were no differences in the actual responses by race/ethnicity. For example, there were no significant differences in Measurement C between Hispanic exiters and White exiters.

Idaho anticipates that the COVID-19 crisis may have impacted the survey response rate marginally. In FFY 2019 social distancing rules resulted in less travel during the survey administration and increased availability, communication by phone, and awareness of emailed materials. The FFY 2020 collection did not have the same stay in place, travel, and distance restrictions. The ISDE anticipates this change in availability of responders had a negative impact but resulted in a more normalized response rate. Idaho's approach was consistent with the prior year's survey administration (phone and email). The response rate decreased from 2019-20 to 2020-21 by 3.39 percentage points moving from just over 61 percent response rate in FFY 2019 to 57.62 percent in FFY 2020.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

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 expand the Indicator 14 LEA opt-in opportunity and encourages all LEAs to conduct initial survey attempts. In FFY 2020, the ISDE provided LEAs participating in the opt-in survey process access to additional funds through the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Grant. LEAs participating in the opt-in survey collection noted that response rates increased when contact was initiated by staff directly connected to the student's secondary program, i.e., case manager, teacher, secondary transition coordinator, etc. In future training, ISDE will strongly encourage that LEAs have staff involved in the past student's education conduct survey instead of general staff members. LEAs will also encourage LEAs to collaborate between programs including special education, migrant, English Learner, and school counselors to determine the best individuals to involve in the survey process.

The ISDE anticipates that some nonrespondents do not identify themselves as individuals with disabilities. It is possible that receiving communication indicating that the collection is specific to students with disabilities reduces the likelihood of response. The ISDE is reviewing protocols and training materials to improve the likelihood of response from these

individuals.

The ISDE hypothesizes that adjusting protocols and establishing contact from individuals that had direct interaction with past students will encourage participation for students that do not identify themselves as an individual with disabilities or identify more closely with other subgroups thereby improving the representativeness of response.

Another area identified for improvement is maintaining accurate contact information. LEAs note that maintaining connections and contact information for youth that drop out is particularly difficult. The ISDE is working with stakeholder groups to identify and discuss ways to improve the collection of contact information. ISDE provides reminders to LEAs through email and webinars regarding the importance of communicating with families and past students about the survey and encouraging participation. ISDE anticipates these efforts will improve data quality and increase the response rate for under-represented youth.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The State used statistical significance testing with a confidence interval of 95% to determine representativeness.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	**Yes / No**
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 14 data collection primarily relies on survey response. After survey completion, raw responses are compared to data available through the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education for enrollment in higher education and involvement in the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR). Individual results are then reaggregated based on these high-quality supplementary data. FFY 2020 marks the first year that the ISDE is able to include data from IDVR. Based on this change in collection methodology and stakeholder recommendations Idaho is establishing the baseline for Indicator 14 using FFY 2020 data.

Idaho anticipates that the COVID-19 crisis may have impacted the survey response rate marginally. In FFY 2019, social distancing rules resulted in less travel during the survey administration and increased availability, communication by phone, and awareness of emailed materials. The FFY 2020 collection did not have the same stay in place, travel, and distance restrictions. The ISDE hypothesizes that the change in availability of responders had a negative impact but resulted in a more normalized response rate. Idaho's approach was consistent with the prior year's survey administration (phone and email). The response rate decreased from 2019-20 to 2020-21 by 3.39 percentage points moving from just over 61 percent response rate in FFY 2019 to 57.62 percent in FFY 2020.

Idaho's Measurement A percentage reduced substantially from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020. Idaho anticipates this is a result of virtual formats at many institutions, gap or deferred enrollment options, and employment opportunities. While working well for some, the virtual format does not address the needs of all students with disabilities. In addition, many of Idaho's colleges and universities have created gap year or deferred enrollment programs that allow students to take a year off of higher education while still ensuring access to later enrollment at the institution. Idaho's economy currently offers a wide variety of job opportunities. The ISDE anticipates that access to higher-paying job opportunities may also have impacted measures A and B. Indicator 14 response data does not suggest any impact on the completeness, accuracy, or validity as a result of COVID-19.

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

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

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

The Secondary Transition Coordinator has partnered with other state agencies to provide training and information to parents and LEAs about the availability of local resources and benefits. Partnering agencies include the IDVR, Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL), and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW). There is a need to keep families and secondary transition students informed, so the IDHW is making a concerted effort to provide training regarding benefits in multiple formats to address various learning types and address accessibility needs.

In the spring of 2021, the ISDE partnered with other state agencies, organizations, and all of Idaho's public universities to hold Idaho's annual Transition Institute. The spring 2021 institute was the first year offering of the Transition Institute in a virtual layout. It was shortened from the regular two-day format to one half-day session to limit participant fatigue. In November of 2021, the Transition Institute was provided in both face-to-face and virtual format to facilitate health and safety recommendations from the CDC. The virtual format also helped LEA teams experiencing staffing shortages to be involved without travel. Lead state partner agencies included the IDVR, IDOL, ICDD, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, and Idaho Parents Unlimited. The Transition Institute links LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. Idaho plans to continue the Transition Institute and expects to see growth for students with disabilities in future Post School Outcomes data as a result.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State used statistical significance testing with a confidence interval of 95% to determine if one group was over-or under-represented based on the response rate. No significant differences were found by the disability of the youth. Significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity and basis of exit. Exiters with a race/ethnicity of Hispanic were less likely to respond (response rate of 49%) than exiters with a race/ethnicity of White (response rate of

60%). Exiters who graduated were more likely to respond (response rate of 62%) than exiters who dropped out (response rate of 33%) or completed adapted requirements (response rate of 51%).

Although significant differences are present in the response rates by race/ethnicity, there were no differences in the actual responses by race/ethnicity. For example, there were no significant differences in Measurement C between Hispanic exiters and White exiters.

Idaho anticipates that the COVID-19 crisis may have impacted the survey response rate marginally. In FFY 2019 social distancing rules resulted in less travel during the survey administration and increased availability, communication by phone, and awareness of emailed materials. The FFY 2020 collection did not have the same stay in place, travel, and distance restrictions. The ISDE anticipates this change in availability of responders had a negative impact but resulted in a more normalized response rate. Idaho's approach was consistent with the prior year's survey administration (phone and email). The response rate decreased from 2019-20 to 2020-21 by 3.39 percentage points moving from just over 61 percent response rate in FFY 2019 to 57.62 percent in FFY 2020.

ISDE continues to expand the Indicator 14 LEA opt-in opportunity and encourages all LEAs to conduct initial survey attempts. In FFY 2020, the ISDE provided LEAs participating in the opt-in survey process access to additional funds through the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Grant. LEAs participating in the opt-in survey collection noted that response rates increased when contact was initiated by staff directly connected to the student's secondary program, i.e., case manager, teacher, secondary transition coordinator, etc. In future training, ISDE will strongly encourage that LEAs have staff involved in the past student's education conduct survey instead of general staff members. LEAs will also encourage LEAs to collaborate between programs including special education, migrant, English Learner, and school counselors to determine the best individuals to involve in the survey process.

The ISDE anticipates that some nonrespondents do not identify themselves as individuals with disabilities. It is possible that receiving communication indicating that the collection is specific to students with disabilities reduces the likelihood of response. The ISDE is reviewing protocols and training materials to improve the likelihood of response from these individuals.

The ISDE hypothesizes that adjusting protocols and establishing contact from individuals that had direct interaction with past students will encourage participation for students that do not identify themselves as an individual with disabilities or identify more closely with other subgroups thereby improving the representativeness of response.

Another area identified for improvement is maintaining accurate contact information. LEAs note that maintaining connections and contact information for youth that drop out is particularly difficult. The ISDE is working with stakeholder groups to identify and discuss ways to improve the collection of contact information. ISDE provides reminders to LEAs through email and webinars regarding the importance of communicating with families and past students about the survey and encouraging participation. ISDE anticipates these efforts will improve data quality and increase the response rate for under-represented youth.

14 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

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 and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	5
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	4

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.

YES

If yes, provide an explanation below

A tracking issue was identified which resulted in a discrepancy in the number of resolution meetings and agreements reported as part of the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey. Idaho is investigating the data issue and is making changes to processes with input from legal counsel. Idaho will update data through the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey during the reopen period.
3.1 and 3.1(a) data = 0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for the state. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

Idaho's dispute resolution system, which includes various options for addressing disputes, was noted as an area of strength by stakeholders. As Idaho's data and processes have been stable and not shown substantial shifts over time. As states are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions are less than 10. Stakeholders did not wished to pursue target setting at this time.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data	33.33%	50.00%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	100.00%			N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 15 data.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions are less than 10.

A tracking issue was identified which resulted in a discrepancy in the number of resolution meetings and agreements reported as part of the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey. Idaho is investigating the data issue and is making changes to processes with input from legal counsel. Idaho will update data through the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey during the reopen period.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

OSEP notes the State reported, "A tracking issue was identified which resulted in a discrepancy in the number of resolution meetings and agreements reported as part of the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey. Idaho is investigating the data issue and is making changes to processes with input from legal counsel. Idaho will update data through the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey during the reopen period." OSEP will review updated data submitted by the State during the clarification period.

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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	15
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	3
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	10

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.

YES

If yes, provide an explanation below

A tracking issue was identified which resulted in a discrepancy in the number of mediations and mediation agreements reported as part of the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey. Idaho has implemented changes in communication and processes regarding data collection responsibilities. The ISDE continues to investigate process improvements with input from legal counsel. Idaho will update data through the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey during the reopening period.

2.1 = 15

2.1.a.i = 4

2.1.b.i = 8

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for the state. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

Idaho's dispute resolution system, which includes various options for addressing disputes, was noted as an area of strength by stakeholders. As Idaho's dispute resolution systems have been stable and not shown substantial shifts over time, stakeholders elected to maintain previously established targets.

Idaho has implemented changes to communication and process regarding data collection responsibilities. As a result of these changes in data collection methodology, Idaho is reestablishing the baseline using FFY 2020 data of 80%.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	80.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	77.00%	78.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00%-85.00%
Data	83.33%	77.78%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4	8	15	100.00%	75.00%	85.00%	80.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 16 data. The ISDE identified a tracking issue that resulted in discrepancies in the number of mediations and mediation agreements reported as part of the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey. Idaho has implemented changes in communication and processes regarding data collection responsibilities. As a result of these changes in data collection methodology, Idaho is reestablishing the baseline using FFY 2020 data of 80%. The ISDE per stakeholder recommendation has elected to maintain previously established target ranges of 75%-85% per year. Idaho will update data through the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey during the collection reopen period between May 2, 2022, and May 25, 2022.

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

Idaho's Special Education Dispute Resolution Office regularly provides information on "hot topic" or "trending issues" as part of monthly webinars to local special education directors and presents at the annual New Superintendents Orientation. The team has developed resources for local school principals related to discipline, IEP and evaluation processes, accommodations, etc. The Dispute Resolution Office offers regular updates to stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and works closely with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), and Idaho Special Education Support & Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) to develop resources and training for parents and school districts.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State did not include baseline data for this indicator.

OSEP notes the State reported, "A tracking issue was identified which resulted in a discrepancy in the number of mediations and mediation agreements reported as part of the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey. Idaho is investigating the data issue and is making changes to processes with input from legal counsel. Idaho will update data through the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey during the reopen period." OSEP will review data provided by the State during the clarification period.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Increase the percent of fourth-grade students with disabilities in Idaho who will be proficient in literacy as measured on the state summative assessment, currently ISAT by Smarter Balanced.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subset of the population from the indicator are the LEAs participating in the SSIP professional development project, Cultivating Readers, during the 2021-22 school year. The LEAs included in the calculation are the following: Joint School District #2, Blackfoot, Boundary County, Filer, Future Public School, Inc., Gem Prep: Nampa, Gem Prep: Meridian, Gem Prep: Online, Gem Prep: Pocatello, Idaho Falls, Kuna, Lapwai, Minidoka County, Mullan, Notus*, Preston, Project Impact STEM Academy, Ririe, Snake River, St. Maries, Sugar-Salem, Twin Falls, Wendell. These 23 LEAs represented 13% of the total number of LEAs in the state in FFY 2020 (23/172) and the number of students in this cohort made up 28% (654/2303) of the total target population of students. Idaho will measure the SiMR for this same cohort of LEAs from year to year. The rationale for including LEAs participating in the SSIP during the 2021-22 school year, as opposed to the LEAs participating in 2020-2021, is that LEAs will begin receiving SPDG support in the 2021-22 school year and Idaho's stakeholders expressed support for the SiMR data to measure improvements in student outcomes for this cohort receiving the additional SPDG support. Idaho will calculate and report the SiMR data for 4th-grade students in this same cohort of LEAs each year in the SPP/APR submission.

*Staff from 24 unique LEAs will participate in the SSIP/SPDG in the 2021-22 school year but only 23 are reported for the purposes of the SiMR. One LEA, Canyon Owyhee School Service Agency (COSSA), is a co-op that employs its own staff to provide services to students in LEAs that form the co-op. Notus school district students receive services from staff from the COSSA co-op and its students will be reported in the SiMR data. COSSA staff will participate in the SSIP activities but no students from COSSA are included in the SiMR data.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/Idaho-State-Systematic-Improvement-Plan-Theory-of-Action.pdf

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

On October 1, 2020, Idaho received the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). Idaho will receive the SPDG from October 1, 2020, through September 30, 2025, and will use SPDG funds to help support the expansion of the SSIP. Some activities were revised or added as a result of the additional SPDG support from October 1, 2020-June 30, 2021, but the majority of changes to activities, strategies, and timelines will take place starting in FFY 2021 and will be reported in the SPP/APR to be submitted in 2023. The changes to activities in FFY 2020 were as follows:

• Improved the process for LEAs to apply for participation in the 2021-22 school year and increased the number of LEAs and buildings the SSIP can support. The application for participation had to be signed by the LEA superintendent, special education director, and participating building principals. All administrators had to agree to the requirements of full participation in the SSIP/SPDG. 11 new LEAs and 21 new buildings applied in March/April 2021 to participate beginning in the 2021-22 school year, for a total of 24 LEAs and 36 buildings. All participating LEA and school staff signed an agreement to complete all of the requirements of the SSIP/SPDG.

Rationale: Idaho will increase the impact of the SSIP by expanding the project's reach throughout Idaho and by ensuring that all participating LEA staff understood the project's requirements and agreed to implement the project with fidelity.

• Began building a stronger communications infrastructure. Idaho developed a communications plan and partnered with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) to create a style guide for the SSIP/SPDG project. Using the new branding, Idaho created templates to use when developing new materials and launched a marketing campaign for recruiting new LEAs to participate. The State Leadership Team developed a communication plan that includes information about the communication objectives, audience, message, channels, and timing for each communication event. Items on the communication plan are developing a newsletter, collecting testimonials from project participants, interviewing individuals to tell their story for project promotion, and celebrating successes through monthly emails.

Rationale: A stronger communications infrastructure will improve communication and marketing for recruiting and retaining LEAs and for improving project implementation.

• Facilitated introductory calls in May 2021 with principals of schools new to the project for the 2021-22 school year. Idaho's SSIP consultants set up meetings with the principals of each of the project's new schools to provide information, develop a relationship, and better understand the school's reading instruction system and the principal's perspective on the successes, concerns, and needs of their team.

Rationale: SSIP consultants had success with this activity in other projects and recommended adding these to develop a strong rapport and relationship with each new principal from the beginning and to better understand their needs to give them targeted support.

• Began developing a more robust data collection system. One of the improvements the SPDG supported in FFY 2020 was the improvement of the data system. The SPDG will support an expansion of the SSIP activities in FFY 2021 and those activities will need to be evaluated. In FFY 2020, Idaho began planning and developing data collection instruments and processes to use starting in the 2021-22 school year. One example of this was a partnership Idaho established with a vendor that developed and maintains a platform for virtual coaching. In the 2021-22 school year, LEA coaches and instructional staff will use the platform for virtual coaching. This platform will allow the state to automate data collection on the fidelity of implementation of reading instruction and coaching. Additionally, the SSIP evaluator and SPDG external evaluator worked together to improve and streamline surveys that are sent to project participants and developed a process for observing trainings to evaluate training quality using a high-quality professional development (PD) checklist. The evaluation team plans to develop a coaching fidelity instrument to assess fidelity of implementation and for coaches to use as an improvement tool.

Rationale: The new data system improvements will result in higher quality data and the ability to make better-informed decisions for continuous improvement purposes.

• Established a system for allocating funds to LEAs to support their participation in the SSIP/SPDG activities and fiscal monitoring. With the additional funds provided by the SPDG, LEAs participating in the SSIP/SPDG project may receive grant funds based on their needs. In April 2021, Idaho began developing the process for collecting information

about LEAs' financial needs, determining their allocation, and monitoring their expenditures.

Rationale: The new fiscal system will improve LEA support to implement the SSIP project, and improved budgeting and fiscal accountability.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	13.02%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	14.10%	14.20%	14.30%	14.40%	14.60%	14.80%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of 4th grade students with disabilities proficient on the ISAT in ELA	Total number of 4th grade students with disabilities who participated in the ISAT in ELA	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
122	797		14.10%	15.31%	Met target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

The data source for the FFY 2020 data is the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), by Smarter Balanced. The ISAT is Idaho's summative assessment in English/language arts (ELA). Idaho uses a subset of the 4th grade ISAT ELA data to calculate the SiMR.

The EDFacts file where the data are reported is the SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups – Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178)

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

ISDE Assessment and Accountability Department receive the raw assessment data from Smarter Balanced. The Assessment and Accountability team cleans the data and provides it to the SSIP internal evaluator for analysis. 4th-grade students with disabilities who were enrolled in an LEA participating in the SSIP in the 2021-22 school year were included in the calculation of the SiMR. The SiMR is calculated by dividing the number of 4th-grade students with disabilities in SSIP LEAs who scored proficient or advanced on the ISAT for ELA by the total number of 4th-grade students with disabilities in SSIP LEAs who were administered the ISAT for ELA.

Idaho aligned the SSIP baseline data year and targets through 2025 with those of SPP/APR Indicator 3B for 4th grade ELA since the SiMR data is a subset of the data for that indicator.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* **that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The SSIP State Leadership Team monitored progress of student outcomes on a monthly basis using data from the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI). The IRI is an early reading screener and diagnostic assessment administered in the fall and spring to students in kindergarten through 3rd grade. LEAs are able to use the IRI as an informal progress monitoring tool at any time and the majority of SSIP LEAs use it as such. The SSIP internal evaluator obtained the informal, uncleaned progress monitoring data at the beginning of each month for the month prior, aggregated the data to the building, LEA, cohort and project levels, and used it for state-level program planning and estimating progress toward the SiMR. Although the ISAT measures a broader range of ELA content (reading, writing, listening and research), student data from the IRI is the only data the State Leadership Team has available for progress monitoring of student outcomes. Compared to the ISAT, the IRI is more useful in measuring student growth in reading, specifically, which is the ELA area the SSIP focuses on improving.

In FFY 2020, the State Leadership Team created LEA-level reports with the monthly progress monitoring data to help LEAs identify their needs mid-year for training and TA during the February 2021 In-District Visits. The State Leadership Team developed similar reports for building teams to use for program planning during the spring 2021 Spring Institute. These reports were disaggregated by student demographics as well as by reading subskill areas. The teams were able to target specific student groups and reading skills that might benefit from staff receiving additional professional development in those specific areas.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

Due to COVID, the SSIP LEAs were unable to collect and submit high-quality fidelity of explicit instruction when teaching reading (RESET Rubric) data during the reporting period. With the support of the SPDG funds, the State Leadership Team was able to partner with a vendor to provide a virtual coaching platform that will facilitate the video recording and coaching process and will automatically collect RESET Rubric data beginning in FFY 2021.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

https://sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/State-Systematic-Improvement-Evaluation-Plan.pdf

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Governance: The SSIP's mission is to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities. The activities of the SSIP align with Governor Little and Superintendent of Public Instruction Ybarra's literacy priorities that all Idaho students are proficient readers by 3rd grade. Idaho is a local control state, and each LEA develops and submits an annual Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan to the Idaho State Board of Education. This literacy plan outlines the LEA's plans to improve English language arts and literacy instruction. The Idaho State Leadership Team collaborates with LEA leadership teams, other departments at the ISDE, and community partners to share resources and communicate activities and priorities to improve reading and literacy instruction. The three priorities for the SSIP in collaboration with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, other ISDE departments, and LEA leadership teams is to address the following:

• 	Increased number of LEAs participating in the SSIP project
• 	Increased number of LEAs offering full-day kindergarten
• Increased alignment of evidence-based practices (EBPs) across all tiers of instruction

Finance: Idaho continues to conduct funding and fiscal accountability activities annually, ensuring that each LEA is reviewed at least every four years. If a participating LEA is identified as "very high risk," ISDE would reevaluate the LEA's participation in the SSIP.

Personnel/Workforce: ISDE provides statewide professional development opportunities face-to-face and virtually (both synchronous and asynchronous), delivered by qualified professionals. A website was developed to house sustainable training materials and various project resources. Through the SSIP, participating LEAs have access to national literacy experts that guide them through evaluating their LEA's literacy programs, instructional practices, and coaching support through the utilization of a continuous improvement cycle to implement change. Technical assistance (TA) is provided through a variety of sources. Idaho SESTA, Help Desk ticket system allows LEAs to submit special education questions or concerns. Requests are filtered, sorted, and assigned to appropriate staff to respond. ISDE personnel work within and across departments to meet LEA needs. TA for LEAs participating in the SSIP includes onsite visits to LEAs in the Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-up years (years 2, 3, and 4 of participation). Differentiated TA has successfully aligned instructional practices across all Tiers of instruction. The LEA leadership teams, general education teams, Title 1 teams, and other LEA and building leaders meet to evaluate the implementation of evidence-based practices, the alignment of instruction across Tiers, and the LEA continuous improvement cycle.

Data System: The State Leadership Team supports a data system that collects both implementation data and student outcomes through various instruments and surveys. ISDE cultivates a culture of data use to drive continuous improvement. Participating SSIP LEAs receive training on data literacy at the annual fall data training delivered by ISDE staff, the Fall Institute training, and Spring Institute. The sections below describe the instruments and data collected in more detail.

Accountability and Quality Improvement: ISDE conducts monitoring and accountability activities annually through the General Supervision File Review (GSFR), fiscal monitoring, and annual LEA Determinations. A team of ISDE Special Education staff improved the data calculation methodology of Idaho's LEA determinations to make a meaningful monitoring system to identify LEAs needing extra support and TA and provide them with those supports to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. LEAs that received a determination of "Needs Intervention" and were identified as low performing in ELA proficiency were approached to participate in the SSIP.

Quality Standards: Idaho continues to facilitate the Idaho Professional Standards Commission, which makes recommendations and renders decisions that provide Idaho with competent, qualified, ethical educators dedicated to rigorous standards, pre-K-12 student achievement, and improved professional practice. All teacher candidates are expected to meet the Idaho Core Teacher Standards and the standards specific to their discipline area(s).

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Governance: During this current reporting period, Idaho continued to implement activities to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities. Governor Little and Superintendent of Public Instruction Ybarra continued to prioritize reading proficiency for all students by 3rd grade. LEAs continued to submit annual Comprehensive Literacy Plans outlining the plan to improve English language arts and literacy instruction.

•Short and Intermediate Outcome: Increased the number of LEAs participating in the SSIP project: The SSIP added eight new LEAs and five LEAs scaled up by adding additional buildings or classrooms to the project. In FFY 2020 there were 21 LEAs and 33 elementary schools in the project.

•How strategies support system change: The addition of LEAs increased the reach of the project to positively impact outcomes for students with disabilities. Several of the new LEAs were small and whole building teams of teachers began participating in the activities and will continue over the next four years. The LEAs that began scaling up across additional buildings and classrooms experienced the benefits of the project and began implementing the evidence-based practices across the LEA.

•Support the SiMR/systems improvement efforts/Scale-up: Idaho saw a scale-up of eight LEAs and 13 additional classrooms from LEAs already in the project.

•Communicate achievement: LEAs participating in the project were identified during statewide Special Education Director webinars, during statewide conferences, Director Advisory Council meetings, and when opportunities were presented.

Finance: Through Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) funds, the SSIP continued to support the SSIP work. During the current reporting period, the SSIP applied for and received the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) beginning October 1, 2020. The SPDG funds were used to plan for enhanced support and activities to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.

•Short and Intermediate Outcomes: Funds continued to support professional development for SSIP LEAs through the Fall and Spring Institutes, In-District Visits, and leadership calls. Due to COVID, several of these activities were provided virtually.

The State Leadership Team developed a plan on the use of the additional funds to support instructional and coaching staff to complete project requirements, fund stipends for parent participation, add additional enhancements to the SSIP work, and expand community partners. The Idaho State Leadership team developed a comprehensive plan on the utilization of the SPDG funds.

•How strategies support system change: During the Fall and Spring Institutes, In-District Visits, and leadership calls, LEA teams had access to literacy experts to support the implementation of evidence-based practices and system change, including improving buildings' Multi-Tiered Systems of Support-Reading (MTSS-R).

The State Leadership team planned how enhanced activities will support the implementation of the SSIP. The plan includes activities to increase student outcomes and strategies to support the implementation of evidence-based practices, district system changes related to literacy instruction, strategies to achieve the SiMR, sustainability of improvement efforts, and scale-up.

•Support the SiMR/systems improvement efforts/Scale-up: During the Fall and Spring Institutes, In-District Visits, and leadership calls, LEA leadership teams learned how to implement evidence-based practices, how to scale-up evidence-based practices, and how to evaluate the LEA's MTSS-R processes.

Planning for responsible use of the additional funds allowed the State Leadership Team to evaluate areas that additional financial support would eliminate burden on LEA staff and assist in their systems improvement efforts.

•Communicate achievement: During the current reporting period, the State Leadership Team developed a communication plan on how material will be shared with LEA staff, ISDE staff, and community partners.

Personnel/Workforce: During the current reporting period, the SSIP worked to create sustainable training materials for LEA personnel to provide PD and TA for new and returning staff. LEAs continued to identify both general and special education teachers, instructional coaches, building administrators, and special education directors to use the training materials.

•Short and Intermediate Outcomes: Create sustainable training material to support the implementation of evidence-based practices specific to foundational skills for reading, explicit instruction, and instructional coaching. Sustainable training material will increase instructional staffs' and paraprofessionals' knowledge on evidence-based practices in reading.

•How strategies support system change: Access to project training materials allows LEAs to bring on new staff and provide the background and previous training to bring team members up to speed. The ability to train new staff through online resources addresses the challenge of onboarding new staff due to turnover.

Online PD is a cost-effective resource that allows non-participating LEA/staff and new staff to receive similar content to in-person PD activities.

•Support the SiMR/systems improvement efforts/Scale-up: With the availability of online training resources, LEAs have support to scale up the use of the evidence-based practices with new staff, provide refreshers to existing staff, and provide support to paraprofessionals. The resources were developed to improve student outcomes and strategies that support the implementation of evidence-based practices, LEA systems change related to literacy instruction, strategies to achieve the SiMR, improvement efforts, and scale-up.

•Communicate achievement: LEAs participating in the project are identified during statewide Special Education Director webinars, during statewide conferences, Director Advisory Council meetings, and when opportunities are presented.

Data System: During the current reporting period, the State Leadership Team supported a data system that collected both implementation data and student outcomes through various instruments and surveys. ISDE cultivated a culture of data use to drive continuous improvement.

•Short and Intermediate Outcomes: Positive feedback from post-training surveys, meeting SiMR target and longitudinal growth for students with and without disabilities on the ISAT.

•How strategies support system change: The State Leadership Team used data collected at the state level to improve the supports the SSIP offers to LEAs and to improve infrastructure. For example, data were used from post-training surveys to improve the quality of training and adjust based on participant feedback. LEA and building leadership teams used implementation and student outcome data to improve the implementation of evidence-based practices and target areas where more training may have been needed for improvement.

•Support the SiMR/systems improvement efforts/Scale-up: The State Leadership Team used reading progress monitoring data to better understand, at the cohort and project level, the reading subskill areas where SSIP participants may have needed more training and technical assistance. At the Spring Institute, consultants helped LEA leadership teams review their reading data and develop a plan to improve the areas they identified as needing more support.

•Communicate achievement: Achievement was communicated in Directors Advisory Council and Special Education Advisory Panel meetings, as well as through recruitment webinars and conference presentations. State Leadership Team staff presented at the Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE) conference in November 2020 and the Idaho Association of Special Education Administrators (IASEA) conference in February 2021. SiMR data was shared in statewide Special Education Directors Webinars, at LEA leadership meetings, and through email announcements.

Did the State implement any _new_ (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each <u>new</u> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

Governance: Following the executive prioritization of literacy by both Idaho's governor and Superintendent of Public Instruction Ybarra to expand the reach of reading initiatives, an analysis was conducted on LEA reading outcomes. Based on the analysis, the State Leadership Team conducted targeted outreach to LEAs with reading scores below the state average to apply for participation in the SSIP.

Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy

o Increased the number of LEAs participating in the project and specifically targeted LEAs with relatively low student outcomes in reading.

Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:

o Applications were open from January 1 through April 1, 2021, for participation in the 2021-22 school year. 11 new LEAs and 21 new buildings applied to participate.

Finance: Idaho was awarded the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) October 1, 2020.

Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy

o Added additional members to the ISDE Leadership team including a percentage of the Fiscal Coordinator, Contract Specialist, and administrative assistant time to assist in the implementation of the project objectives. The team began planning for an improved system of fiscal support and accountability, including allocating funds to LEAs based on their needs and developing a process for fiscal monitoring of LEAs.

Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:

o 24 LEAs received their year 1 allocation based on the needs of their staff in July 2021. State Leadership Team staff have been conducting fiscal monitoring of LEAs and have found no fiscal issues to date.

Personnel/Workforce: During the current reporting period, the SSIP worked to create sustainable training materials for LEA personnel to provide PD and TA for new and returning staff.

Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy

o Created sustainable materials to support new and returning LEA personnel to implement evidence-based practices.

Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:

o A series of online trainings were created by literacy and coaching experts on the foundational skills for reading, Science of Reading, comprehensive data systems, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The materials were linked on the SSIP website and promoted during trainings. Pageviews were tracked on the training materials to monitor how they were being accessed. The page views for the various training materials from August 2021 through January 2022 are as follows:

Foundational Skills resource page: 122 public views

Comprehensive Data Systems resource page: 148 public views

Vocabulary Instruction resource page: 54 public views

Reading Comprehension resource page: 78 public views

Data System: During the reporting period, Idaho began developing a more robust data collection system. One of the improvements the SPDG supported in FFY 2020 was the improvement of the data system. The SPDG will support an expansion of the SSIP activities in FFY 2021 and those activities will need to be evaluated. In FFY 2020, Idaho began planning and developing data collection instruments and processes to use beginning in the 2021-22 school year. One example of this was a partnership Idaho established with a vendor that developed and maintains a platform for virtual coaching. Additionally, the SSIP evaluator and SPDG external evaluator worked together to improve and streamline surveys that are sent to project participants and developed a process for observing trainings to evaluate training quality using a high-quality PD checklist.

Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy

o Planning for and beginning implementation of a more robust data system

Installation of a virtual coaching platform that will collect fidelity of implementation data.

Streamlining PD surveys to be sent to project participants.

Developed a process for observing trainings to evaluate training quality using a high-quality PD checklist.

Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:

o The virtual coaching platform will facilitate collection of fidelity data and improve the quality and quantity of data.

o Streamlining of PD surveys has increased response rates and improved usefulness of data collected.

o The collection of training quality data by neutral observers has allowed the team to identify training areas to be improved and increase training effectiveness.

Governance: Following the executive prioritization of literacy by both Idaho's governor and Superintendent of Public Instruction Ybarra to expand the reach of reading initiatives, an analysis was conducted on LEA reading outcomes. Based on the analysis, the State Leadership Team conducted targeted outreach to LEAs with reading scores below the state average to apply for participation in the SSIP.

- Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy
  - o Increased the number of LEAs participating in the project and specifically targeted LEAs with relatively low student outcomes in reading.
- Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
  - o Applications were open from January 1 through April 1, 2021, for participation in the 2021-22 school year. 11 new LEAs and 21 new buildings applied to participate.

Finance: Idaho was awarded the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) October 1, 2020.

- Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy
  - o Added additional members to the ISDE Leadership team including a percentage of the Fiscal Coordinator, Contract Specialist, and administrative assistant time to assist in the implementation of the project objectives. The team began planning for an improved system of fiscal support and accountability, including allocating funds to LEAs based on their needs and developing a process for fiscal monitoring of LEAs.
- Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
  - o 24 LEAs received their year 1 allocation based on the needs of their staff in July 2021. State Leadership Team staff have been conducting fiscal monitoring of LEAs and have found no fiscal issues to date.

Personnel/Workforce: During the current reporting period, the SSIP worked to create sustainable training materials for LEA personnel to provide PD and TA for new and returning staff.

- Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy
  - o Created sustainable materials to support new and returning LEA personnel to implement evidence-based practices.
- Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
  - o A series of online trainings were created by literacy and coaching experts on the foundational skills for reading, Science of Reading, comprehensive data systems, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The materials were linked on the SSIP website and promoted during trainings. Pageviews were tracked on the training materials to monitor how they were being accessed. The page views for the various training materials from August 2021 through January 2022 are as follows:
    - Foundational Skills resource page: 122 public views
    - Comprehensive Data Systems resource page: 148 public views
    - Vocabulary Instruction resource page: 54 public views
    - Reading Comprehension resource page: 78 public views

Data System: During the reporting period, Idaho began developing a more robust data collection system. One of the improvements the SPDG supported in FFY 2020 was the improvement of the data system. The SPDG will support an expansion of the SSIP activities in FFY 2021 and those activities will need to be evaluated. In FFY 2020, Idaho began planning and developing data collection instruments and processes to use beginning in the 2021-22 school year. One example of this was a partnership Idaho established with a vendor that developed and maintains a platform for virtual coaching. Additionally, the SSIP evaluator and SPDG external evaluator worked together to improve and streamline surveys that are sent to project participants and developed a process for observing trainings to evaluate training quality using a high-quality PD checklist.

- Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy
    - Planning for and beginning implementation of a more robust data system
- Installation of a virtual coaching platform that will collect fidelity of implementation data.
- Streamlining PD surveys to be sent to project participants.
- Developed a process for observing trainings to evaluate training quality using a high-quality PD checklist.
- Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
    - The virtual coaching platform will facilitate collection of fidelity data and improve the quality and quantity of data.
    - Streamlining of PD surveys has increased response rates and improved usefulness of data collected.
    - The collection of training quality data by neutral observers has allowed the team to identify training areas to be improved and increase training effectiveness.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Governance: Considering that there will be an executive prioritization of literacy by both Idaho's governor and Superintendent of Public Instruction Ybarra to expand the reach of reading initiatives, the SSIP will continue aligning with this priority. An analysis will be completed on reading proficiency of students in kindergarten through third grade and the State Leadership Team will continue with targeted outreach to LEAs whose reading scores were below the state average to apply to the SSIP. Idaho plans to add 10 new LEAs and 20 additional schools to the project. The application is open from January 1 through March 1, 2022. Selected LEAs will be notified by April 2022. The addition of new LEAs and buildings will continue to expand the project, increasing the reach of the training to improve fidelity of evidence-based practices. If the Idaho Legislature passes funding for full day kindergarten, the Idaho State Leadership Team will collaborate with participating LEAs to explore additional reading opportunities for kindergarten students.

- Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
    - Initiate recruitment campaign for 2022-23 participation in the SSIP
    - Target low-performing LEAs to apply to participate in the SSIP for the 2022-23 school year.
- Anticipated Outcomes:
    - Add new LEAs that would benefit from participation in the project and increase proficiency for students with disabilities
    - Improve instructional staffs' delivery of explicit instruction when teaching reading
    - Build capacity of LEAs to provide coaching for instructional staff
    - Improve schools' implementation of MTSS-R
    - Improve LEA and school leaders' abilities to effectively lead an implementation team

Finance: The addition of the SPDG funds allowed the Idaho State Leadership Team to develop a comprehensive fiscal plan to support LEA personnel in participation in project activities.

- Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:

- o Allocate funds for instructional/coaching staff to pay for off contract time to complete project activities.
    - o Allocate funds to provide additional professional development opportunities to LEA personnel, not directly involved in the project, that address literacy instruction, coaching, and leadership
    - o Contract with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's parent center, to support parent participation on the building leadership teams.
    - o Allocate funds for parent stipends. LEAs will provide stipends to parents for attending project PD and monthly calls with Idaho's parent center, IPUL.
    - o Develop community resources in collaboration with the Idaho Commission for Libraries (ICfL) to help struggling readers in school and public libraries
- The State Leadership Team will continue awarding funds to LEAs to support their participation in the SSIP and monitoring LEA expenditures.
- Anticipated Outcomes:
    - o Instructional/coaching staff will participate and complete project activities with increased timeliness and fidelity.
    - o The additional PD opportunity will increase the knowledge, skills, and abilities of additional LEA staff to improve the reading instruction for a wider range of students.
    - o Partnering with IPUL and offering stipends for parents to participate in the project activities will increase the likelihood of parent participation on LEA and building leadership teams and attendance at support calls with IPUL.
    - o Through collaborative efforts with ICfL, school and public librarians will increase their knowledge to encourage reading for struggling students.
    - o Identifying and addressing LEA needs will result in increased participation, engagement, and implementation of evidence-based practices.
    - o Implementing a formal fiscal monitoring plan will improve fiscal accountability.

Personnel/Workforce:
- Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
    - o Continuing development of a website to house project material
    - o Expand LEA personnel participating in the project to include the school librarians and parent representatives.
    - o IPUL plans to tailor Leading by Convening and Serving on Groups trainings to meet the needs of the project and deliver training as part of the Fall Institute.
    - o IPUL plans to facilitate monthly parent calls to support the parents as part of the LEA leadership team.
    - o Planned synchronous and asynchronous training will be offered to principals and special education directors (Leading by Convening), parents (Serving on Groups), and librarians (Cultivating Readers through Inclusion and Connection in the Library) with follow up calls throughout the year.
    - o Planned additional sustainable coaching resources will be developed and posted on the project website, as well as an electronic coaching fidelity platform, InsightCalibrate.
    - o Utilization of InsightCalibrate will allow coaches to practice identifying quality explicit instruction through an online platform and rate a video that measures the coach's skills and fidelity to the explicit instruction rubric Idaho uses to assess fidelity.
- Anticipated Outcomes:
    - o Continuing to build a website will increase participating LEA personnel in utilization of sustainable materials to implement evidence-based practices.
    - o Expansion of personnel will address gaps in the home-to-school and community literacy connection.

- Providing training to parents (Serving on Groups) and administrators (Leading by Convening) will increase the respective understanding of parents and administrators on the importance of collaboration for closing the reading proficiency gap.
- IPUL's ongoing support of parents will increase their engagement and sustain parent involvement.
- Synchronous and asynchronous trainings will increase and support engagement.
- The use of a coaching platform will increase the knowledge and implementation of coaching practices with fidelity.

Data System:

- Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
  - LEA coaches and instructional staff will use a virtual coaching platform that will collect more robust coaching and fidelity data.
  - Idaho will explore new digital tools to improve communication and dissemination of collected data.
  - The Idaho SPDG team will implement the SPDG evaluation plan which aligns with the SSIP evaluation plan but is more robust.
  - The Idaho SPDG team and external evaluator will develop data collection instruments
- Anticipated Outcomes:
  - Utilization of a coaching platform will allow the state to automate data collection on fidelity of implementation of reading instruction and coaching
  - Improved dissemination of data will increase buy-in and better inform stakeholders of project activities and outcomes.
  - The new data system improvements will result in more specific and higher-quality data. This will improve the ability of all stakeholders to make better informed decisions for continuous improvement purposes.
- Accountability and Quality Improvement:
  - Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
  - The SPDG funds will be used to increase accountability and quality improvement through the use of a virtual coaching platform.
  - Contract with external experts to evaluate fidelity of explicit instruction instructional coaching.
  - Update the SSIP evaluation plan to align with the SPDG evaluation plan.
- Anticipated Outcomes:
  - The coaching platform will provide more reliable data.
  - Better quality fidelity data will allow the team to identify future training needs.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

ISDE supported the implementation of five evidence-based practices:
Implementation Science Framework
Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA)
IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide
Instructional Coaching
Explicit Instruction

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Implementation Science Framework: Implementation science refers to the "methods or techniques used to enhance the adoption, implementation, and sustainability" of a program or practice (Eccles & Mittman, 2006). The Implementation

Science Framework provides methods and strategies to facilitate quality implementation and use of evidence-based practices. The SSIP utilizes the resources created by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) housed at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up (Cohorts in years 2, 3, and 4) LEAs utilize the EBPs within implementation science to focus on improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle is the EBP the Project has identified as a vehicle for change within the LEA system.

IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide: The Institute of Education Sciences Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade provides four recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills. The practice guide was developed utilizing rigorous research to provide specific recommendations for teaching reading. The evidence-based recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills include: Recommendation 1 – Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge; Recommendation 2 – Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3 – Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; and Recommendation 4 – Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

Instructional Coaching: Instructional coaching is the use of a LEA-identified staff that receives training in coaching practices to support the professional development and implementation of explicit instruction practices with specifically assigned instructional staff. The Instructional coach offers classroom modeling, supportive feedback, and specific observations of specific teaching practices.

Explicit Instruction: The LEA utilizes explicit instruction to deliver effective reading instruction to SWD. Dr. Anita Archer and Dr. Charles Hughes define explicit instruction as "a systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented" form of instruction. The Project provides training on the effective implementation of explicit instruction to coaches and teachers as a part of the Fall Institute. Coaches are provided additional training on the seven explicit instruction components within the RESET Rubric to support teachers with effective implementation of the EBP and evaluate the fidelity of implementation. Instructional staff implement and measure progress on each component throughout the year and receive coaching support on identified weaknesses in instructional delivery. Instructional staff receive expert TA from Project staff and contracted coaches in the LEA during the Fall Institute, twice a year during In-District Visits, and during monthly calls with literacy experts to further their understanding and implementation of the explicit instruction practices.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Implementation Science Framework: The State Leadership Team strengthens state-level infrastructure and LEAs implement EBPs using an implementation science framework. At the LEA level, implementation teams are formed, training on the Framework is provided by ISDE Project staff.

• Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Special Education Director Calls

• Tools Used: NIRN Initiative Inventory, Communication Plan Template, Implementation Drivers, Action Plan, Implementation Stages, and Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA)

• Data collected: Attendance, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials

• Impact on the SiMR: Through the use of Implementation Science, LEAs identify the personnel necessary to implement and sustain change, implement evidence-based practices with fidelity to impact student outcomes; and develop LEA leadership skills to sustain and scale-up practices across buildings and their LEA.

Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up (Cohorts in years 2, 3, and 4) LEAs utilize the EBPs within implementation science with a focus on improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle is the EBP the project has identified as a vehicle for change within the LEA and building systems. Building teams complete the PDSA cycle at least annually upon completion of their MTSS-R review. TA from Project staff is provided during monthly Special Education Director calls and In-District Visits to support their understanding of the process and promote effective implementation of the practice.

• Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Special Education Director Calls
• Tools Used: Action Plan worksheet
•   Data collected: Attendance, completed and submitted Action Plan, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials
• Impact on the SiMR: Through the use of a continuous improvement cycle, LEA and building leadership teams can track their progress in the implementation of evidence-based practices, use of student data to make decisions, improve the delivery of explicit instruction, align instruction across all tiers, and other LEA identified priorities. All of these activities improve outcomes for students.

IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide. SSIP LEAs are trained on the EBPs outlined in the IES Foundational Skills Guide. This training is provided every year for LEAs in the Readiness year during the Fall Institute, as well as through an online course designed to support instructional staff to implement early reading EBPs in the classroom. All instructional staff and coaches complete twenty modules in two parts over the span of the school year during the Readiness year. Completion, knowledge gain, and satisfaction is measured for each module to ensure the Project provides training that supports improved implementation of EBPs in reading. A hybrid version of the module course is available for teachers and coaches entering the project after the initial Readiness year. This will accommodate staff turnover, allowing new staff to gain the knowledge of the EBPs and participate fully in the project, since the original course is completed only during the Readiness year. Each subsequent year during the Fall Institute, instructional and coaching staff receive PD specific to the recommendations outlined in the IES Practice Guide.

• Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Special Education Director Calls, online PD
• Tools Used: Contracted Reading Specialist, synchronous and asynchronous trainings, website to house resources, Fall Institute
•   Data collected: Attendance, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials
• Impact on the SiMR: Providing quality professional development and resources to support instructional staff knowledge, skills, and abilities to provide explicit instruction specific to the foundations of reading has a positive impact on student outcomes.

Instructional Coaching: LEAs implement instructional coaching practices to support growth at the classroom level for students with disabilities. Coaching PD is delivered in a three-year cycle. Instructional coaches participate in trainings to improve their knowledge and skills in both explicit instruction and instructional coaching. Each year the Project has a specific coaching focus on Jim Knight's coaching practices and explicit instruction. LEA-identified coaches attend training during the Fall Institute specific to their year in the project. Coaches during the Readiness Year focus on the foundational skills of reading; Implementation Year focus on data decision making; Sustainability Year focus on vocabulary instruction; and the Scale-Up Year addresses reading comprehension. In the Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up years, instructional coaches also participate in a coaching-specific training in December.

• Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, Coaching PD (years 2, 3, and 4), In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Special Education Director Calls, online PD,
• Tools Used: Contracted consultants, synchronous and asynchronous training, website to house resources

- Data collected: Attendance, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials
- Impact on the SiMR: Providing quality professional development and resources to support coaching staff knowledge, skills, and abilities to provide instructional coaching with fidelity improves instructional staffs' delivery of explicit instruction, which, in turn, improves student reading outcomes.

Explicit Instruction: LEA instructional staff utilize explicit instruction to deliver effective reading instruction to students with disabilities. Dr. Anita Archer and Dr. Charles Hughes define explicit instruction as "a systematic, direct, engaging, and success oriented" form of instruction. The Project provides training on the effective implementation of explicit instruction to coaches and teachers as a part of the Fall Institute. Coaches and instructional staff are provided additional training on the 7 explicit instruction components within the RESET Rubric to support teachers with effective implementation of the EBP and to evaluate fidelity of implementation. Instructional staff implement and measure progress on each of the explicit instruction components throughout the year and receive coaching support on identified weaknesses in instructional delivery. Instructional staff receive expert TA from Project staff and contracted coaches during the Fall Institute, twice a year during In-District Visits, and during monthly calls with literacy experts to further their understanding and implementation of the explicit instruction practices.
- Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, Coaching PD (years 2, 3, and 4), In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Special Education Director Calls, online PD, teachers videotape instruction and self-reflect using the RESET Rubric, coaches assess instructional delivery using the RESET Rubric to guide coaching
- Tools Used: Contracted consultants, synchronous and asynchronous training, website to house resources, Fall Institute, RESET Rubric
- Data collected: Attendance, survey data, training materials, RESET Rubric data and instructional videos uploaded by instructional staff
- Impact on the SiMR: Providing quality professional development and resources to support coaches and instructional staff knowledge, skills, and abilities to provide explicit instruction to support the delivery of foundations of reading has a positive impact on student outcomes.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Idaho monitors fidelity of implementation on multiple levels; at the state, building and classroom levels. Below is a description of the instruments and processes used to monitor fidelity and a summary of the data collected in FFY 2020.

State-level systems assessment using the SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components worksheet
As a SPDG grantee, Idaho is required to complete the SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components worksheet annually to submit with the annual performance report (APR) in May. The SPDG State Leadership Team completed the worksheet from January through April 2021. The worksheet includes 16 components of high-quality professional development including personnel selection, quality of trainings, coaching, data systems and systemic leadership supports. The State Leadership Team developed an action plan for improving gaps in implementation and will continue assessing and updating the action plan.

Building-level systems assessment using the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support-Reading (MTSS-R) Checklist and Action Planning Tool
The MTSS-R Checklist and Action Planning Tool was developed by the National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL). It is an evaluation, prioritization and planning tool that is utilized by building leadership teams to assess their school infrastructure to support high-quality reading instruction for all students. Annually, building leadership teams complete the Checklist and prioritization process and develop an improvement plan. Teams use the data from the Checklist monthly during leadership team meetings along with a Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycle to update their action plans to continuously improve their implementation. The State Leadership Team uses the data to monitor building, cohort and

project-level systems improvements. FFY 2020 was the first year that Idaho used the MTSS-R Checklist. Building leadership teams completed the Checklist and Action Planning Tool at the Fall Institute in September 2020.

The Checklist is divided into 4 elements: Element 1: Core Reading Instruction and Intervention, Element 2: Data Use, Element 3: Professional Development and Coaching, Element 4: MTSS-R School Leadership. Each element is further broken down into sections and individual indicators. The average percentage of items implemented is reported below for each element.

Element 1: Core Reading Instruction and Intervention; 69%

Element 2: Data Use; 57%

Element 3: Professional Development and Coaching; 46%

Element 4: MTSS-R School Leadership; 60%

Classroom-level fidelity of explicit instruction assessment using the Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers (RESET) Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (RESET Rubric) and surveys

The RESET Rubric was developed under a grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education Institute for Education Sciences (IES). The Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (CDR) evaluates the teacher's implementation of a comprehensive decoding lesson taught using explicit systematic instruction. In a comprehensive decoding lesson, the focus is on the instruction and practice of accurate sound-symbol correspondence, word reading, encoding and reading connected text. The RESET Rubric consists of 7 components made up of 18 individual practices. In the SSIP project, instructional staff are required to record videos of their classroom instruction and review the video and self-reflect using the RESET Rubric. They then submit the video to their LEA instructional coach who also views the video and completes a RESET Rubric to assess implementation fidelity. The coach and instructional staff develop an action plan collaboratively that they review and update monthly. A full RESET Rubric is completed twice per year, in the fall and spring, to assess improvement in implementation fidelity. The State Leadership Team collects the RESET Rubric data from LEA coaches and summarizes the data to identify areas where participants might benefit from targeted training and to monitor improvement in implementation fidelity at the LEA, cohort and project levels.

Due to COVID, the SSIP LEAs were unable to collect and submit high-quality RESET Rubric data during the reporting period. With the support of the SPDG funds, the State Leadership Team was able to partner with a vendor to provide a virtual coaching platform that will facilitate the video recording and coaching process and will automatically collect RESET Rubric data beginning in FFY 2021.

The State Leadership Team also collected data on participants perceptions of their growth in knowledge and skills related to explicit instruction delivery. In the End of Year Survey sent to participants in May 2021, instructional staff reported their level of ability increased from a 6.1 (n=7) at the beginning of the school year, on a scale from 1-10 (1 being beginner, 10 being expert), to a 7.6 (n=7) at the end of the year. Additionally, they reported an increase in their level of ability to use explicit instruction strategies when teaching reading from an average of 6.5 to 7.25 (n=4).

Fidelity of coaching assessment using the Coaching Literacy Instruction Fidelity Tool (C-LIFT) (to be developed):

Through a thorough review of literature, a rubric for measuring the core components of instructional coaching, which also aligns with the proposed training curriculum for LEA coaches, will be identified and/or adapted in FFY 2021.

Training fidelity of implementation using the High-Quality Professional Development (HQPD) Observation Checklist:

The HQPD observation checklist is a 22-item instrument that addresses six domains present in high-quality professional development: Preparation, Introduction, Demonstration, Engagement, Evaluation/Reflection, and Mastery. Beginning in the 2021-22 school year, it will be used to provide ongoing feedback and coaching to trainers, as well as, a guidance document given to trainers when designing or revising their training materials/design.

Virtual training fidelity using the Virtual Facilitation Checklist (to be developed):
In the same vein as the HQPD observation checklist, a virtual facilitation checklist will be developed, based on identified best practices, to (1) assist planners and facilitators in the design and delivery of virtual collaboratives and (2) observe virtual collaboratives in order to provide ongoing feedback to planners and facilitators for process improvements.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The State Leadership Team collects various data for progress monitoring and continuous improvement of the SSIP evidence-based practices. The results of the progress monitoring support the state's decision to continue the ongoing use of the previously identified evidence-based practices. The data collection instruments, processes and data summaries are described below.

Essential Components for Reading Instruction (ECRI) Part I & II online training modules
An important part of the SSIP training for instructional staff and coaches is the ECRI online training modules. The purpose of these modules is for participants to increase their knowledge and ability to effectively instruct students when teaching reading. The State Leadership Team collects progress monitoring data on participants' completion and learning. Participants complete a short survey after finishing each module. The survey asks questions related to the quality of the training and participant satisfaction, as well as their perceptions around how they've increased their understanding of the course content and ability to implement it. The State Leadership Team tracks the completion progress of participants as they work their way through the modules and analyzes the survey data to better understand how participants perceive their improvements. 36 SSIP participants completed at least the first 10 online training modules (Part I) and 28 of those completed the whole 20 module series during FFY 2020.
90% (n=342) of SSIP participants reported satisfaction with the training modules. 23% (n=88) of participants said that they understood how to teach the big idea or strategy of the module before the training (proficient or expert on a 5-point scale of novice, beginner, competent, proficient, expert), which increased to 62% (239) after the training. In regards to their ability to utilize the big idea or strategy from the module in their instruction, 23% (89) said they were able to utilize the big idea or strategy before the training compared to 62% (n=238) after the training.

Post-training surveys
Fall Institute Post-Training Survey
The Fall Institute is the SSIP training kick off in which LEA leadership teams participate. The training is delivered over multiple days. Teams come together to complete the MTSS-R Checklist for the school year and then participate in various other trainings on evidence-based practices according to their role. After the training, the State Leadership Team sends the participants a post-training survey which asks questions about their satisfaction with the training and improvements in knowledge and abilities around the evidence-based practices. The survey responses are used to better understand in which areas the trainings need improvement and to develop an improvement plan.
After the Fall Institute 2020, 90% of survey respondents reported satisfaction with the training (n=11). Participants answered questions about their perceived competency around the learning objectives of the various trainings they attended before and after participating in the training. Data aggregated for all the questions asking participants about their perceived growth according to the learning objectives showed that participants reported 68% competency before the training and 86% after the training (n=44) (competent, proficient or expert on a 5-point scale of novice, beginner, competent, proficient, expert).

Coaching Training Survey
The Coaching Training took place in December 2020 and was attended by LEA coaches in years 2, 3, and 4 of SSIP participation. The purpose of the training was for LEA coaches to increase their knowledge of effective instructional

coaching practices and ability to implement them. The Coaching Training survey was sent out to participants after the training. 100% (n=8) of survey respondents were satisfied with the training. 62.5% of respondents reported competency around the learning objectives before the training compared to 100% after the training (competent, proficient or expert on a 5-point scale of novice, beginner, competent, proficient, expert).

Spring Institute Post-Training Survey

The Spring Institute is the SSIP's annual data training that takes place in May each year. The FFY 2020 Spring Institute took place in May 2021. Participants were sent the Spring Institute Post-Training Survey after completing the training. Similar to the other post-training surveys, respondents are asked about their perceptions around the quality of the training and satisfaction. 100% of respondents reported they were satisfied with the training (n=29).

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Implementation Science Framework: The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support building leadership teams in the implementation of evidence-based practices, review and revise their MTSS-R process, and support instructional staff to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.

Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA) ISDE The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support building leadership teams to identify areas of need through the MTSS-R process and create and implement a continuous improvement cycle to support instructional staff to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.

IES Foundational Skills Practice: The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support instructional staff to implement evidence-based instruction practices

New activities or strategies that support SiMR:

o Addition of monthly collaborative calls for instructional staff and coaches with literacy experts, differentiated by year in the project.

Anticipated Outcomes

o Additional monthly support will provide additional training, TA and the opportunity to ask questions that will increase the knowledge, skills, and abilities of instructional staff to implement evidence-based practices. Instructional staff and coaches will be able to collaborate with their peers across the state and learn from each other.

Instructional Coaching:

New activities or strategies that support SiMR:

o Addition of a new coaching platform with a fidelity feature, InsightCalibrate. InsightCalibrate provide coaches with practice videos to rate and comment on the level of fidelity of explicit instruction. Annually, there is a new video that will measure coaches' ability to observe and identify the level of implementation of explicit instruction by instructional staff.

o Coaches will upload videos of themselves coaching the instructional staff they support. Contracted consultants will review the video and complete a coaching fidelity rubric. Consultants will meet one-on-one with the coach to provide targeted coaching support.

o Addition of monthly collaborative calls with literacy experts for coaches, differentiated by the year they are in the project.

Anticipated Outcomes

o Practice identifying levels of implementation of instructional staffs' delivery of explicit instruction will improve coaches' ability to identify high-quality instructional practices and areas for improvement. Coaches will improve their ability to effectively coach the staff they support if they understand what high-quality instruction looks like.

o Assessing coaches' fidelity of coaching and providing the opportunity for coaches to participate in one-on-one

coaching with experts will improve coaches' ability to coach and benefit instructional staff and students in the delivery of quality reading instruction.

o Additional support monthly will provide additional training, TA and the opportunity to ask questions that will increase the knowledge, skills, and abilities of coaches to implement evidence-based practices. Coaches will be able to collaborate with their peers across the state and learn from each other.

Explicit Instruction:

New activities or strategies that support SiMR:

o Addition of a new virtual coaching platform, ADVANCEfeedback. ADVANCEfeedback provides a location for instructional staff to upload instructional videos and receive synchronous and asynchronous coaching.

o Addition of monthly collaborative calls with literacy experts and coaches, differentiated by the year they are in the project.

Anticipated Outcomes

o The coaching platform will increase the number of videos submitted, the quality of coaching provided, and how teachers reflect on their instructional practices.

o Additional support monthly provides additional training, TA and the opportunity to ask questions that will increase the knowledge, skills, and abilities of instructional staff to implement evidence-based practices.

o Instructional staff will increase their fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction which will improve their instruction and student reading outcomes.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho engaged diverse stakeholders representing a wide range of perspectives. These stakeholders informed and provided input to the SSIP State Leadership Team on how to overcome challenges, improve implementation of evidence-based practices, improve the evaluation and address gaps in the SSIP project through the SPDG application. These suggestions were ultimately written into the SPDG application as an expansion of the SSIP work. Idaho conducted meetings with the following stakeholders over the course of the reporting period:

• Current SSIP participants including special education directors, teachers and principals

•   SPDG Core Team comprised of staff from ISDE and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA)

•   Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) comprised of members from organizations focused on the needs of individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

•   Directors Advisory Council (DAC), comprised of special education directors from all regions of the state and of LEAs of varying sizes.

•   Idaho Commission for Libraries

•   Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL)

• Boise State University

•   University of Idaho

•   Staff from other ISDE divisions including the English/Language Arts Coordinator, Family and Community Engagement Coordinator, Title 1-C: Migrant Education Coordinator, Federal Programs Director, and English Language Arts/Literacy Assessment Coordinator

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, SEAP and DAC, to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. In September of 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview

of state historical data, and anticipated impacts for Idaho's educational systems. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and about future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

• How to get involved;

• Types of groups;

• Understanding data;

• Roles of families on groups; and

• Skills for serving on groups.

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. The ISDE provided examples of target options using FFY 2015 assessment data as a baseline to establish better alignment with Idaho's Consolidated State Plan. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information, and participated in discussions. Group discussions were facilitated by an ISDE staff member who provided additional information and clarifications on the indicator(s). Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions.

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact LEAs, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students.

In the small group discussions, SEAP members expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. Overall, for assessment, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative target increases.

Reading assessments show some decrease in proficiency, but stakeholders indicated that consistency between target progression would be beneficial. The aligned target progressions would be easier to communicate to stakeholders and reduce their confusion while still promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Idaho will continue to provide data with estimates on student counts to help stakeholders relate to the information and provide meaningful input.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Stakeholders expressed concerns about using FFY 2015 data as baseline and about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on student learning and how that would impact LEAs' abilities to meet rigorous SPP/APR targets. They also requested the information be translated into student-centered examples, as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students.

Idaho scheduled follow-up work sessions with stakeholders to address their expressed concerns. In preparation for the work sessions, Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students

positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. In response to SEAP members' concern about the proposed baseline data being old, ISDE also updated the baseline year to school year 2018-19. The 2018-19 school year represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and reflected changes in Idaho processes based on the Idaho Consolidated State Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training.

The work session began in a large group, with all participants receiving an orientation to the materials and additional information on how ISDE uses targets to impact Idaho's educational system. Discussions included the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including systems challenges and supports and the impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on education, then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets. After establishing norms in the large group, the work session participants were divided into three small-group breakouts facilitated by an ISDE staff and a SEAP leadership member to discuss assessment data and target setting. The SEAP leadership member of each group was assigned to be a notetaker. After discussions in the small group, participants returned to the large group to share about their conversations. Stakeholders suggested going with the more conservative targets so as not to cause LEA and school staff to feel defeated and overburdened with unattainable targets. Stakeholders thought the better approach was to keep targets near the baseline for a few years so that LEAs could recover from the impact of COVID and then begin increasing targets at a higher rate. Idaho took the stakeholders' suggestions and decided on the more conservative targets.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

All activities are addressed in previous sections.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

See previous sections.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Idaho has not identified any new barriers that have not been addressed in prior sections. The ISDE Leadership Team will monitor all activities, implementation, and data collection to determine if additional supports are needed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

The current theory of action. https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/Idaho-State-Systematic-Improvement-Plan-Theory-of-Action.pdf

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State must provide a link or narrative description of the current Theory of Action.

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Dr. Charlie Silva

Title:

State Director of Special Education

Email:

csilva@sde.idaho.gov

Phone:

2083326806

Submitted on:

04/27/22 7:33:23 PM