

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2023**

Idaho



PART B DUE February 3, 2025

**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 Department of Education supports public education across the state by providing funding, aligning policies, and offering technical assistance to families, educators, and schools. Under new leadership since January 2023, the Department has rebranded to focus on strengthening educational outcomes and supporting schools through strategic leadership.

The Department's mission is to provide Idaho students, educators, and school leaders with tools and resources to achieve academic excellence. The vision is to ensure that all Idaho students have access to a high-quality education that prepares them for future success as engaged citizens. Core values guiding the Department's work include intentional listening, collaboration, and integrity.

Priority goals for the Department include improving literacy and math achievement, recruiting and retaining quality educators, modernizing the school funding formula, addressing student behavioral health issues, and preparing students for life beyond the classroom. The Department's efforts are aimed at ensuring Idaho's education system meets the needs of all students while promoting continuous improvement and effective resource use.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

188

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.

Idaho's System of Support and General Supervision helps LEAs meet the IDEA requirements while improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The Department conducts monitoring activities throughout the year, including General Supervision File Reviews (GSFR), LEA Determinations, Significant Disproportionality (SD), Dispute Resolution (DR), Fiscal Reviews, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Idaho's System of Support and General Supervision ensures compliance with IDEA Part B by monitoring all LEAs annually. The Department uses onsite visits, desk audits, and self-assessments to review key indicators such as child find activities, IEP processes, and fiscal management. LEAs are selected for monitoring using performance data and categorized into different support levels to provide targeted assistance. The Department collaborates with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) to provide professional development and support. SESTA is a partnership with the University of Idaho and Boise State University.

GSFR Monitoring Activities includes a Self-Assessment and also focuses on compliance with Indicators 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, and 13. This involves ongoing proactive support to all LEAs every year, monitoring during the review process, and follow up support for LEAs out of compliance. On November 1, each LEA's list of reviewed students must be submitted. In the fourth week of November, using this list, the Department selects student files for comprehensive or abbreviated review. LEAs then receive a notification about which students have been selected for review. By the second Monday in December, LEAs submit their files and by the second full week of December, the Department and SESTA will review submitted files and notify LEAs starting in January. LEAs can upload existing evidence to verify compliance until Notifications of Noncompliance are sent on February 14th, with Correction of Noncompliance due on June 30. All LEAs must complete the GSFR every year.

Per QA 23-01, Idaho includes LEA performance on compliance indicators, valid, reliable and timely data, correction of identified noncompliance, and other data available to the State about the LEA's compliance with IDEA, including any relevant audit findings in annual determinations. LEA Determinations involve desk audits covering Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, which are virtual or onsite. This consists of ongoing proactive support to all LEAs, monitoring during the review process, and follow up support for LEAs at risk or out of compliance. The State uses a detailed process to determine LEA compliance with IDEA annually, as outlined in QA 23-01. This process relies on valid, reliable, and timely data, such as performance on SPP indicators, compliance monitoring, IDEA Part B funding reports, and audit findings. The data is verified through checks, audits, and monitoring activities for accuracy. LEAs must fix noncompliance within one year and provide updated data to show both individual and systemic corrections. State staff verify these fixes and offer support for timely resolution. Noncompliance findings include a corrective action plan that guides technical assistance. Audit findings related to federal awards are managed according to 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.332 and 200.521. Fiscal compliance, including requirements like MOE and appropriate use of IDEA funds, is also reviewed. Audit findings, especially those with significant or repeated issues, influence the LEA's determination. LEAs may be assigned to one of four categories: Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, or Needs Substantial Intervention. Every LEA receives a determination every year.

SD monitoring is onsite and virtual, including desk audits and self-assessment, which entails ongoing proactive support to all LEAs, monitoring during the review process, and follow-up support for LEAs at risk or out of compliance. LEAs receive their SD report annually with three years of calculations. If an LEA exceeded the state threshold in one or more areas, they are notified if they are at risk (exceeding the threshold for 1 or 2 years), or formally identified (above the threshold for three or more years). LEAs that have exceeded the threshold for three consecutive years and have SD must comply with the following requirements: Provide for the review and, if appropriate, revision of policies, practices, and procedures to ensure compliance with the requirements of IDEA; publicly report on the revision of policies, practices, and set aside 15% of IDEA, Part B funds for CCEIS to address factors contributing to the SD, with CCEIS plans reviewed and approved by the Department and documented in the IDEA Part B grant application. LEAs

identified at risk in year two must participate in an onsite information gathering meeting between the Department, SESTA, and LEA educational partners. Calculations are done in March and April; Superintendents and Special Education Directors receive their findings in May. SD is calculated for every LEA, every year.

The DR office provides ongoing support to parents and LEAs by responding to telephone and email inquiries to answer questions, provide resources, and help address concerns related to policy, practices, and procedures specific to IDEA. DR staff then connect families, LEAs, and members of the community with resources, people, other agencies, and DR options (facilitation, mediation, state administrative complaints, and due process hearings) that provide support to constituents and enables them to resolve their IDEA concerns at the lowest level appropriate.

The Fiscal Monitoring and Accountability team reviews programs for compliance with IDEA, focusing on data collection and analysis. They monitor federal grant subrecipients to ensure they follow policies aligned with federal regulations, including 2 CFR Part 200 (Uniform Grant Guidance), 34 CFR Part 76 (Education Department Regulations), and 34 CFR Part 300 (Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities). The Fiscal Accountability Office performs an annual fiscal risk assessment and regularly reviews LEAs, using a rubric to identify and report findings. LEAs are reviewed at least once every five years, with the number of reviews based on risk levels. Fiscal monitoring checks compliance with IDEA's provisions like MOE, proportionate share, budgets, internal controls, and cost allocability. Findings of noncompliance lead to corrective action plans and technical assistance. For audit findings, management decisions are made as per 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.332 and 200.521. IDEA compliance is ensured through corrective action plans, technical help, and sometimes financial sanctions. LEAs must provide and certify documentation for IDEA Part B funding requests to ensure allowable costs, and annual reviews address key compliance areas like MOE, excess cost reporting, supplement-not-supplant, private school proportionate share, and CEIS/CCEIS reporting.

Compliance and implementation of SSIP is ensured with integrated monitoring including IRI (Idaho Reading Indicator) monthly progress tracking. IRI and ISAT (Idaho Standards Achievement Test) results are examined with survey feedback to evaluate implementation and student outcomes. Skill and application-based training on best practices and multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) is monitored through beginning and end-of-year surveys for continuous improvement. LEAs must submit fiscal quarterly drawdowns, with line-item justifications tracked against the initial budget. LEAs found noncompliant are given steps for correction until compliance is achieved, with a goal of compliance within two weeks. Based on IRI and ISAT results reviewed every spring, LEAs with the lowest literacy scores are invited to join the initiative. LEAs are tracked over four years to build capacity and sustain improvements, with new LEAs added as needed. All data is reviewed annually.

Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified compliance.

Every year, the General Supervision File Review (GSFR) is conducted for all LEAs with a child count, focusing on eligibility and IEP processes. LEAs complete an internal review of a set number of student files based on Child Count data. The Department selects three files from this review, prioritizing secondary IEPs, students with Specific Learning Disabilities, and Early Childhood files. If concerns arise around specific indicators (e.g., 4, 9, 10, 13), file selection is more targeted. The review is documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). Noncompliance notifications are issued on February 14, with corrections required by June 30 and full compliance expected within 365 days. LEAs must upload two corrected files per noncompliant area to demonstrate systemic improvement. Targeted technical assistance is provided to LEAs with three consecutive years of noncompliance or 13+ issues in the latest review.

During fiscal monitoring, the Department Fiscal Accountability Office requests preliminary general ledger detail files for random sampling, and other pertinent fiscal documents, policies, and procedures. LEA Findings Reports are issued including a comprehensive corrective action plan to track the progress and completion of each activity before a final closeout letter of fiscal compliance is issued.

Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.

Idaho primarily uses the Idaho System of Educational Excellence (ISEE) to collect data for both monitoring and SPP/APR indicators for the entirety of the fiscal year. ISEE is Idaho's K-12 Longitudinal Data System, which supports budgeting processes, data submissions, and delivers information to educational partners to create data-driven decisions. The source data for Indicator 8 is a Parent Involvement Survey, which consists of two cohorts that include all parents of students included in the November Child Count. The survey is available starting the first week in June and closes in the first week in July, with the analysis done by the Department. The source data for Indicator 14 is a survey that is analyzed by Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), a third-party vendor. Contact information is collected in March, with the survey opening the first week in May and closing in the first week of September.

Data used to report Indicator 3 comes from the ISAT and the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). These tests are administered to all Idaho public school students in grades 3-8 and 11 by a vendor (Cambium) in collaboration with the Department's Assessment Office. The testing window is from mid-March to the end of May, with ISAT scores administered and tracked through Cambium, which has a secure portal to access assessment results and view reports on student performance. At the completion of the testing window, the Assessment Office collaborates with Cambium to complete data validation, which includes enrollment matching, data cleanup, and an Appeals window to ensure that medical exemptions are appropriately applied. After the data have been finalized, they are stored in the Department's data warehouse under the Idaho State Board of Education. The data then are used for various purposes, including the reporting of Indicator 3

Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.

Idaho issues compliance findings by LEA rather than listing each instance separately. All noncompliant instances discovered in an LEA's files are grouped together under a single LEA-level finding. The LEA is then responsible for both fixing the affected student files and proving the underlying systemic issue has been resolved. When the Department identifies noncompliance in one or more student files, each LEA must correct every individual instance. The deadline for correction is June 30 but no later than one year from the date of notification. Along with addressing each student-level error, the LEA must also demonstrate that the issue is corrected system-wide, meaning subsequent files reviewed must show 100% compliance for that requirement and the LEA must provide evidence of activities implemented within the LEA to address understanding and increase compliant practices. Fiscal monitoring issues findings by LEA, tracking each finding by type and corrective actions required

If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

The state does not have a pre-finding correction policy.

Describe the State's system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

Idaho reviews LEA performance annually by evaluating various compliance and results indicators from the SPP/APR. As specified in OSEP QA23-01, Idaho includes LEA's performance on each compliance indicator (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13), valid, reliable and timely data submission by the LEAs, timely correction of identified noncompliance, and other data that is received via monitoring and other sources. LEAs are evaluated annually and assigned a determination level—Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, or Needs Substantial Intervention—based on compliance and

performance data. LEAs in lower tiers receive more frequent monitoring and targeted assistance. When noncompliance is found, LEAs must correct issues within a year and show 100% system-wide compliance. If corrections are not made, the LEA may face higher intervention levels, including more intensive audits or mandatory training. The Department selects onsite visits or desk audits based on the severity of issues and prior performance.

The Department prioritizes training and guidance through partnerships like SESTA but may impose stricter measures if an LEA fails to improve. Risk-based fiscal reviews ensure compliance with financial policies, and serious fiscal issues may lead to stricter controls or withheld funds. Overall, Idaho's system combines progressive interventions and monitoring to address noncompliance and areas of improvement.

The State uses a system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of noncompliance and address areas needing improvement, consistent with IDEA Part B enforcement provisions, the Uniform Guidance, and State rules. If the Department identifies a subgrantee as high-risk based on criteria such as a history of noncompliance, failure to meet performance goals, or other concerns, it may impose additional specific conditions under 2 CFR 200.208. These conditions may include requiring reimbursement payments instead of advances, withholding authority to proceed until acceptable performance is demonstrated, requiring detailed financial reports, increasing project monitoring, providing technical assistance, or requiring additional approvals. The subgrantee will be notified in writing of the conditions, reasons, actions required for removal, timeline, and how to request reconsideration. Once deficiencies are corrected, conditions are removed.

If noncompliance persists despite these measures, the Department may apply further remedies, including withholding payments, disallowing noncompliant activities, suspending or terminating grants, recommending suspension or debarment, or pursuing other enforcement actions as allowed by 2 CFR 200.339. Before suspension or termination, the Department will provide the subgrantee an opportunity to object and submit documentation. A written determination will be issued within 30 days and will be final.

If a subgrant application is denied or funds are withheld in violation of State or federal regulations, the applicant may request a hearing under 34 CFR 76.401. If the Department's action is found to be contrary to law, it will be ordered to rescind its decision. If the Department fails to comply, the applicant may appeal to the U.S. Department of Education within 20 days. If the decision is upheld, the ruling is final, and no further appeal is permitted.

Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.

Idaho reviews LEA performance annually by evaluating compliance and results indicators from the SPP/APR, including timely evaluations, early childhood transitions, graduation rates, and assessment outcomes. Each LEA receives a percentage score based on these indicators and is ranked from highest to lowest performance. LEAs are placed into one of four determination levels: Meets Requirements (top 80%), Needs Assistance (bottom 15%), Needs Intervention (bottom 5%), or Needs Substantial Intervention (for those needing significant help to meet IDEA requirements). More information can be found at [https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/1078/local-education-agency-lea-determination-differentiated-levels-of-support/content/index.html#/#/](https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/1078/local-education-agency-lea-determination-differentiated-levels-of-support/content/index.html#/).

LEA Superintendents and Special Education Directors receive their Determination Report each June, which outlines their score, supporting data, and areas for improvement. This process is part of Idaho's broader System of Support and General Supervision, which includes monitoring, compliance checks, and dispute resolution. LEA determination results are made publicly available on the Department's Special Education webpage to promote transparency and accountability. The tiered determination system allows the state to provide targeted support and ensure compliance with IDEA to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.

For a full, user-friendly overview, please see the Idaho Special Education Manual 2024 and the Idaho System of Support & General Supervision Handbook: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/files/shared/Idaho-Special-Education-Manual-2024.pdf> and <https://sde.idaho.gov/sped/files/handbooks/Idaho-General-Support-and-Supervision-Handbook.pdf>. Or visit SESTA <https://idahotc.com/SESTA> or ITC <https://idahotc.com/>.

Technical Assistance System:

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

Technical Assistance (TA), Targeted TA (TTA), and Professional Development (PD) are core parts of Idaho's general support and supervision for special education. These services align with IDEA, the SPP/APR indicators, and the goal of improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The Department partners with SESTA to develop TA activities informed by LEA reporting and compliance data. This allows the Department to differentiate support based on local needs. Resources are available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) and the Department's Special Education webpage. The ITC provides instructional webinars, training modules, and quick guides on various topics (e.g., Accessible Educational Materials, Behavior, IEPs, Secondary Transition, etc.). The Department's website features documents and forms like the Idaho State Special Education Manual. Additionally, LEAs can request assistance year-round from SESTA coordinators who specialize in instruction, behavior, and IDEA compliance. SESTA then compiles these requests to shape future training. The Department also offers comprehensive training and support in areas like New Teacher Essentials, Secondary Transition, Fiscal Accountability, Early Childhood, Results Driven Accountability, Parent Resources, Comprehensive Evaluation, and Behavior.

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.

Idaho's Professional Development (PD) system ensures that special education service providers have the necessary skills to improve outcomes for children with disabilities through a variety of training programs and partnerships. The Department's Special Education Division funds these efforts in collaboration with key partners, including Idaho SESTA, the Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHD) at the University of Idaho, and the Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies at Boise State University.

PD initiatives focus on a range of topics to meet the diverse needs of educators and students. Programs like the Autism Supports Project help school staff assess and implement effective strategies for students with autism, while the Idaho Assistive Technology Project (IATP) increases access to assistive devices for people with disabilities. The Pyramid Model Collaborative promotes social and emotional development in young children, and the Cultivating Readers project focuses on improving early literacy instruction for all students, including those with disabilities. The Pathways to Partnerships project and the Idaho Transition Institute promote secondary programs and community partnerships that aim to increase post-secondary for students with disabilities. Resources and training materials are centralized through ITC, providing educators with easy access to webinars, modules, and guides on topics such as IEPs, behavior management, and secondary transition.

Additional training opportunities include regional workshops, such as Data Drill Down, where educators analyze student performance data, and the ISEE Roadshow, which focuses on data quality and reporting procedures. Collaborative efforts with agencies like Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW) and Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) support early childhood programs, secondary transition planning, and employment

readiness for students with disabilities. The Youth Empowerment Services (YES) program offers further training to support students with mental health needs. Through these projects and partnerships, Idaho provides ongoing, targeted professional development to improve educational outcomes and ensure high quality support for students.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The Department engages a diverse group of educational partners, including parents, higher education institutions, IDVR, IDHW, juvenile corrections, and charter and private schools, to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Feedback from these partners helps refine targets, policies, and improvement strategies for key indicators like SSIP. The Department prioritizes cultural sensitivity by using the term “educational partners” out of respect for Idaho’s Native American communities.

Educational partners are involved early in the planning process and encouraged to provide feedback during public comment periods. The Department conducts Data Drill Down sessions to review LEA and state-level data, discuss challenges, and identify improvement strategies. Visual tools, like infographics, help partners understand data trends and the impact of meeting higher targets.

Small and large group discussions are held to review changes, and follow-up workgroups continue refining improvement strategies. Surveys conducted by the Department and SESTA gather ongoing feedback from school staff, including directors, principals, and teachers. Current efforts focus on improving Indicator 8 (Parent Involvement) data collection and revising criteria for identifying students with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD). These collaborative efforts ensure educational partners actively shape special education policies.

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

NO

Number of Parent Members:

13

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.

The Department actively involves parents in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress for special education programs. Parent engagement occurs through various advisory groups, including SEAP and IPUL, as well as local and statewide advocacy committees. The Department seeks feedback from parents before finalizing plans, offering open comment periods to review proposed changes to the SPP/APR.

The Department meets with parents and partners at least quarterly to discuss key indicators, review progress data, and set targets. To help partners better understand the data and goals, the Department provides visual tools such as infographics that show how meeting higher targets improves student outcomes. Training sessions are offered through IPUL, including “Serving on Groups” workshops, to help parents engage effectively in decision-making.

Parent engagement is ongoing, with regular group discussions on challenges, progress, and improvement strategies. In 2023, SEAP requested more focused discussions on topics like early childhood and secondary transitions, fiscal matters, and student outcomes on statewide assessments. The Department continues to collaborate with parents to improve data collection for Indicator 8 and to revise SLD eligibility criteria. Parents play a critical role in shaping these efforts, and the Department plans to share more updates in future submissions.

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.

The Department conducts various activities to help parents support initiatives that improve outcomes for children with disabilities. IPUL provides Serving on Groups training, teaching parents how to participate in decision-making groups, understand data, and contribute to school leadership. The Department uses State Professional Development Grant (SPDG) funds to encourage parent participation by offering stipends for attending trainings and monthly calls organized by IPUL. Parents also serve on school leadership teams to strengthen the implementation of SSIP. Additionally, Department staff facilitate the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition with representation from other state agencies, higher ed, parents, and will soon be adding students. This work group creates resources for students, parents and educators and also serves partly as an advisory group that provides guidance on coordination of services aimed at increasing post-school success of students with disabilities.

Training opportunities for parents and educators include live and recorded sessions on group participation and literacy improvement. Follow-up sessions throughout the year ensure ongoing collaboration and reinforce learning. The Idaho Assistive Technology Project (IATP) increases access to assistive devices, while the Idaho AT4All website offers a platform to find used devices for sale, loan, or giveaway.

The Department provides Dispute Resolution (DR) information to ensure parents and schools know their options for resolving conflicts. The DR office, in partnership with SESTA, provides regular updates and guidance to educational partners. The Department also holds regular meetings with partners to review progress, address challenges, and recommend improvements. In response to SEAP’s 2023 request, the Department introduced smaller group sessions focused on support and monitoring, transitions, fiscal issues, and student outcomes to keep parents engaged and informed.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

The Department collaborates with various educational partners to gather public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Key partners include SEAP, Idaho Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Idaho Head Start Collaboration Office, DAC, IICST, and IPUL. These groups provide diverse perspectives that shape the SPP/APR, particularly priority performance indicators like Indicator 17. Partners include parents, educators, vocational rehabilitation professionals, corrections staff, and health agencies. Feedback is collected through public comment periods, meetings, webinars, and training sessions, such as the Data Drill Down training. The Department uses accessible infographics to help partners understand how meeting targets improves student outcomes.

The Department provides training on target-setting methods and organizes discussions to explain changes to the SPP/APR and their impact. Partners review data trends and provide feedback on conservative and aggressive targets. In response, the Department created estimates showing the number of

students who would benefit if targets were met.

The Department holds regular meetings with partners at least quarterly to discuss progress, challenges, and potential improvements. Based on feedback, mini-group sessions have been added to focus on areas like early childhood and secondary transitions, fiscal issues, and statewide assessments. The Department is also working to improve parent involvement and revise criteria for identifying students with SLD based on input from educational partners.

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 shares its special education performance data with the public through several channels. After the SPP/APR clarification period ends, the Department posts detailed reports on its website. These reports include comparisons of LEA performance against state targets for all SPP/APR indicators, along with LEA determination levels, in an accessible Excel format available at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>. Additional performance data is also available on <https://idahoschools.org/> and the Accountability Results page at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/Accountability/results.html>. This information is also shared directly with LEAs through LEA determinations and Data Drill Down training sessions.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2022 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 2022 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2022 APR in 2024, is available.

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

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/>

<https://idahoschools.org/>

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/accountability/>

For information specific to SPP/APR indicators, go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/> and select State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report. Information, including the comparison of LEA performance against state targets, is available by submission year.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2024 and 2025 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2025 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 2024 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2026, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) 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 ED*Facts* 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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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 Data¹

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	63.84%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	65.48%	70.70%	63.84%	63.85%	63.90%
Data	65.48%	62.45%	71.51%	60.29%	65.57%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	65.05%	66.21%	67.37%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes members from various groups, such as parents of students with disabilities, educators, state agencies like the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), charter schools, private schools, and the Idaho Department of Education (Department).

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) is another important group for setting targets. It includes 14 special education directors from across the state, representing different types of school districts, such as small, large, urban, and rural areas.

The Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) is made up of various organizations, including vocational rehabilitation, disability rights, and schools, to help with transition services for students with disabilities.

Idaho prefers to call these groups educational partners instead of "stakeholders" because the term "stakeholders" has negative connotations for some Native American groups.

In winter 2021, Idaho set targets for Indicator 1, which is related to graduation rates. The Department trained educational partners on how to set targets and held discussions in small and large groups. These discussions included reviewing changes, potential impacts, and historical data. Educational partners recommended using 2019 data as the baseline, since it was unaffected by COVID-19.

During discussions, partners expressed concerns about COVID-19's impact on student learning, staffing shortages, and other challenges. For graduation rates, they recommended keeping targets near the baseline for a few years due to the long-term effort required to graduate students. They also suggested setting more ambitious targets for the last three years to reduce the gap between students with and without disabilities. Idaho set a target of a 3.53% increase in graduation rates by FFY 2025. The Department continues to meet quarterly with educational partners to track progress and discuss improvements.

Prepopulated Data

¹ Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,310
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	363
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	67
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	365

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
1,310	2,105	65.57%	65.05%	62.23%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted educational outcomes for our students, contributing to observed slippage in graduation rates and related metrics. Several key factors contributed to this decline:
 Employment: During the pandemic, some students secured employment opportunities and did not return to school, impacting graduation rates.
 Graduation Requirement Adjustments: A higher proportion of students were reported as completing adapted graduation requirements rather than meeting regular graduation standards.
 Challenges with Online Learning: The transition to online learning created significant barriers for many students, including struggles to adapt to remote instruction, resulting in reduced academic engagement and performance in activities that would lead to graduation.
 Chronic Absenteeism and Follow-Up Gaps: Chronic absenteeism increased during this time, exacerbated by limited capacity to follow up effectively with absent students resulting in decreased graduation rates.

These factors collectively impacted our ability to maintain steady progress in graduation rates.

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 03, 2023, may be viewed at: <https://www.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)

Idaho recognizes a significant gap between the graduation rates of students with disabilities and other students. To address this, Idaho is working with national technical assistance providers like the IDEA Data Center and the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition to improve its system. The state has a plan to identify the lowest-performing schools for graduation rates, and these schools must create plans for improvement. Although the state's accountability system no longer directly links to graduation rates, there is still a focus on improving graduation outcomes for students with disabilities. The Department is working with educational partners to set new goals for these improvements.
 The Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system evaluates Local Education Agencies (LEAs) based on graduation rates and other performance indicators. LEAs are given support based on their performance, and all LEAs must review data on students with disabilities every year. The Department provides tools like self-assessment protocols and SMART goals to help LEAs improve their graduation rates. LEAs needing more help can work directly with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators.
 Internal communication within the Department has improved, helping to clarify timelines, share training information, and enhance coordination. Despite staffing shortages at LEAs, the Department continues to offer professional development through webinars and training sessions. The Secondary Special Education Coordinator leads monthly webinars on secondary transition and other special education topics to improve access to training.
 The Department also offers data and coding training to LEA staff through various platforms, including annual training sessions like the Data Drill Down and webinars. The Transition Institute, held annually, brings together LEAs, higher education, and other state agencies to improve transition services for students with disabilities. The Transition Institute helps LEAs develop action plans for local improvements in transition practices.
 Finally, Idaho is using the Idaho EdPlan software to improve data quality across several indicators, including graduation and program exits. The system helps ensure accurate coding and documentation for student exits, improving the overall quality of exit data.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (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 dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (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 section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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 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.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data²

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	17.90%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	2.58%	2.08%	17.70%	17.50%	17.30%
Data	7.63%	5.18%	14.87%	17.31%	15.83%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	16.73%	16.17%	15.61%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,310
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	363
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	67
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	365

² Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator.

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
365	2,105	15.83%	16.73%	17.34%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted educational outcomes for our students, contributing to observed slippage in graduation rates and related metrics. Several key factors contributed to this decline:

Employment: During the pandemic, some students secured employment opportunities and did not return to school, impacting dropout rates.

Challenges with Online Learning: The transition to online learning created significant barriers for many students, including struggles to adapt to remote instruction, resulting in reduced academic engagement and performance in activities that would lead to graduation.

Chronic Absenteeism and Follow-Up Gaps: Chronic absenteeism increased during this time, exacerbated by limited capacity to follow up effectively with absent students resulting in increased dropout rates.

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

Dropouts are defined as students who:

Were enrolled in school and exited, but;

1. did not graduate from high school.
2. did not complete a state or district-approved educational program.
3. 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)

The Historical Data Table provides data from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019 for a previous dropout measurement, but it doesn't reflect the current Indicator 2 dropout measurement. The previous method focused on the number of students with disabilities in grades 9-12 who dropped out.

The COVID-19 pandemic did not affect the accuracy or reliability of the data for Indicator 2, and data for FFY 2023 shows normal program exit numbers. Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system tracks dropout rates and other performance measures at the Local Education Agency (LEA) level. LEAs are given scores based on performance and compliance, which determine the level of support they receive. LEAs must review their performance data annually for students with disabilities. If there are issues like high dropout rates, LEAs complete self-assessments to find the root causes and create SMART Goals to improve. The Department provides support for LEAs to complete the self-assessments and improve outcomes, including one-on-one support from Idaho SESTA coordinators.

The Department is focusing on improving communication, which has led to positive outcomes such as better coordination of training and timelines for LEAs.

Idaho has experienced staff shortages, including a lack of substitute teachers, which limits the flexibility of LEA teams to attend training. To address this, the Department's Secondary Special Education Coordinator offers monthly recorded webinars on topics like secondary transition and program exits, making training more accessible.

Training on exit data and coding is also provided through various annual events, such as the Data Drill Down training, Federal Directors Meeting, and Secondary Transition Institute. These events help LEAs improve data quality and develop strategies for better outcomes.

Idaho has partnered with several state agencies to improve secondary outcomes for students with disabilities, particularly through the Transition Institute. This event helps LEA teams collaborate with other agencies to improve transition services. Since 2023, participants from agencies like Vocational Rehabilitation and Career Technical Education attended the institute.

To improve data quality, Idaho has developed rules and validations within the statewide Idaho EdPlan system, ensuring proper coding for program exits and reducing errors.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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 ED Facts 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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes members from various groups, such as parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, special education directors, teachers, and staff from various state agencies. The Directors Advisory Council (DAC), made up of special education directors, also contributed to setting targets. These groups were all involved in discussions about Indicator 3A targets. Idaho prefers the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

In winter 2021, the department set targets for Indicator 3A with input from these educational partners, offering training on the target-setting process. The department also held discussions in small and large groups to review changes, impacts, and state data. Educational partners suggested using more student-centered examples to better understand how targets would affect students and LEAs. The department created infographics to show the potential positive impact on students if targets were met.

Discussions about the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on student learning and educational systems took place, and participants expressed concerns about its lasting effects. For Indicator 3A, which focuses on participation in statewide assessments, educational partners agreed to keep the target of

95% participation each year per grade level. The baseline for this indicator was set using data from the 2020-2021 school year, which included the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA).

The Department continues to meet with educational partners quarterly to discuss progress toward targets and challenges. As requested by SEAP, the Department also added mini-group sessions focused on student outcomes and statewide assessments.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	3,443	2,906	2,416
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	2,538	2,004	1,842
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	698	627	221
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	143	153	127

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	3,446	2,907	2,416
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	1,892	1,169	1,467
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	1,349	1,463	603
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	142	155	124

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) 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.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,379	3,443	Not Valid and Reliable	95.00%	98.14%	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	2,784	2,906	Not Valid and Reliable	95.00%	95.80%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	2,190	2,416	Not Valid and Reliable	95.00%	90.65%	Did not meet target	N/A

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,383	3,446	Not Valid and Reliable	95.00%	98.17%	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	2,787	2,907	Not Valid and Reliable	95.00%	95.87%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	2,194	2,416	Not Valid and Reliable	95.00%	90.81%	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.

Per 20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f), Idaho publicly reports the state assessment results in : <https://idahoreportcard.com>. The public report card includes (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 with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children.

The performance of students with disabilities on the alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards is not included in the report card, and posted publicly here: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In response to OSEP’s feedback on last year’s SPP/APR submission, Idaho submitted data that was deemed invalid and unreliable. The Department’s Assessment and Accountability team is actively working to correct the data and update the public reporting on the Department’s website, with a targeted completion date aligned with this year’s clarification period in April. As a result, it is not possible to calculate slippage for this year’s SPP/APR submission using the current data.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State’s 2024 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2022, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2023.

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

Per OSEP’s response to last year’s SPP/APR submission, 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).

3A - OSEP Response

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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.40%	14.60%	14.80%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	8.53%	8.86%	9.20%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	10.65%	10.96%	11.27%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	16.39%	16.64%	16.89%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	4.28%	4.53%	4.78%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.51%	3.91%	4.31%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes members from various groups, such as parents of students with disabilities, higher education, LEA superintendents, special education directors, teachers, and representatives from Idaho state agencies like Vocational Rehabilitation and Health and Welfare. Idaho prefers to term educational partners instead of stakeholders due to the negative connotation in Native American communities.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) plays a key role in target-setting discussions. It consists of special education directors from across the state, ensuring a broad representation of school types and regions.

In winter 2021, the department set targets for Indicator 3B with input from these groups. They provided training and hosted discussions to clarify the changes, their potential impacts, and state data. Initially, the department proposed using 2015-2016 data as a baseline, but feedback from educational partners led to updating the baseline to 2018-2019 data, which was unaffected by COVID-19 and reflected improvements in Idaho's educational processes. Educational partners requested more student-centered examples to better understand how the targets affect local education agencies (LEAs) and student outcomes. The department created updated visual materials to help members see how the targets and increasing percentages would benefit students.

During discussions, concerns about the COVID-19 pandemic's impact on education were raised, especially regarding staffing shortages and student learning loss. For Indicator 3B (performance on statewide assessments), partners agreed on keeping the targets near the updated baseline for a few years before increasing them gradually.

The Department continues to update and engage with educational partners through regular meetings to discuss progress and challenges. The Department has also added mini-group sessions focusing on student outcomes, especially in statewide assessments.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	3,236	2,631	2,063
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	451	192	256
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	71	21	23

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	3,241	2,632	2,070
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	456	100	69
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	81	27	x ³

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

³ Data suppressed due to small cell size.

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	522	3,236	13.78%	14.40%	16.13%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	213	2,631	7.79%	8.53%	8.10%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	279	2,063	14.13%	10.65%	13.52%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	537	3,241	14.49%	16.39%	16.57%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	127	2,632	3.93%	4.28%	4.83%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	x ⁴	2,070	3.22%	3.51%	x ⁴	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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.

Per 20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f), Idaho publicly reports the state assessment results in : <https://idahoreportcard.com>. The public report card includes (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 with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children.

The performance of students with disabilities on the alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards is not included in the report card, and posted publicly here: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Since taking office in January 2023, Superintendent of Public Instruction Debbie Critchfield has focused on improving early literacy in Idaho by:
 Reviewing Idaho standards and curriculum,
 Offering high-quality professional development and promoting collaboration across the state,
 Implementing the K-3 SMART program, which provides teachers with two years of training, monthly book studies on reading science, and support from a state coach,
 Using federal funds to offer free evidence-based reading interventions to schools,
 Requesting funding for an Early Literacy Coordinator to support schools and districts,
 Providing dyslexia training to help teachers support all students.

The Department is also working on resources and training to support math instruction, including:

Reviewing Idaho math standards with the State Board of Education,
 Supporting Regional Math Centers to improve collaboration and instruction,
 Offering free Imagine Math curriculum resources to districts,
 Creating the Idaho Council of Teachers of Mathematics to increase statewide collaboration.

To improve instruction, the Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content divisions collaborate to train teachers on better instruction, assessment use, accommodations, and Idaho Content Standards. The state's Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on improving literacy through training and coaching.

⁴ Data suppressed due to small cell size.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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 ED*Facts* 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	2021	43.14%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2021	46.20%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	50.72%
Math	A	Grade 4	2021	41.67%
Math	B	Grade 8	2021	36.48%
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	37.78%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	43.75%	44.00%	44.25%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	46.75%	47.00%	47.25%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	51.25%	51.50%	51.75%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	42.25%	42.50%	42.75%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	37.00%	37.25%	37.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	38.25%	38.50%	38.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes a diverse group of members such as parents of students with disabilities, educators, and representatives from various state agencies. The Directors Advisory Council (DAC), consisting of special education directors from different regions, also plays a key role in setting targets. Idaho prefers the terms educational partners instead of stakeholders, due to the negative connotations with Native American communities.

In winter 2021, the department set targets for Indicator 3C with input from educational partners. The department provided training and held discussions on target-setting, adjusting data and providing examples to better show how targets impact local education agencies (LEAs) and student outcomes. After feedback, the department updated the baseline using data from the 2021-2022 school year and agreed on applying a small annual increase to each subject area's target. In 2022, the department worked on aligning Idaho's Extended Content Standards with a focus on both Math and Reading, involving

parents of students with disabilities in the process. Currently, the department holds regular meetings with educational partners to discuss progress toward targets and address specific issues. SEAP requested mini-group sessions on student outcomes, focusing on statewide assessments.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	143	153	127
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	52	68	52

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	142	155	124
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	52	54	47

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	52	143	31.87%	43.75%	36.36%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	68	153	51.53%	46.75%	44.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	52	127	51.13%	51.25%	40.94%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Teacher shortages, particularly in special education, have been a nationwide issue. High turnover and reliance on provisionally licensed educators has most likely impacted instructional quality. Additionally, the long-term effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning have been widely documented across the United States. Students with disabilities, in particular, experienced significant challenges due to missed or inconsistent instruction during periods of remote learning. This disruption has likely contributed to slippage in performance on Indicator 3C, as these students faced unique barriers to accessing consistent, high-quality instruction and support during this time.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Teacher shortages, particularly in special education, have been a nationwide issue. High turnover and reliance on provisionally licensed educators has most likely impacted instructional quality. Additionally, the long-term effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning have been widely documented across the United States. Students with disabilities, in particular, experienced significant challenges due to missed or inconsistent instruction during

periods of remote learning. This disruption has likely contributed to slippage in performance on Indicator 3C, as these students faced unique barriers to accessing consistent, high-quality instruction and support during this time.

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	52	142	34.44%	42.25%	36.62%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	54	155	40.37%	37.00%	34.84%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	47	124	36.92%	38.25%	37.90%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Teacher shortages, particularly in special education, have been a nationwide issue. High turnover and reliance on provisionally licensed educators has most likely impacted instructional quality. Additionally, the long-term effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning have been widely documented across the United States. Students with disabilities, in particular, experienced significant challenges due to missed or inconsistent instruction during periods of remote learning. This disruption has likely contributed to slippage in performance on Indicator 3C, as these students faced unique barriers to accessing consistent, high-quality instruction and support during this time.

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.

Per 20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f), Idaho publicly reports the state assessment results in : <https://idahoreportcard.com>. The public report card includes (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 with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children.

The performance of students with disabilities on the alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards is not included in the report card, and posted publicly here: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Since becoming Superintendent in January 2023, Debbie Critchfield has focused on improving early literacy in Idaho. Key initiatives include:
 Reviewing Idaho's standards and curriculum.
 Offering high-quality, research-based professional development and fostering collaboration across the state.
 Launching the K-3 SMART program, where teachers can participate in a two-year program with book studies on reading science and support from a state coach.
 Using federal funds to provide free, evidence-based reading interventions to schools.
 Requesting funding to hire an Early Literacy Coordinator to assist schools and districts.
 Providing dyslexia training for teachers to support all students.

The Department is also working on improving math instruction through:
 A focus on Idaho's math standards with the State Board of Education.
 Supporting Regional Math Centers to improve instruction and meet state requirements.
 Offering free access to the Imagine Math curriculum for districts.
 Establishing the Idaho Council of Teachers of Mathematics to enhance leadership and collaboration.
 Idaho's state plan has set targets for all students on statewide assessments, with a focus on improving outcomes for all students, including those with disabilities. Schools with significant achievement gaps must create plans to address these gaps.
 The department's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system helps local education agencies (LEAs) improve outcomes for students with disabilities by using performance data. LEAs must annually review this data, complete self-assessments, and set SMART goals to drive improvement. LEAs needing more support can work with Idaho SESTA coordinators.
 The department collaborates across divisions to provide training to improve instruction, understand assessments, and implement Idaho's Content Standards. Additionally, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on improving 4th-grade literacy and addressing low performance with training and resources for LEA staff.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2024 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2022, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2023.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

Per OSEP's response to last year's SPP/APR submission, 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).

3C - OSEP Response

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 ED*Facts* 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 2023-2024 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 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 2023-2024 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	37.21	36.50	35.79
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	44.98	44.12	43.25
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	48.81	47.86	46.92
Math	A <=	Grade 4	33.15	32.52	31.89
Math	B <=	Grade 8	35.89	35.21	34.52
Math	C <=	Grade HS	29.63	29.07	28.51

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes a variety of members, such as parents of students with disabilities, educators, correctional staff, and representatives from various state agencies. The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) consists of at least 14 special education directors who represent different regions across the state. Idaho prefers the terms educational partners instead of stakeholders, due to the negative connotations with Native American communities.

In 2021, the department set targets for Indicator 3D, with input from educational partners. Training and discussions were held to prepare participants for setting these targets. Feedback from educational partners led to updating the baseline data to better reflect Idaho's current educational system. A new baseline from the 2018-2019 school year, before COVID-19 disruptions, was chosen, and updates were made to show how these targets would benefit student outcomes. The discussions highlighted concerns about COVID-19's impact on learning, especially with math assessments showing lower

performance. Educational partners recommended keeping targets near the baseline for a few years and raising them gradually. They also suggested aligning the target progressions for both math and reading to reduce confusion and improve communication with educators. The department continues to update progress through regular meetings with educational partners. In 2023, SEAP requested mini-group sessions focusing on student outcomes and statewide assessments.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	23,548	23,546	22,983
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	3,236	2,631	2,063
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11,509	12,427	14,159
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	133	60	49
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	451	192	256
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	71	21	23

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	23,757	23,720	23,113
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	3,241	2,632	2,070
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11,209	9,371	7,949
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	136	47	x ⁵
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	456	100	69
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	81	27	x ⁵

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot

⁵ Data suppressed due to small cell size.

assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16.13%	49.44%	34.25	37.21	33.31	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.10%	53.03%	43.16	44.98	44.94	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	13.52%	61.82%	49.38	48.81	48.30	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16.57%	47.75%	32.09	33.15	31.19	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4.83%	39.70%	31.93	35.89	34.88	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	x ⁶	x ⁶	29.89	29.63	31.02	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The long-term effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on learning have been widely documented across the United States, and students with disabilities were disproportionately impacted. These students faced unique challenges in accessing consistent, high-quality instruction and support during periods of remote or disrupted learning. As a result, the gap in proficiency rates on grade-level academic achievement standards may have widened, reflecting the compounded effects of missed instructional opportunities and uneven access to resources during the pandemic. Additionally, ongoing challenges such as high teacher turnover and reliance on provisionally licensed special educators may have further contributed to this gap. These factors likely impacted the ability to deliver effective, individualized instruction to students with disabilities, exacerbating disparities in academic performance relative to their peers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Since January 2023, Superintendent Debbie Critchfield has focused on improving early literacy in Idaho schools by:
 Reviewing Idaho’s standards and curriculum.

Offering high-quality, research-based professional development and encouraging collaboration.

Launching the K-3 SMART program, which provides teachers with two years of training on the science of reading, monthly book studies, and support from state coaches.

Using expiring federal funds to offer evidence-based reading interventions for schools at no cost.

*Requesting funding to hire an Early Literacy Coordinator to help schools and districts.

Additionally, the department is working on supporting math instruction by:

Focusing on essential Idaho math standards with the State Board of Education.

Supporting Regional Math Centers for collaboration and improvement.

Offering districts free access to the Imagine Math program through House Bill 623.

Creating the Idaho Council of Teachers of Mathematics to enhance statewide leadership and collaboration.

The state’s Consolidated State Plan focuses on improving outcomes for all students, including those with disabilities. It includes setting targets for statewide assessments and identifying schools that need extra support to close achievement gaps. Schools with a significant gap between groups must create plans to address the gap.

Idaho’s Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system tracks performance for students with disabilities and gives schools different levels of support based on their performance. Schools must regularly review data on students with disabilities and use self-assessment protocols to identify areas for improvement. Schools that need the most support can work closely with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA). The department also works across divisions to address issues in teaching, ensuring teachers get the training and tools needed to improve instruction, use accommodations effectively, and teach the Idaho Content Standards. The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) targets 4th-grade literacy and low performance through training and coaching for educators.

⁶ Data suppressed due to small cell size.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of 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 = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{\# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable)}} \right) \right] \times 100$.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 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 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs 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 23-01, dated July.

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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	2.08%	0.00%		0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes a diverse group of members such as parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), private schools, charter schools, and Idaho Department of Education (Department) staff. The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) plays an important role in discussions about target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with representation from small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs across the state.

Idaho prefers the term "educational partners" over "stakeholders" due to the negative connotations of the latter for Native American populations. When discussing equity indicators and significant disproportionality, educational partners have expressed confusion, leading to further discussions in 2021. These discussions focused on improving the calculation process (e.g., n-size, cell size, and target setting) and making the system more cohesive. Educational partners suggested aligning equity indicators and significant disproportionality measures, using a cell size of 10 and an n-size of 30, and increasing the data analysis period to two years. These changes aimed to reduce confusion and false positives. After reviewing data on out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities, the department decided to increase the cell size to 5 and kept the n-size of 30. This ensures more sensitive measures while protecting students' privacy. Throughout the process of updating Indicator 4, the Department worked with the IDEA Data Center and national technical assistance centers.

The department meets with educational partners quarterly to discuss progress on special education topics and issues.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Minimum Cell size = 5, which means there must be at least 5 students with disabilities experiencing long-term suspensions/expulsions for the LEA to be included in the analysis

Minimum N-size = 30, which is the number of students with disabilities (SWDs) enrolled at the LEA

Analysis period = 1 year

Threshold = 1 percentage point above the state suspension/expulsion rate.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

Idaho adopted an n-size of 30, which aligns with input from educational partners regarding statistical validity, and a cell size of 5, the minimum required by state public reporting rules. These definitions were informed by the SEAP, Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and technical assistance centers. They ensure the State can accurately identify LEAs with significant discrepancy while protecting student privacy and avoiding inflated or misleading results. Idaho defines Significant Discrepancy as a rate that's 1 percentage point or more above the state's suspension/expulsion rate for SWDs.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

Idaho has not changed its minimum n and/or cell size since the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

Idaho has not changed its minimum n and/or cell size since the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

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

181

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	7	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

- Minimum Cell size = 5
- Minimum N-size = 30
- Analysis period = 1 year
- Threshold = 1 percentage point above the state suspension/expulsion rate.

Idaho defines Significant Discrepancy as a rate that's 1 percentage point or more above the state's suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities (SWDs).

For FFY 2023, the calculation is as follows:

Number of SWDs suspended/expelled for over 10 days in 2022-2023 = 121

Total number of SWDs in the state for 2022-2023 = 38,298

State suspension/expulsion rate = $(121 / 38,298) * 100 = 0.32$

The state's suspension/expulsion rate bar = $0.32\% + 1.00\% = 1.32$

An LEA is flagged for a significant discrepancy if it meets the cell size and n-size criteria, and its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities is equal to or higher than the state's bar of 1.32%.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For FFY 2023, the data for Indicator 4A comes from the 2022-2023 school year. Forty-six LEAs did not meet the minimum n size requirement of 30 students with disabilities, and 181 LEAs did not meet the minimum cell size requirement of five SWD who received greater than 10 days out-of-school suspensions/expulsions. Thirty-two LEAs reported out-of-school suspensions/expulsions of more than ten days in the 2022-2023 school year. The seven LEAs that met the reporting criteria had suspension/expulsion rates below 1.32% and did not show significant discrepancy.

After receiving guidance on discipline from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in 2022, Idaho began providing LEAs with additional information through webinars and training, including the Data Drill Down training, which covered disciplinary actions. This training allowed LEAs to compare their data with the state level and focused on data quality and improvements in documenting disciplinary actions for students with disabilities.

The Department continues to offer webinars to local special education staff on data reporting, dispute resolution, new resources, and OSEP guidance. Additionally, resources on disciplinary actions and behavior interventions specific to students with disabilities are available for educators, including training materials for new principals and superintendents. Idaho SESTA also offers free, multi-year support for LEAs on Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) through an application process.

Idaho acknowledges the concerns raised by OSEP regarding its current methodology for identifying significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions among children with IEPs. Specifically, the inclusion of only 3.72% of LEAs in the analysis highlights a limitation in the methodology's sensitivity, potentially underrepresenting the true scope of disciplinary disparities. Idaho recognizes that the current thresholds for minimum cell and n-size may exclude smaller districts or those with fewer disciplinary incidents, inadvertently masking areas of concern. In response, the state is committed to revising its methodology to increase the number of LEAs that meet the inclusion criteria, thereby enhancing the sensitivity of the measurement and allowing for a more accurate identification of significant discrepancies.

This change also aligns with Idaho's broader commitment to better reflect national best practices. As noted by OSEP, the state's existing threshold for identifying significant discrepancies exceeds the median used by other states, indicating an opportunity to recalibrate Idaho's approach in a way that is more rigorous. Furthermore, Idaho plans to conduct a comprehensive review of its disciplinary thresholds in Fall 2025. This review will involve key educational partners to ensure that any updates to the methodology are transparent, clearly understood, and relevant to the communities they serve.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2023 using 2022-2023 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 find any significant discrepancies for FFY 2023, based on 2022-2023 data. All LEAs must provide an assurance that they follow policies, practices, and procedures outlined in Idaho's Special Education Manual before their IDEA Part B Grant applications are approved. Through the annual General Supervision File Review (GSFR), the department checks student files in each LEA to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements, the consistent application of policies, and the use of positive behavioral interventions, supports, and procedural safeguards. GSFR results help determine whether any policies, practices, or procedures contributed to significant discrepancy.

If noncompliance is identified, Idaho follows an outlined process. First, Idaho uses Self-Assessment for Discipline to identify whether discrepancies result from inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. This tool was originally developed for significant disproportionality and is used for both Indicator 4 and significant disproportionality. By using the same tool for both, Idaho promotes consistency and clarity for LEAs and educational partners. The self-assessment pairs with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) Goals, guiding the development and implementation of improvement plans. LEAs requiring the most support work directly with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and set SMART Goals. The department provides information and training on this process to both SESTA

coordinators and LEAs. Idaho continues to work with national technical assistance centers to strengthen its review processes and ensure ongoing compliance with IDEA.

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 2022

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 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- 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 must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 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 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 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, 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.

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 23-01, dated July.

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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%			0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State’s n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State’s cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities, by race and ethnicity, who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The minimum cell size is five, which is the number of SWD in the given race/ethnic group in an LEA who received greater than 10 days of cumulative out of school suspension/expulsion. The minimum n-size is 30, which is the number of SWD in the given race/ethnic group enrolled in an LEA.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

In 2021, the Department reviewed equity indicators for SPP/APR and found that an undefined cell size led to false positives, where a single case caused a significant discrepancy. Educational partners discussed revising calculations (e.g., cell size, n-size, years of analysis, and targets) to create a more cohesive equity system. In November 2021, educational partners recommended aligning equity indicators with significant disproportionality measures, suggesting a cell size of 10, an n-size of 30 (matching Idaho’s disproportionality measure), and using two years of data while keeping the target at 0%. These changes aimed to reduce confusion and false positives. However, after reviewing suspension and expulsion data for students with disabilities, the Department decided against a cell size of 10, instead reducing it to five to comply with Idaho’s Data Management Council requirements and protect student privacy. The n-size was adjusted as recommended. During this process, Idaho consulted with the IDEA Data Center (IDC). While educational stakeholders suggested combining two years of data for better monitoring, IDC clarified that Indicator 4 allows for multi-year analysis but not combining data from different years. Therefore, Idaho retained one year of data analysis in order to include as many LEAs as possible in the analysis.

Based on feedback from OSEP, Idaho wants to increase the percentage of LEAs who meet the minimum cell size and n-size in order to have a more sensitive measurement. This discussion has been a collaborative effort between the Department and IDC. The Department will be presenting new methodology options to educational partners Fall 2025, and implementing the new methodology for next year’s SPP/APR submission.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

Idaho has not changed its minimum n and/or cell size since the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

Idaho has not changed its minimum n and/or cell size since the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

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

188

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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0	0.00%	0%		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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Idaho calculates whether there is a significant discrepancy in long-term out-of-school suspensions or expulsions by race/ethnicity for students with disabilities (SWD) in each LEA. The state uses a suspension/expulsion rate bar to determine if there is a significant discrepancy for each racial/ethnic group. A "significant discrepancy" is defined as a rate that is 1 percentage point or more above the state's suspension/expulsion rate for SWD, which is 1.32%.

The calculation for Indicator 4B follows these criteria:

Minimum Cell size = 5 (minimum number of children with disabilities, by race and ethnicity, who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within an LEA)

Minimum N-size = 30 (minimum number of students with disabilities in the group)

Years of analysis = 1 (data from one year)

Threshold = 1 percentage point above the state rate

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For the FFY 2023 reporting year, which covers the 2022-2023 school year, zero LEAs met the criteria for both cell size and n-size. One hundred and sixteen LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size of 30 students with disabilities in one or more racial/ethnic categories, and zero LEAs met the minimum cell size of 5 instances of out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days by race/ethnicity. As a result, 188 LEAs were excluded from the Indicator 4B calculation. In general, only 32 out of 188 LEAs reported out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days in 2022-2023.

In 2022 and 2023, Idaho provided additional training and resources to LEAs on disciplinary action, including webinars and data drill-down sessions.

These trainings focused on comparing disciplinary data, identifying trends, and improving data collection processes, particularly for students with disabilities.

Idaho SESTA also offers resources for educators on behavioral interventions, and the department has developed materials for principals and superintendents. These resources include webinars, guides, and modules on topics like functional behavioral assessments and tiered behavior supports. Additionally, Idaho SESTA provides multi-year support for Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports. The Department is also working with national technical centers to review the self-assessments used by LEAs for policies related to significant disproportionality and discrepancy. Based on feedback, the department plans to revise these self-assessments for greater clarity and compliance.

Idaho acknowledges the concerns raised by OSEP regarding its current methodology for identifying significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions among children with IEPs. Specifically, the inclusion of only 3.72% of LEAs in the analysis highlights a limitation in the methodology's sensitivity, potentially underrepresenting the true scope of disciplinary disparities. Idaho recognizes that the current thresholds for minimum cell and n-size may exclude smaller districts or those with fewer disciplinary incidents, inadvertently masking areas of concern. In response, the state is committed to revising its methodology to increase the number of LEAs that meet the inclusion criteria, thereby enhancing the sensitivity of the measurement and allowing for a more accurate identification of significant discrepancies.

This change also aligns with Idaho's broader commitment to better reflect national best practices. As noted by OSEP, the state's existing threshold for identifying significant discrepancies exceeds the median used by other states, indicating an opportunity to recalibrate Idaho's approach in a way that is more rigorous. Furthermore, Idaho plans to conduct a comprehensive review of its disciplinary thresholds in Fall 2025. This review will involve key educational partners to ensure that any updates to the methodology are transparent, clearly understood, and relevant to the communities they serve.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2023 using 2022-2023 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 find any significant discrepancies for FFY 2023, based on 2022-2023 data. All LEAs must provide an assurance that they follow policies, practices, and procedures outlined in Idaho's Special Education Manual before their IDEA Part B Grant applications are approved. Through the annual General Supervision File Review (GSFR), the department checks student files in each LEA to ensure compliance with IDEA requirements, the consistent application of policies, and the use of positive behavioral interventions, supports, and procedural safeguards. GSFR results help determine whether any policies, practices, or procedures contributed to significant discrepancy.

If noncompliance is identified, Idaho follows an outlined process. First, Idaho uses Self-Assessment for Discipline to identify whether discrepancies result from inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. This tool was originally developed for significant disproportionality and is used for both Indicator 4 and significant disproportionality. By using the same tool for both, Idaho promotes consistency and clarity for LEAs and educational partners. The self-assessment pairs with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) Goals, guiding the development and implementation of improvement plans. LEAs requiring the most support work directly with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and set SMART Goals. The department provides information and training on this process to both SESTA coordinators and LEAs. Idaho continues to work with national technical assistance centers to strengthen its review processes and ensure ongoing compliance with IDEA. Idaho continues to work with national technical assistance centers to improve compliance with IDEA regulations.

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 2022

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 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

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 ED*Facts* 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2020	Target >=	70.00%	71.00%	63.75%	63.80%	63.85%
A	63.75%	Data	62.69%	64.77%	63.75%	65.20%	64.72%
B	2020	Target <=	5.50%	5.02%	9.58%	9.55%	9.52%
B	9.58%	Data	8.99%	8.64%	9.58%	9.05%	9.49%
C	2020	Target <=	1.50%	1.50%	1.11%	1.10%	1.09%
C	1.11%	Data	1.45%	1.33%	1.11%	1.06%	1.03%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	64.90%	66.00%	67.05%
Target B <=	9.18%	8.87%	8.55%
Target C <=	1.05%	1.01%	0.97%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes representatives from various groups like parents of students with disabilities, higher education, corrections, local education agencies (LEAs), special education directors, teachers, and state departments such as the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW). The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) is made up of special education directors nominated by their peers. It includes members from various types of LEAs (small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual) to represent a broad range of communities in Idaho. Instead of using the term "stakeholders," Idaho prefers "educational partners" due to the negative connotations "stakeholders" can have for Native American populations.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment	07/31/2024	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	37,308

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	24,843
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,458
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	240
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	65
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	27

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

NO

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	24,843	37,308	64.72%	64.90%	66.59%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,458	37,308	9.49%	9.18%	9.27%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	332	37,308	1.03%	1.05%	0.89%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho includes trend data on Indicator 5 in its annual Data Drill Down training to help local education agencies (LEAs) improve their data skills. During the training, Department staff guide discussions, root cause analysis, and action planning to improve LEA systems and outcomes for students with disabilities.

The Department continues to focus on correctly coding kindergarten-age students. To help with this, the Department and Idaho Special Education Support & Technical Assistance (SESTA) have created resources and guidance for planning the transition from preschool to kindergarten. These resources cover timelines, correct grade-level coding, access to peers, and general education curriculum for kindergarten-age students. Changes have also been made to the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) to fix coding issues.

Idaho has introduced processes and rules to improve data quality for multiple indicators using Idaho EdPlan, a statewide IEP software. For Indicator 5, Idaho EdPlan uses information from the service grid. The IEP Service Grid is a section of the IEP that lists the special education and related services a student will receive. It includes type of service, frequency and duration, location, provider, and start and end dates. The grid ensures clarity and accountability for meeting the student's needs and enrollment type to automatically assign the correct educational environment code. This reduces coding errors and ensures all necessary documentation is completed.

LEAs receive support to improve Indicator 5 data through Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system. This system uses performance and compliance data to determine the level of support an LEA needs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Every year, LEAs review performance data for students with disabilities. Based on their results, they may receive support, including help with root cause analysis and developing

SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound) goals. LEAs needing the most help can work directly with Idaho SESTA coordinators for intensive support and goal setting.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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 ED*Facts* 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 (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	Target >=	37.40%	38.40%	12.56%	12.57%	12.58%
A	Data	25.35%	27.01%	12.56%	11.98%	9.54%
B	Target <=	44.30%	43.30%	71.04%	71.03%	71.02%
B	Data	53.18%	53.14%	71.04%	72.30%	74.81%
C	Target <=					
C	Data			0.34%	0.26%	0.36%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho set its current targets based on data analysis and feedback from various educational partner groups, including the Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Head Start, Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), and others. These groups include parents, teachers, special education directors, and state agencies like the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW). Instead of using the term "stakeholders," Idaho prefers "educational partners" due to the negative connotations "stakeholders" can have for Native American populations.

In 2020, the Idaho Department of Education (Department) discussed Indicator 6 for the 2020-2025 plan. They explained that federal reporting changes affected inclusion rates for early childhood, as students age 5 in kindergarten were moved to school-age reporting. Since Idaho doesn't have a state-funded preschool program, this change impacted the inclusion rate. In the Data Drill Down training in fall 2021, LEA representatives, including special education directors and teachers, discussed the changes in reporting and how they affected their local data. They reviewed the data, gave feedback, and developed strategies to improve inclusion in their schools.

The Department set targets for Indicator 6 in the winter of 2021, based on input from educational partners. They also provided training on target-setting methods and how educational partners can contribute to decision-making. After the initial training, a follow-up session was held to provide more examples and discuss the connection between target increases and positive outcomes for students. Participants discussed Idaho's educational system, including challenges from COVID-19, staffing shortages, and the lack of universal preschool. They recommended keeping targets close to the baseline for several years before gradually increasing them, especially since Idaho doesn't have universal preschool.

The 2023-2024 school year marked the first time Idaho had 10 or more students in category 6C. To address this, the Department sought feedback from educational partners, including SEAP and the Director's Advisory Council (DAC). Discussions focused on setting a baseline for 2023-2024 and establishing proposed targets for the 2024-2025 and 2025-2026 school years.

For early childhood placements, the group recommended maintaining conservative targets due to the limited availability of preschool programs and the state's decision not to accept additional federal preschool funding. The emphasis is on encouraging typically developing peers to attend early childhood programs rather than placing students with disabilities in restrictive environments. Idaho continues to meet with educational partners at least quarterly to provide updates on progress towards targets and discuss ways to improve

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baselines 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	2023	0.44%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	12.85%	13.12%	13.35%
Target B <=	70.75%	70.50%	70.25%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.44%	0.44%	0.43%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/31/2024

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	899	1,345	261	2,505
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	59	123	23	205
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	622	866	166	1,654
b2. Number of children attending separate school	84	109	24	217
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	8	2	1	11

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 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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	205	2,505	9.54%	12.85%	8.18%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	1,871	2,505	74.81%	70.75%	74.69%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	11	2,505	0.36%	0.44%	0.44%	N/A	N/A

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable

Idaho's inclusive opportunities for Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) students have declined due to funding challenges and limited placement options. Without state-funded preschool for children who don't qualify for special education, inclusive settings are scarce, leading to more segregated placements. The loss of federal ARP funds has further strained resources, making it harder to maintain and expand inclusive programs. Budget constraints also limit partnerships with private preschools and Head Start, reducing opportunities for inclusion. Head Start has struggled to find adequate staffing to fill classrooms resulting in fewer opportunities for students on IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho has faced challenges in improving inclusion for early childhood students, mainly because the state Idaho does not have a state-funded preschool program. Local education agencies (LEAs) are encouraged to use Title I funds and collaborate with local Head Start and private preschools to create more inclusive programs. Without state funding, many LEAs only serve students receiving special education, which leads to fewer students being included in regular programs.

To improve inclusion, the Department regularly uses national resources to enhance its strategies. They've partnered with other agencies and worked on improving data quality, communication, and training to support early childhood inclusion.

The Department has developed training on early childhood coding and inclusion practices. These training modules are available online through the Idaho Training Clearinghouse for both new and existing teachers. LEA teams can also request specific training facilitated by Idaho's Early Childhood Coordinator. Based on feedback, the Department has created additional breakdowns of early childhood data, which are shared during annual Data Drill Down training to help improve understanding.

The Department works with other state agencies, like IdahoSTARS, to increase training and resources for inclusion. IdahoSTARS offers guidance and training for childcare providers, which is also available to the public.

Idaho is also part of a national initiative focused on improving inclusive practices in early childhood education. This collaboration includes several state agencies and universities, aiming to help early childhood educators develop evidence-based teaching practices, build positive relationships, and promote inclusion.

Idaho established an Early Childhood Advisory Panel composed of special education directors, early childhood teachers, and support staff to guide the implementation of improvement strategies. Meeting quarterly, the panel reviews early childhood data and prioritizes activities to enhance outcomes. Key initiatives from the past year included developing an inclusion module, supporting kindergarten readiness efforts, publishing an early childhood newsletter to disseminate important information, hosting the Early Years Conference with sessions aligned to the Pyramid Collaborative, and planning for the statewide Early Childhood Special Education Process training scheduled for June 2025.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided the baseline for Indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2023, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for Indicator 6C, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022

A1	2020	Target >=	85.20%		70.12%	70.32%	70.52%
A1	70.12%	Data	68.29%	64.25%	70.12%	62.67%	61.95%
A2	2020	Target >=	56.38%		48.76%	48.96%	49.16%
A2	48.76%	Data	50.45%	45.95%	48.76%	44.55%	43.61%
B1	2020	Target >=	80.55%		69.49%	69.69%	69.89%
B1	69.49%	Data	69.96%	62.88%	69.49%	62.29%	59.37%
B2	2020	Target >=	29.87%		16.14%	16.34%	16.54%
B2	16.14%	Data	17.52%	13.75%	16.14%	13.00%	12.95%
C1	2020	Target >=	85.81%		65.60%	65.80%	66.00%
C1	65.60%	Data	67.42%	64.89%	65.60%	60.23%	61.65%
C2	2020	Target >=	67.91%		55.76%	55.96%	56.16%
C2	55.76%	Data	57.95%	54.75%	55.76%	50.67%	51.98%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	70.72%	70.92%	71.12%
Target A2 >=	49.36%	49.56%	49.76%
Target B1 >=	70.09%	70.29%	70.49%
Target B2 >=	16.74%	16.94%	17.14%
Target C1 >=	66.20%	66.40%	66.60%
Target C2 >=	56.36%	56.56%	56.76%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho set its current targets based on data analysis and input from educational partners, including groups such as the Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Head Start, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), and the Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC). These groups represent a variety of educational partners, including parents, teachers, school administrators, and the Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW). Instead of using the term "stakeholders," Idaho prefers "educational partners" due to the negative connotations "stakeholders" can have for Native American populations.

The Department established targets for Indicator 7 in early 2021, with educational partner feedback and training. There were discussions in small and large groups, and it was agreed that Idaho should aim for conservative targets due to challenges like the lack of universal preschool and the lasting impact of COVID-19. As a result, Idaho set FFY 2020 data as a baseline, with a yearly increase of 0.2%. The Department continues to update educational partners on progress through quarterly meetings and breakout sessions.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,110

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	33	2.97%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	262	23.60%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	294	26.49%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	246	22.16%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	275	24.77%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	540	835	61.95%	70.72%	64.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	521	1,110	43.61%	49.36%	46.94%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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	9	0.81%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	430	38.74%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	543	48.92%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	113	10.18%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	15	1.35%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	656	1,095	59.37%	70.09%	59.91%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	128	1,110	12.95%	16.74%	11.53%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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	17	1.53%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	269	24.23%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	229	20.63%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	270	24.32%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	325	29.28%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	499	785	61.65%	66.20%	63.57%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	595	1,110	51.98%	56.36%	53.60%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B2	Slippage for Indicator 7 occurred due to several identifiable factors directly impacting the progress of students receiving speech and language services. The Department analyzed data by region and LEA and gathered input from educators and service providers to determine the causes of slippage. One key reason is Idaho's lack of state-funded pre-K programs, which limits access to typically developing peers. This reduces opportunities for students to model and practice essential language skills in naturalistic and peer-rich environments, crucial for language and communication development. Dual language learners also face unique challenges. While these students often make progress in both languages, the observable growth may appear slower, particularly when development in each language is not fully addressed. Additionally, skills developed during isolated therapy sessions often do not transfer easily to natural environments, such as classrooms or home settings, unless there is consistent reinforcement and opportunities for practice across contexts. The complexity and severity of speech and language delays further contribute to varied rates of progress. Students with more profound needs may require longer intervention periods before showing significant measurable growth.

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 (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) data is collected and added to the Early Childhood IEP using the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process. After being documented in the IEP, ECO ratings are reported to the Department through the ECO Data Collection System. The system creates student records using demographic information, ensuring they are correctly listed and avoiding duplicates. When a student exits, the Local Education Agency (LEA) submits exit and progress ratings to finalize the record. The system checks that students have received special education services for at least six months before reporting data federally.

Idaho also uses the Idaho EdPlan system, which includes validation rules and processes for recording ECO data. For Indicator 7, Idaho EdPlan guides users through a decision tree to determine ratings for each outcome. This helps reduce errors and ensures accurate tracking of progress and exit ratings.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho has faced challenges improving early childhood outcomes, partly because it lacks a state-funded universal preschool program. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are encouraged to use Title I funds to create inclusive programs, often working with Head Start and private preschools. However, many LEA programs only serve students with special needs, limiting access to inclusive environments and peer models.

To improve outcomes, the Department uses national resources to learn better strategies and improve partnerships with other agencies. They focus on improving communication, training, and collaboration through state agencies and grants. Training on early childhood outcomes and inclusive practices is available to new teachers and staff through the Idaho Training Clearinghouse. The 619 Early Childhood Coordinator also offers LEA team training on request. Additionally, the Department shares data and tools to help LEAs monitor their progress against state goals. The Department also partners with IdahoSTARS, which provides training and resources to childcare providers. Additionally, Idaho is expanding its Pyramid Model Collaborative, a program

that supports social and emotional development in young children and involves various agencies working together to improve early childhood outcomes and social-emotional skills.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

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 3 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 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 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 must consider race/ethnicity. 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 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.

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 survey questions and processes in Spring and Fall of 2023. Targets for the Indicator 8 collection, were set in the Fall of 2024 by Directors Advisory Council (DAC) and SEAP. The state reset the baseline and targets in Fall 2024 due to the changes in methodology that resulted from these discussions. SEAP membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, and State Department of Education staff. DAC also contributed to discussions on the new baseline and setting targets. DAC consists of at least 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 SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to build capacity to authentically engage in target setting activities. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively. The Department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	78.13%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	55.75%	56.00%	70.50%	70.75%	70.75%
Data	68.29%	71.74%	71.50%	70.47%	72.32%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	78.13%	78.13%	78.14%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
4,052	5,186	72.32%	78.13%	78.13%	N/A	N/A

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.

Because the parents of preschool students received the same survey as those of school-age students, the state could combine the responses into a single data set without the need for instrument modifications or bridging measures. To ensure validity and reliability when merging these data, the following procedures were followed:

1. Consistent Survey Instrument: Both preschool and school-age populations were administered the exact same set of questions. This ensured that data from both groups were comparable and that no separate scoring or recalibration of items was needed.
2. Uniform Administration Procedures: The survey distribution, data collection timelines, and follow-up processes were the same for all respondents.
3. Standardized Data Processing: Prior to analysis, all responses were subjected to the same data cleaning procedures, including the removal of duplicate entries and the validation of response completeness. Applying the same quality checks across both groups helped maintain data integrity.

Through these procedures, the state maintained a valid and reliable approach to aggregating preschool and school-age survey data, allowing the results to accurately represent the overall parent experience without the need for separate reporting.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

17,271

Percentage of respondent parents

30.03%

Response Rate

FFY	2022	2023
Response Rate	26.01%	30.03%

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

Idaho uses the metric +/- 3 percentage point discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group.

Include the State's analyses of 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.

Idaho analyzed race/ethnicity, disability category, and grade level to determine if the demographics of the children for who, parents responded to the parent involvement survey represented the demographics of students receiving special education and related services. Based on the data analysis using a plus or minus three percentage point discrepancy, the department identified one demographic subgroup that was underrepresented in the response data, which was parents of Hispanic/Latino students with disabilities. By contrast, parents of White students were overrepresented. However, it is expected that recent improvements in survey methodology will lead to a more representative sample in future data collections.

The state's analysis of data representativeness is provided below and includes the percentage point difference between the proportion of survey respondents and the target population for the subcategories of each demographic variable the state analyzed.

Race/ethnicity

American Indian/Alaska Native: -0.10%

Asian: 0.05%

Black or African American: -0.17%

Hispanic/Latino: -3.23%
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: -0.04%
Multiple Races: 0.37%
White: 3.12%

In FFY 2023, parents of Hispanic/Latino students represented 23.30% of the target population, but only 20.07% of survey respondents, for a difference of -3.23 percentage points. In FFY 2022, the difference in parents of Hispanic/Latino respondents compared to the target population was 4.8 percentage points, so the state improved the representativeness of the data with respect to race/ethnicity in from FFY 2022 to FFY 2023.

Grade level

Preschool: 1.05%
Kindergarten: 0.48%
1st grade: 0.65%
2nd grade: 0.18%
3rd grade: -0.04%
4th grade: 0.32%
5th grade: 0.13%
6th grade: -0.24%
7th grade: 0.03%
8th grade: -0.28%
9th grade: -0.17%
10th grade: -0.25%
11th grade: -0.39%
12th grade: -1.39%
No grade: -0.09%

Disability category:

Autism: 1.84%
Developmental Delay: 0.31%
Emotional Behavioral Disorder : -0.20%
Hearing Impairment: 0.19%
Intellectual Disability: 0.04%
Multiple Disabilities: 0.35%
Other Health Impairment: -0.47%
Orthopedic Impairment: 0.04%
Specific Learning Disability: -2.47%
Speech/Language Impairment: 0.37%
Traumatic Brain Injury: 0.03%
Visual Impairment: -0.01%
Deaf/Blindness: -0.03%

Using the state's metric of +/- 3 percentage point discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group, the response data were representative of the target population with respect to students' grade level and disability category.

The demographics of the children for whom parents are 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

In the 2023-2024 school year, the state implemented a new sampling plan for the Parent Involvement survey. This plan included surveying half of the LEAs each year and inviting all families within the sample of LEAs who had students counted during the Child Count to participate. To develop and refine this sampling plan, the department worked with a survey statistician and received guidance from national technical assistance centers, including the Rhonda Weiss Center for Accessible IDEA Data and the IDEA Data Center (IDC). In creating the updated sampling frame, the Department took into account each LEA's geographic region, its total enrollment, and the percentage of students with disabilities. Other factors considered included:

Whether the LEA was located near Native American reservations.

Whether the LEA had a minority student population above the state median.

Ensuring that the two largest LEAs in the state were evenly distributed between the two survey groups.

This approach allowed for improved communication with LEAs and families. As part of revising survey questions, representatives of Hispanic/Latino and Native American communities reviewed the survey wording to ensure cultural sensitivity. These reviewers provided feedback on tone and language that could influence response rates, and the department adjusted the wording based on their input. Furthermore, the Parent Involvement survey was made available in the top 13 languages spoken in Idaho, whereas previously it had only been available in English and Spanish. By increasing the number of translations, the department enabled a broader range of non-English-speaking families to participate in the survey.

To ensure the response data are representative of underrepresented groups such as Hispanic families moving forward, the department plans to provide LEAs with resources tailored to their communities. LEAs will be supplied with messaging and digital flyers in both English and Spanish so they can more effectively communicate the purpose of the survey and its importance. In addition, LEAs will be encouraged to use communication strategies that resonate with their local populations—this may include sending out automated calls, text messages, and emails; distributing flyers at community events; posting information on social media; or partnering with local cultural organizations and parent advocacy groups. By delivering information through trusted, familiar channels and ensuring materials are culturally and linguistically appropriate, the department expects to see a steady increase in participation and representation over time.

In the future, we plan to implement multiple ways for families to access and complete the Parent Involvement survey. Educational partners, including parents of students with disabilities, have emphasized that offering more options will help improve participation and response rates. Parents noted that they are more likely to respond using their cell phones, so we are exploring ways to provide secure survey access not only through mail and electronic links but also through QR codes. Encouragement for expanding these options has also come from Idaho Department of Education coordinators who support Migrant and Native American families, as these communities often rely on cell phones rather than computers or other dependable internet connections.

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

To increase the survey response rate year over year, especially among underrepresented groups such as Hispanic families, the department plans to provide LEAs with resources tailored to their communities. LEAs will be supplied with messaging and digital flyers in both English and Spanish so they can more effectively communicate the purpose of the survey and its importance. In addition, LEAs will be encouraged to use communication strategies that resonate with their local populations, particularly LEAs with large Hispanic populations—this may include sending out automated calls, text messages, and emails; distributing flyers at community events; posting information on social media; or partnering with local cultural organizations and parent advocacy groups. By delivering information through trusted, familiar channels and ensuring materials are culturally and linguistically appropriate, the department expects to see a steady increase in participation and representation over time.

In the future, we plan to implement multiple ways for families to access and complete the Parent Involvement survey. Educational partners, including parents of students with disabilities, have emphasized that offering more options will help improve participation and response rates. Parents noted that they are more likely to respond using their cell phones, so we are exploring ways to provide secure survey access not only through mail and electronic links but also through QR codes. Encouragement for expanding these options has also come from Idaho Department of Education coordinators who support Migrant and Native American families, as these communities often rely on cell phones rather than computers or other dependable internet connections.

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.

To identify the potential impact of nonresponse bias, the state first identified any demographic subgroups who were underrepresented in the survey response data. As reported previously, parents of Hispanic/Latino students were underrepresented in the survey data. Second, the state analyzed parent involvement outcome percentages by race/ethnicity to determine whether parents of Hispanic/Latino students differed in their perception of whether schools facilitated parent involvement. 79.35% of parents of Hispanic/Latino students reported that schools facilitated parent involvement. This percentage was greater than the overall parent involvement percentage of 78.13. The state determined that if the survey respondents had been representative of the target population with respect to race/ethnicity, the overall parent involvement percentage would likely be slightly higher. As reported in a prior section, the state improved the representativeness of the FFY 2023 data compared to FFY 2022 with respect to race/ethnicity, which reduced the potential impact of nonresponse bias. The state took several steps to improve the response rate and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities, including working with experts to improve the sampling frame’s representativeness, working with education partners from relatively underrepresented communities to revise survey questions to ensure their relevance and cultural sensitivity, and making the survey available in 13 languages.

Moving forward, the state will provide LEAs with flyers in English and Spanish about the survey so LEAs can effectively communicate its importance and increase the response rate. The state is also exploring additional ways to provide secure survey access, such as through QR codes, so that families who may not have access to a computer or simply prefer communicating via phones, can respond to the survey on their cell phones.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	YES
If yes, provide sampling plan.	Indicator 8 Sampling Plan

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

The new sampling plan involves including half of Idaho’s LEAs each year. Unlike previous approaches that may have limited the number of families surveyed, we now offer all families (a census) within the selected LEAs the opportunity to participate in the survey, provided that their child(ren) are counted in the annual Child Count. This approach ensures that no eligible family is excluded and that subgroups previously underrepresented have a greater chance of participating. With assistance from national technical assistance centers and consultation with an IDC survey statistician, we have updated the sampling frame to consider multiple LEA-level factors. The revised frame incorporates:

Geographical Region: Ensuring that rural, urban, and suburban LEAs are appropriately represented.

Total Enrollment by Quartiles: Balancing LEAs of varying sizes to ensure that smaller LEAs are not overshadowed by larger districts.

Percentage of Enrollment of Students with Disabilities: Ensuring that LEAs serving higher proportions of students with disabilities are adequately represented.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	2024 Parent Involvement Survey - English

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to concerns about representativeness and selection bias, the state revised its baseline data and changed the data collection methodology. This decision is based on collaboration and feedback, as well as continued support from educational partners. Idaho’s educational partners—including LEAs, professional organizations, and advocacy groups—were actively involved in planning and reviewing the updates to the survey methodology. Their input was key to tailoring changes in a way that balanced practical considerations with the need for comprehensive, high-quality data. Their support demonstrates a shared commitment to gathering more accurate feedback and ultimately improving special education services for students and families. By adopting these changes, Idaho is positioning itself to gather more complete, high-quality input from parents, which will inform targeted improvements in special education programs and services across the state.

Please note that due to a technical issue, we are unable to edit our future targets. We have reached out to the EDFacts Partner Support Center for assistance on this issue and they have created a ticket (25-00678 CB). We are aware that our target for 2024 should be 78.13% and our target for 2025 should be 78.14%. Currently the submission platform says 71.00% for 2024 and 71.25% 2025. This issue will be resolved in clarification if needed.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 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 response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The State submitted its sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. The State has submitted revisions to the sampling plan and OSEP will respond under separate cover.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2023, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator, and OSEP's evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it is approvable.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2024 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 response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for 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. 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 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 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.

29

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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	159	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Idaho has established a cell of 10, n-size of 30, and uses two years of data analysis. The calculation for disproportionate representation utilizes a risk ratio and an alternate risk ratio formula.

Where:

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

DLRC = District-level risk for the comparison group

SLRC = State-level risk for the comparison group

Risk ratio = DLR/DLRC

Alternate risk ratio = DLR/SLRC

The calculation for disproportionate representation uses the following criteria:

Minimum cell size, risk numerator of students in a specific analysis category = 10

Minimum n-size, risk denominator of students for comparison = 30

Number of years of analysis = two consecutive years

Threshold, the minimum value used to flag an LEA for disproportionate representation = a risk ratio or an alternate risk ratio of 3.0

The first step in calculating disproportionate representation is to determine the risk of a specific racial or ethnic group being placed in special education. This is done by dividing the number of children from that group in special education by the total number of children from that group enrolled in the LEA (Local Education Agency).

However, to calculate the risk, there must be at least 10 students from the group in special education and at least 30 students enrolled in the LEA. If these requirements aren't met, the risk can't be calculated, and the process stops.

The second step is to calculate the risk for all other racial or ethnic groups (the comparison population). This is done by dividing the number of special education students from other groups by the total number of students from those groups enrolled in the LEA. If the comparison group doesn't meet the minimum requirements, state-level data is used to calculate the risk.

If an LEA has a risk ratio of 3 or more for the same race/ethnicity in two consecutive years, it is flagged for disproportionate representation.

In FFY 2023, 159 LEAs were analyzed, and no instances of disproportionate representation were found. For examples on how the calculations work, please refer to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse Significant Disproportionality Module Series, Module 2: The Data, at <https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/915>.

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.

The Department uses the risk ratio formula to identify LEAs with a ratio of 3.0 or higher for two consecutive years, which indicates disproportionate representation. For FFY 2022, no LEAs were flagged for disproportionate representation in special education based on racial and ethnic groups.

If an LEA is flagged, it must complete a Self-Assessment for Identification, reviewing its referral policies, practices, and procedures. The department, along with Idaho Special Education Technical Assistance and Support (Idaho SESTA) staff, also reviews student eligibility files to ensure assessments are appropriate, particularly for English language proficiency. If assessments are found inappropriate, the department checks if there is enough evidence to support the eligibility decision and if exclusionary factors were properly considered.

The department uses national technical assistance to improve the review process and ensure compliance with IDEA.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In this year's analysis, 159 LEAs met the State's minimum n and/or cell size requirement. This was determined by starting with the total of 188 LEAs, then removing:

7 LEAs with no students receiving special education services, and 22 LEAs that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size criteria.

Idaho is creating evidence-based training to help LEAs and families with the identification process. This includes online training modules, quick guides, and guidance documents. The Idaho Department of Education also updated its Special Education website to improve communication, with clearer resource buttons linking to additional materials and training. Each year, more resources are added to help partners understand IDEA requirements. Idaho has improved data quality with its statewide IEP software, Idaho EdPlan, by linking validations and rules from referral through eligibility determination, helping LEA teams meet evaluation compliance.

The department is working with national technical assistance centers, like the Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), to review self-assessments used by LEAs. Based on feedback from these centers and educational partners, Idaho is revising the self-assessments for better clarity and compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

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 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 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 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). 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 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 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.

70

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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	118	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Idaho has established a minimum cell of 10, minimum n-size of 30 , and uses two years of data analysis. The calculation for disproportionate representation utilizes a risk ratio and an alternate risk ratio formula.

Where:

- DLR = District-level risk for the racial/ethnic group
- DLRC = District-level risk for the comparison group
- SLRC = State-level risk for the comparison group
- Risk ratio = DLR/DLRC
- Alternate risk ratio = DLR/SLRC

The calculation for disproportionate representation uses the following criteria:

- Minimum cell size, risk numerator of students in a specific analysis category = 10
- Minimum n-size, risk denominator of students for comparison = 30
- Number of years of analysis = two consecutive years

Threshold, the minimum risk ratio or, when required, alternate risk ratio used to flag an LEA for disproportionate representation = a risk ratio or an alternate risk ratio of 3.0.

To calculate the disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories, the first step is to calculate the risk for a specific racial/ethnic group. This is done by dividing the number of students in that group with a specific disability by the total number of students of that race/ethnicity in the LEA.

If the minimum requirements are not met (10 students from the target racial/ethnic group in the relevant disability category and 30 enrolled students of that race/ethnicity), the calculation cannot be made. The process stops if these criteria aren't met for a particular group.

Next, the risk for all other racial/ethnic groups is calculated by dividing the number of students in those groups with the particular disability by the total number of students of other racial/ethnic groups in the LEA . If the minimum requirements are not met for the comparison group, an alternate risk is calculated using state-level data.

If an LEA has a risk ratio of 3.0 or higher for the same race/ethnicity and the same disability category for two consecutive years, they are flagged for disproportionate representation in specific disability categories.

In FFY 2023, 125 LEAs were analyzed, and no instances of disproportionate representation were found. For more details, visit Idaho's Significant Disproportionality Module Series, Module 2: The Data, on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at <https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/915>.

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.

The department uses the risk and alternate risk ratio formula to flag LEAs with a ratio of 3.0 or higher for two consecutive years in the same category, indicating disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in certain disability categories. For FFY 2023, no LEAs were flagged.

If an LEA is flagged, it must complete a Self-Assessment for Identification, reviewing its referral policies, practices, and procedures. The department, along with Idaho Special Education Technical Assistance and Support (Idaho SESTA) staff, also reviews student eligibility files to ensure assessments are appropriate, particularly for English language proficiency. If assessments are found inappropriate, the department checks if there is enough evidence

to support the eligibility decision and if exclusionary factors were properly considered. The department uses national technical assistance to improve the review process and ensure compliance with IDEA.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In this year's analysis, 118 LEAs met the State's minimum n and/or cell size requirement. This was determined by starting with the total of 188 LEAs, then removing 70 LEAs that did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size criteria.

Idaho is creating evidence-based training to help LEAs and families with the identification process. This includes online training modules, quick guides, and guidance documents. The Idaho Department of Education also updated its Special Education website to improve communication, with clearer resource buttons linking to additional materials and training. Each year, more resources are added to help partners understand IDEA requirements. Idaho has improved data quality with its statewide IEP software, Idaho EdPlan, by linking validations and rules from referral through eligibility determination, helping LEA teams meet evaluation compliance. The department is working with national technical assistance centers, like the Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), to review self-assessments used by LEAs. Based on feedback from these centers and educational partners, Idaho is revising the self-assessments for better clarity and compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

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 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	97.32%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.36%	98.58%	97.98%	97.16%	97.32%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
7,320	7,072	97.32%	100%	96.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

248

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.

A total of 248 students, whose parents gave consent for evaluation, had their initial eligibility determination take longer than the state's required timeline. The range of days beyond the timeline of when the evaluation was completed was 1-197 days.

Additional assessments were requested by the family or adult student

Staffing issues, defined as a delay that resulted from the inability to coordinate internal resources because of staffing issues

Scheduling difficulties, defined as a delay that resulted from the inability to coordinate with all concerned external team members and/or partners

Inaccurate application of the State's exception rule

These delays represent the reasons for the number of days beyond the 60-day timeline. The timeline starts the day after the school district receives signed parental consent for evaluation and ends when the eligibility decision is made. Days when school was not in session for 5 or more consecutive days were not included in the delay calculations, per Idaho state rule.

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.

The 60-day timeline begins the day after the LEA receives signed parental consent for initial assessment, and in Idaho, the timeline ends the day that the evaluation team comes to a consensus regarding eligibility (initial eligibility determination date). The initial eligibility determination date is used as the official date of the conclusion of the evaluation.

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 Department staff.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Idaho has improved the process of notifying potentially eligible students transitioning from Part C to Part B services by automating the notifications. The Idaho Department of Education (Department) also created an application for LEAs to track these students. The updates, which started in October 2022, allow for better communication between Part C, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW) Infant Toddler Program (ITP), and Part B through automated uploads. This also connects to the state's data system to reduce duplicated efforts. These changes have impacted the timeliness of transition and Child Find services. Because of the new system, the Department reset its baseline for Indicator 11 to 97.32% for data collected in the 2022-2023 school year (FFY 2022), making it not comparable to previous years' data.

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system includes Indicator 11 and other compliance indicators, which are used to determine the level of support an LEA receives. LEAs review data for students with disabilities annually as part of the RDA system. The Department has developed self-assessment tools to help LEAs identify and address areas of low performance, particularly in initial evaluations. LEAs with the most needs can work one-on-one with Idaho SESTA coordinators to complete assessments and create improvement plans using SMART goals.

To improve data quality, Idaho predominately uses the Idaho EdPlan software system. This system helps ensure compliance with timelines for Indicator 11 by providing calendar reminders and allowing staff to track progress. The system automatically generates necessary dates and improves the process from referral to eligibility determination. LEAs who choose not to use EdPlan must use an alternative IEP platform to ensure accurate tracking.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
72	72	0	0

FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

To ensure the 72 Local Education Agencies (LEAs) correctly implemented the regulatory requirements" to align more closely with 23-01, the Department conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. They reviewed updated Child Find 60-day timeline data through the Idaho System for

Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA that had shown noncompliance in FFY 2022. After this subsequent review of updated data, the Department determined that all 72 LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

LEAs were also required to share improvement activities, such as training or changes in policies, practices, or procedures, to address the causes of noncompliance. The Department confirmed that these activities were completed and targeted the noncompliance issues. All 72 LEAs corrected their noncompliance on time.

The Department verified that all 72 LEAs passed the two verification tests and corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for Indicator 11. They confirmed that the LEAs were in full compliance with IDEA regulations.

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

The Department confirmed that all individual cases of noncompliance were corrected by reviewing updated data and ensuring the 72 LEAs completed all 194 initial eligibility evaluations. The Department investigated each case of noncompliance from FFY 2022 at the student level and verified that all students had an evaluation, even if it was late. If eligible, an IEP was created and implemented with parental consent for placement. The Department tracked and documented this review in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

Please see verification of noncompliance narratives above in the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022."

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	97.51%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.95%	96.95%	99.24%	89.79%	97.51%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,293
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	41
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	365
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.	865
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	2
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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.	365	385	97.51%	100%	94.81%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Idaho continues to experience turnover and shortages of educational staff and data stewards in local education agencies (LEAs), contributing to slippage in reported data. These challenges have resulted in reduced resources for completing evaluations on time, diminished communication between program staff and data personnel, and a weaker understanding of accurate data collection and reporting processes. Staffing shortages, including limited substitute teacher availability, have further hindered LEA teams' participation in professional development or training opportunities that could address these issues.

The Idaho Department of Education (Department) 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 generated from ISEE to represent all early childhood transitions for the year. These data are then compared to the list of potentially eligible students referred by Idaho's lead agency for Part C, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Infant Toddler Program (ITP).

Slippage has occurred partly due to new staff lacking sufficient training to pull down nightly referrals promptly. Additionally, miscommunication from ITP staff regarding what information can or cannot be provided to school districts, such as details about late referrals or students who move during the referral process, has further complicated the accurate reporting and processing of data. These factors together have contributed to delays and inconsistencies in Idaho's early childhood transition data reporting. In conjunction with staffing shortages, the influx in children transitioning from Part C to Part B could have amplified the noncompliance and subsequent 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

20

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.

Scheduling difficulties and Additional Assessments were listed as the primary reasons for the delay in the early childhood timeline, which exceeded the timeline by a range of 2-74 days .

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 Department collects Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition data through ISEE. After the final data upload of the school year, a report is generated from ISEE to track early childhood transitions. These data are compared with the list of potentially eligible students referred by the IDHW, ITP.

In October 2022, Idaho implemented an automated secure data transfer between the two agencies to improve communication about students potentially eligible for preschool services under Part B of IDEA. This replaced monthly notifications from regional ITP offices with centralized nightly updates sent to the State Education Agency (SEA) and Special Education Directors/Designees. The department also launched the Early Childhood Transition (ECT) Data Collection System, an online tool that allows the state and local educational agencies (LEAs) to track student progress in transitioning. The system assigns a unique Educational ID (EDUID) to students whose parents consent to initial assessments and cross-checks data with ISEE to ensure quality. Updates to Idaho's data system have streamlined communication between Part C and Part B services, accelerating the transition process for students. These changes reset Idaho's baseline for Indicator 12 to 97.51%, based on FFY 2022 data.

In 2022, the department and ITP collaborated to enhance the transition of children from Part C to Part B services. After evaluating the system using the ECTA/DaSy Framework, Idaho identified areas for improvement in communication and data management.

Key improvements include:

Automated Data Transfer: Nightly updates replace monthly notifications, using current contact information from ISEE.

Improved Communication: LEAs are identified based on the child's address and district boundaries, with notifications sent within 24 hours of key milestones, such as reaching age two years six months.

Enhanced Data Security: Systems integration ensures secure communication.

Unified Tracking: The ECT Data Collection System allows SEA, LEAs, and ITP to track student progress in a shared application.

Follow-Up and Accountability: ITP can confirm that LEAs received notifications, and the department ensures compliance with transition requirements.

The department provided training on the new processes, emphasizing roles and responsibilities based on OSEP guidance. Joint communication has been developed by the department and ITP to clarify the need for accurate information to the appropriate LEA during the transition process.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

1. Submission and Review of Required Documentation

Each LEA provided signed parental consent forms, eligibility determinations, and Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for the number of students transitioning from Part C to Part B, based on the LEA's Child Count.

If all reviewed student files demonstrated compliance, one of the two required components to verify correction of noncompliance was satisfied.

2. Improvement Activities to Address Contributing Factors

LEAs reported on improvement activities—such as staff training or revisions to policies and procedures—to correct factors contributing to noncompliance.

The department and Idaho SESTA staff verified completion and effectiveness of these activities using documentation within the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). To ensure the 9 Local Education Agencies (LEAs) correctly implemented the regulatory requirements to align more closely with 23-01, the Department conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. They reviewed updated Early Childhood Transition data through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA that had shown noncompliance in FFY 2022. After this subsequent review of updated data, the Department determined that all 9 LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

By confirming the correction of each individual instance of noncompliance and verifying that LEAs consistently follow regulatory requirements (as required by OSEP QA 23-01), the department determined that all nine LEAs corrected their FFY 2022 noncompliance for Indicator 12 in a timely manner.

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

The department verified the correction of all noncompliance by reviewing updated data and confirming that the 9 LEAs completed all early childhood transitions. It investigated each instance of noncompliance from FFY 2022 at the student level. The department ensured that all eligible students had evaluations and IEPs developed and implemented, even if delayed, and were receiving special education services, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. All verification and documentation were tracked in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). LEAs were also required to share improvement activities, such as training or changes in policies, practices, or procedures, to address the causes of noncompliance. The Department confirmed that these activities were completed and targeted noncompliance issues. All 9 LEAs corrected their noncompliance within 365 days of notification of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	95.35%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.80%	90.48%	95.35%	92.55%	96.18%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
167	171	96.18%	100%	97.66%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 through a process called General Supervision File Review (GSFR). Each year, all local education agencies (LEAs) with secondary students are reviewed for compliance with Indicator 13 requirements. The secondary transition review tool can be found at the Idaho Training House website: <https://idahotc.com/Resources/File/RFFID/17706>.

The GSFR is done online. LEAs first conduct an internal file review and then submit an assurance to the Idaho Department of Education (Department). They list the students reviewed in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). The Department selects three files from this review, prioritizing secondary IEPs, students with Specific Learning Disabilities, and Early Childhood files.

For the 2023-2024 review, Department staff, along with Idaho SESTA staff, conducted reviews of the files and entered the data into the CTT system. LEAs were then notified of the review results and had a chance to address any missing or incomplete materials. Supporting documentation must already be in existence.

The Department then made a final decision on whether the LEA was noncompliant. If an LEA was found to be noncompliant, they received written notice of this on February 14, 2024.

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)

The Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system in Idaho includes Indicator 13 as part of LEA compliance reviews. Based on performance, LEAs are assigned a level of support to help improve outcomes for students with disabilities. LEAs review data for students annually and may receive help through self-assessments to identify areas needing improvement. For LEAs needing more support, Idaho SESTA coordinators help with self-assessments and creating improvement plans.

The Secondary Special Education Coordinator provides training to LEAs on secondary transition data and organizes informational and training webinars. Idaho has also worked with the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) to connect pre-employment IDVR counselors and special education personnel and students, leading to more students engaging in pre-employment activities.

In 2023, Idaho received a grant to support innovative programs that increase job opportunities for youth with disabilities. The focus is on creating systems that help students transition smoothly from school to work, with key partners including vocational rehabilitation agencies, centers for independent living, parent information and training centers, and LEAs.

The Department and IDVR conducted surveys to better understand the services available for students with disabilities. The results are helping to identify gaps in service access and improve communication to inform families about available resources.

Idaho offers training to parents, LEAs, and other agencies to raise awareness of resources and benefits. In 2021, a Transition Institute was held to improve transition services. In 2022, 2023, and 2024 the institute connected LEA teams with higher education and other agencies to improve resources for students with disabilities

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

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

FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Five local education agencies (LEAs) addressed noncompliance issues involving six students by developing and implementing improvement plans to correct underlying factors. They demonstrated completion of these activities within 365 days through assurances and documentation, tracked in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

To ensure system-level compliance, LEAs submitted additional student files after the initial notification, showing 100% compliance with regulatory requirements. The Department, along with Idaho SESTA, reviewed improvement plans, documentation, and subsequent files and verified that all five of the LEAs corrected the findings noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for Indicator 13 demonstrated 100% compliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with QA 23-01. All reviews and verifications were documented in the CTT.

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

The Department identified noncompliance in six student files across five LEAs and verified correction of all noncompliance within 365 days of notification. LEAs submitted updated student files for the six students with identified noncompliance, demonstrating correction at the individual level, and

the Department verified that each individual student record/case of noncompliance was corrected and demonstrated 100% compliance. For details on GSFR processes, visit the Idaho Training Clearinghouse RDA Monitoring System page and select GSFR.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

Five local education agencies (LEAs) addressed noncompliance issues involving six students by developing and implementing improvement plans to correct underlying factors. They demonstrated completion of these activities within 365 days through assurances and documentation, tracked in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

To ensure system-level compliance, LEAs submitted additional student files after the initial notification, showing 100% compliance with regulatory requirements. The Department, along with Idaho SESTA, reviewed improvement plans, documentation, and subsequent files and verified that all five of the LEAs corrected the findings noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for Indicator 13 demonstrated 100% compliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, consistent with QA 23-01. All reviews and verifications were documented in the CTT.

The Department identified noncompliance in six student files across five LEAs and verified correction of all noncompliance within 365 days of notification. LEAs submitted updated student files for the six students with identified noncompliance, demonstrating correction at the individual level, and the Department verified that each individual student record/case of noncompliance was corrected and demonstrated 100% compliance. For details on GSFR processes, visit the Idaho Training Clearinghouse RDA Monitoring System page and select GSFR.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.

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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2024 on students who left school during 2022-2023, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2022-2023 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).

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 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 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 analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their 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.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2020	Target >=	24.50%	25.00%	15.75%	15.85%	15.95%
A	15.75%	Data	21.41%	20.41%	15.75%	17.87%	16.67%
B	2020	Target >=	49.00%	50.00%	58.87%	59.27%	59.67%
B	58.87%	Data	55.31%	55.72%	58.87%	54.56%	53.40%
C	2020	Target >=	79.50%	80.00%	74.50%	75.39%	76.29%
C	74.50%	Data	69.38%	71.89%	74.50%	72.90%	73.92%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	16.05%	16.15%	16.25%
Target B >=	60.07%	60.47%	60.87%
Target C >=	77.18%	78.08%	78.97%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes representatives from various groups such as parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, school superintendents, special education directors, teachers, and several Idaho state agencies, like the Idaho Department of Education (Department) and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL). The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) plays an important role in setting educational targets. It consists of at least 14 special education directors who represent a mix of school districts across Idaho, ensuring broad demographic representation. The Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) includes a range of organizations, such as vocational rehabilitation, disability rights groups, and school representatives, working together to support students with disabilities in transitioning to adulthood.

The Department uses the term "educational partners" instead of "stakeholders" to avoid negative connotations with Native American groups. The department worked with these partners to set targets for Indicator 14, which measures post-school outcomes like higher education and employment for students with disabilities. In 2021, the department set targets based on the most recent available data (FFY 2020). After discussions, partners

recommended small, achievable increases in the targets, with a more ambitious goal for employment outcomes due to the state's strong economy.

The department continues to meet with educational partners regularly to discuss progress, address challenges, and share updates

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,749
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	701
Response Rate	40.08%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	112
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	273
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)	52
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).	119

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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	112	701	16.67%	16.05%	15.98%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	385	701	53.40%	60.07%	54.92%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	556	701	73.92%	77.18%	79.32%	Met target	No Slippage

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	2022	2023
Response Rate	51.52%	40.08%

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

Idaho uses a +/- 3 percentage point discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group.

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 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.

Idaho analyzed race/ethnicity and disability category to determine if 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. Based on the data analysis using a plus or minus three percentage point discrepancy, the department identified differences by race/ethnicity and disability. In terms of race/ethnicity, the SWD population consists of 24.19% of Hispanic exiters and 66.50% of White exiters, whereas the respondents consist of 20.54% of Hispanic exiters and 70.33% of White exiters. Thus, Hispanic students are under-represented in the data, and white students are over-represented. All other races/ethnicities were within three percentage points of their population. In terms of disability, the SWD population consists of 12.18% of Autistic exiters, whereas the respondents consist of 15.41% of Autistic exiters. All other disabilities were within three percentage points of their population. Thus, students with autism are over-represented in the data. Note that exiters from a wide range of LEAs from across the State responded to the survey and reflect the population of exiters in terms of geographic distribution.

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.

The department offers annual training for opt-in LEAs before the survey collection period begins. During the 2023-2024 training, a representative from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) shared insights on national trends, quality survey practices, and strategies for engaging hard-to-reach former students.

The department strongly encouraged LEAs to have staff who previously worked with former students conduct the surveys. Collaboration across programs, including special education, migrant education, English Learners, and school counselors, was also recommended to identify the best individuals to support the survey process.

Future trainings will further integrate NTACT:C resources to enhance outreach and improve response rates, particularly from Hispanic students. These efforts aim to improve data quality and increase participation.

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 department continues to work to expand the Indicator 14 LEA opt-in opportunity and encourages all LEAs to conduct initial survey attempts. In school year 2023-2024, (FFY 2023), the department again provided LEAs participating in the opt-in survey process access to additional funds through the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Grant. In the 2023-24 collection, 48 LEAs representing more than 57% of LEAs with eligible past students participated in the opt-in survey collection. Training for opt-in LEAs included representation of the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C). The NTACT:C representative provided additional information on national trends and strategies to connect with hard-to-reach past students. The department strongly encouraged LEAs to have staff involved in past student education conduct surveys. LEAs were also encouraged to collaborate between programs, including special education, migrant, English Learner, and school counselors, to determine the best individuals to involve in the survey process. Future training of opt-in LEAs will further incorporate NTACT:C resources around improving response from hard-to-reach populations. This will include reaching out to staff other than Special Education staff who might have a stronger connection to the students, for example an EL teacher who might be able to review the survey in Spanish if that is the student's first language. The department anticipates these efforts will improve data quality and increase the response rate, particularly for past Hispanic students.

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 analyzed the survey response rate and data representativeness to identify potential nonresponse bias and ensure that the data reflects the demographics of youth who exited secondary school with IEPs in effect. Three criteria were examined:

1. Overall Response Rate: Idaho achieved a 40% survey response rate, which is considered very high. This level of participation increases the likelihood that the data is representative of the population and minimizes the risk of nonresponse bias.

2. Representativeness of Responses:

Race/Ethnicity: Using a plus or minus three percentage point threshold, the analysis showed minor discrepancies. Hispanic youth were underrepresented (24.19% of the population compared to 20.54% of respondents), and White youth were slightly overrepresented (66.50% of the population compared to 70.33% of respondents). However, these differences were not significant.

Disability: The analysis found a notable overrepresentation of youth with Autism (12.18% of the population compared to 15.41% of respondents). This suggests that nonresponse bias might be present for certain disability categories.

3. Response Timing Comparison: The department compared early responders to those who required multiple prompts to respond. With respect to the reported post-school outcomes, the analysis revealed no significant differences between the two groups, indicating that response timing did not introduce meaningful bias.

Addressing Nonresponse Bias: Based on this analysis, Idaho identified potential nonresponse bias in data related to students with Autism and Hispanic youth. To address these issues and promote broader representation, Idaho has implemented the following strategies:

Targeted Outreach for Hard-to-Reach Populations: LEAs were provided guidance to prioritize outreach to students with disabilities that are underrepresented in the data. Strategies include personalized and culturally relevant communication methods, as well as engaging family members to encourage participation.

Collaboration Across Programs: LEAs are encouraged to collaborate with special education, migrant education, and EL services to reach diverse subgroups and underrepresented populations more effectively.

Training for Survey Personnel: The department conducts annual training that emphasizes strategies for engaging hard-to-reach groups, leveraging insights from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) to improve outreach and data quality.

Improved Communication Tools: The state continues to develop tools to support LEAs in building trust with non-responders.

Ongoing Monitoring and Adjustments: Idaho is committed to refining its strategies based on feedback and monitoring of response patterns, with plans to incorporate additional resources and targeted training to address identified gaps.

These actions aim to reduce nonresponse bias, enhance the representativeness of the data, and ensure a comprehensive understanding of the experiences of all youth who exited secondary school with IEPs.

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)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2024 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baselines 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 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	2
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	2

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes diverse members such as parents of students with disabilities, educators, higher education representatives, juvenile and adult corrections, charter and private schools, and staff from state agencies like the Idaho Department of Education (Department), Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW). Similarly, the Directors Advisory Council (DAC) consists of 14 special education directors representing various LEA types across the state, ensuring demographic diversity in discussions, including target setting.

Idaho uses the term "educational partners" instead of "stakeholders" to avoid negative connotations for Native American populations. Educational partners have praised Idaho's stable and effective Dispute Resolution (DR) system. Since fewer than 10 resolution sessions were held, partners opted not to set targets for Indicator 15 until reaching this threshold. DR resources are provided in various formats to ensure broad access, emphasizing that processes can be initiated in any order, simultaneously if needed, without prerequisites. Regular updates are shared with SEAP, DAC, and parent groups like Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL).

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=					
Data	0.00%	100.00%			

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=			

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
2	2			100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Several mechanisms are available through the Department’s Dispute Resolution (DR) office to resolve disputes related to special education or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These processes include facilitation, informal conflict resolution, mediation, state administrative complaint investigation, and due process hearings (including expedited due process matters). Idaho’s DR office makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve emergent disputes at the least adversarial and most local level appropriate.

The DR office contracts with nearly 20 third-party experts who provide facilitation, mediation, complaint investigation, and due process hearing services under the supervision of the DR office. Three contractors serve as due process hearing officers. Each DR contractor brings unique experience and talent to the Department, and all have significant knowledge and expertise in both special education regulations and practices and conflict resolution. Contractors are assigned to cases on a rotational and geographic basis and are required to participate in professional development and stay up to date on current issues in special education. The DR office provides its contractors with national legal updates, current OSEP/OSER and state-level guidance, annual in-person forums hosted by the DR office, quarterly remote meetings that include DR updates and Q&A discussions, and regular opportunities to attend national and/or regional training such as LRP Media Group, Pacific Northwest Institute on Special Education and the Law (PNWI), and Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) training.

The DR office regularly includes information on trending issues in monthly webinars and newsletters provided by the Department’s state-level special education staff to Idaho’s special education directors. Additionally, in collaboration with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA), Idaho’s special education training team, the DR office recommends and develops updated guidance for LEAs and resources for parents. The DR office also presents annual administrative training to special education directors, superintendents, and other educational leaders at various training opportunities sponsored by the Department.

Recent resources developed by the DR office to support constituents include but are not limited to:

Idaho Dispute Resolution Brochure – A concise guide to the special education resources and services available to constituents through the DR office.

The DR office offers regular updates to educational partners, 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.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2023. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baselines or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of 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 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1 Mediations held	18
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	12

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) includes parents, educators, corrections representatives, state agencies, and other key educational partners. The Directors Advisory Council (DAC), made up of 14 regional special education directors representing diverse LEA types, also plays a critical role in target setting. Idaho uses "educational partners" instead of "stakeholders" to respect cultural preferences.

Idaho's Dispute Resolution (DR) system, praised for its effectiveness, offers various options that can be used at any time, in any sequence, or simultaneously. Updates are regularly shared with SEAP, DAC, and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) to ensure broad awareness. In FFY 2020, Idaho updated its data collection methods, establishing a new baseline of 80% and setting a target range of 75%-85%, approved by educational partners.

The Idaho Department of Education (Department) shares progress toward targets through quarterly meetings and provides opportunities for feedback on improvements and regional challenges.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	80.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	80.00%	66.67%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	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%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target (low)	FFY 2023 Target (high)	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
2	12	18	100.00%	75.00%	85.00%	77.78%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Several mechanisms are available through the Department’s DR office to resolve disputes related to special education or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These processes include facilitation, informal conflict resolution, mediation, state administrative complaint investigation, and due process hearings (including expedited due process matters). Idaho’s DR office makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve emergent disputes at the least adversarial and most local level appropriate.

The DR office contracts with nearly 20 third-party experts who provide facilitation, mediation, complaint investigation, and due process hearing services under the supervision of the DR office. Three contractors serve as due process hearing officers. Each DR contractor brings unique experience and talent to the Department, and all have significant knowledge and expertise in both special education regulations and practices and conflict resolution. Contractors are assigned to cases on a rotational and geographic basis and are required to participate in professional development and stay up to date on current issues in special education. The DR office provides its contractors with national legal updates, current OSEP/OSER and state-level guidance, annual in-person forums hosted by the DR office, quarterly remote meetings that include DR updates and Q&A discussions, and regular opportunities to attend national and/or regional training such as LRP Media Group, Pacific Northwest Institute on Special Education and the Law (PNWI), and Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) training.

The DR office regularly includes information on trending issues in monthly webinars and newsletters provided by the Department’s state-level special education staff to Idaho’s special education directors. Additionally, in collaboration with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA), Idaho’s special education training team, the DR office recommends and develops updated guidance for LEAs and resources for parents. The DR office also presents annual administrative training to special education directors, superintendents, and other educational leaders at various training opportunities sponsored by the Department.

Recent resources developed by the DR office to support constituents include but are not limited to:

Idaho Dispute Resolution Brochure – A concise guide to the special education resources and services available to constituents through the DR office. The DR office offers regular updates to educational partners, including SEAP and DAC, and works closely with IPUL and Idaho SESTA to develop resources and training for parents and school districts.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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) (SiMR) 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 2022 through February 2027, 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) 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, 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, 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 SPPs/APRs, 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., February 1, 2024). 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 2023 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025).

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 (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., 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 2023 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025) 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 participants in the SSIP professional development project, Cultivating Readers Project, during the SY 2023-2024 were selected as the subset of the population that included 23 of the 169 LEAs (12.4%) in Idaho. The LEAs participating in this project include: 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. There are 36 unique elementary schools that are participating in the project. The subset of the population continues to be selected based on the LEAs that started the project in SY 2021-2022. The number of students in this subset for the SY 2023-2024 represents 28% of the target population (6668 - 4th grade students in project/24087 total number of 4th graders in Idaho). Of the 6668 students participating in the project at the LEA level, 950 were identified as students with disabilities. Idaho will calculate and report the SiMR data for 4th-grade students in this same cohort of LEAs each year in the SPP/APR. The SSIP Leadership Team selected LEAs based on reading outcomes. LEAs with lower reading outcomes got priority because those LEAs would benefit most from intensive literacy support and training.

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>

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	Current Relationship	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	14.40%	14.60%	14.80%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of 4th grade students in participating LEAs with disabilities proficient on the ISAT in ELA	Total number of 4th grade students in participating LEAs with disabilities who completed the ISAT in ELA	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
172	950	14.05%	14.40%	18.11%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2023 data.

Data for FFY 2023 are collected from the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), which is administered through Cambium. The ISAT is the state of Idaho's summative assessment for English/Language Arts (ELA) for students in grades 3-8 and 11. The process of reporting is through the EDFacts file titled - EdFacts File FS 178—Academic Achievement in English Language Arts. Idaho uses this data file to select the subset population to calculate its SiMR.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The Assessment and Accountability Department at IDSE receives raw assessment data from Cambium. This department cleans the data, and it is sent to the SSIP internal evaluator. The SSIP internal evaluator calculates the SiMR by including all fourth-grade students with disabilities in the SSIP LEA's during the SY 2023-2024 (based on ISAT for ELA). The calculation for SiMR is found by dividing the number of proficient or advanced students with disabilities by the total number of fourth-grade students with disabilities from the SSIP LEA's who completed the ELA ISAT assessment.

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.

To enhance early reading outcomes, the SSIP State Leadership Team (which is comprised of the Director of Special Education, SPED Data Analyst, Special Education Data & Reporting Coordinator, Program Evaluation Coordinator, and SSIP Contractor) utilizes the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) data for ongoing monthly monitoring. The IRI, an early reading screener for students in kindergarten through third grade, provides valuable insights into student progress. The Special Education Department analyzes this data, which is presented to LEAs through comprehensive reports, including charts and tables, disaggregated by demographics. LEAs then use this information for informal progress monitoring at the local level. Simultaneously, the SSIP internal evaluator aggregates the raw data monthly to assess LEA progress, inform state-level planning, and track the overall progress toward the SiMR. While the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) covers a broader range of English Language Arts (ELA) content, the State Leadership Team uses the IRI for its specific focus on reading, aligning directly with SSIP goals. In FFY 2024, school-level IRI reports played a role in mid-year needs assessments during In-District Visits. Similarly, reports generated in Spring 2024 informed professional development needs for building teams, enabling them to target specific student groups and reading skills requiring additional support.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, which 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)

NO

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:** Idaho's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), aligned with the Governor's and Superintendent of Instruction's literacy priorities, aims to enhance reading outcomes. The State Leadership Team, after evaluating Local Education Agencies' (LEAs) reading scores, initiated focused outreach to boost SSIP participation. Upholding local control principles, each LEA submits an annual Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan to the State Board of Education. Collaborative efforts ensure seamless communication and resource-sharing among the State Leadership Team, LEA leadership, IDE departments, and community partners. The SSIP's collaborative priorities target reading challenges and strategically leverage resources to enhance statewide literacy. The infrastructure improvement strategy focuses on increasing LEA participation, particularly those with lower reading outcomes. Despite aiming to recruit 10 LEAs and 20 schools, the State Leadership Team successfully onboarded 7 LEAs with 9 schools, primarily from rural districts and small charter schools. This expansion enables Idaho to scale up SSIP activities, aiming to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities.
- Finance:** Idaho used the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) to support its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This involved giving mini grants to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) for additional support for the implementation of the project. The grants also allowed LEAs to address needs related to reading instruction. Systems for monitoring fiscal responsibility were led by the Special Education fiscal team and the SPDG project director through online meetings and training. The state also created a system for awarding, tracking, and reimbursing the 21 LEAs that received grants. SPDG funds helped pay for staff or substitute teachers, contributing to ongoing improvement. Progress was measured by tracking spending, how often funds were used, and through feedback. The state kept in touch with LEA business managers through emails, calls, and online meetings.
- Personnel/Workforce:** Idaho's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focuses on giving teachers the skills they need to teach reading with

evidence-based practices to fidelity. To do this, the state provides training in many ways, like meetings, online courses, and coaching. These trainings help teachers learn the best ways to teach reading and use technology in their classrooms. This approach encourages teamwork and improves the quality of reading programs in Local Education Agencies (LEAs). The SSIP has continued to focus on creating online courses for teachers on topics like foundational reading skills, the Science of Reading, using data, and teaching vocabulary and reading comprehension. The state's website continues to see an increase of web traffic, indicating that the resources are being accessed by educators.

4. **Data System:** Idaho established a comprehensive data collection and analysis system, supported by the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). This system tracks various aspects of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), including feedback from participants through post-training surveys, observations of training quality, and how well the training is implemented to fidelity in classrooms. It also monitors how closely schools are following the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading (MTSS-R) framework and gathers data on the effectiveness of coaching provided to educators, including metrics related to coaching sessions. Furthermore, it tracks attendance at training events and the completion rates of assigned activities. The State Leadership Team created a data-driven culture by providing participants with regular data reports and training on how to use this information effectively. This emphasis on data analysis allows for informed decision-making, leading to improvements in SSIP support and identifying specific areas where teachers can strengthen their reading instruction. The goal is to use this data to refine SSIP activities, leading to better teaching practices and improved reading outcomes for students. To measure the success of the SSIP project, the state tracks survey response rates, the timeliness of data submissions, and gathers qualitative feedback. To promote engagement, the organization employs monthly reminders, implements an incentive program, and highlights success stories through a year-end video presentation.

5. **Professional Development:** Idaho recognizes the critical link between educator expertise and effective reading instruction. The state has prioritized comprehensive professional development in literacy for administrators, instructional coaches, teachers, and support staff. This training continues to include specialized training in dyslexia to ensure comprehensive literacy support. Delivered by qualified professionals through both in-person and virtual formats, the training encompasses Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading (MTSS-R), evidence-based strategies, and foundational reading skills. A dedicated website continues to provide centralized access to resources, fostering collaboration and engagement with national literacy experts. To further enhance instructional practices, Idaho provides ongoing technical assistance to educators, including onsite visits and virtual coaching, focused on refining teaching methods, strengthening collaboration with parents, and supporting effective implementation of MTSS-R. During this reporting period, the state has utilized its online training resources for instructional and coaching staff, with a focus on video submissions and providing meaningful feedback. Achievement is assessed through various metrics, including tracking uploaded videos, submissions to coaches, and mid-year survey data on the coaching platform's usability. This data-driven approach allows for continuous improvement and adjustments based on feedback, ultimately contributing to the sustainability of the SSIP and the achievement of its targets.

6. **Accountability and Quality Improvement:** The Idaho Department of Education (IDE) actively monitors and supports Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to ensure positive outcomes for students. This involves several key activities, including the General Supervision File Review (GSFR), fiscal monitoring, and annual LEA Determinations. To strengthen this process, a specialized team within IDE's Special Education department has used the refined data calculation methodology for LEA determinations. This comprehensive monitoring system effectively identifies LEAs needing additional support and technical assistance (TA). IDE then provides tailored support to these LEAs, with the goal of improving outcomes for students with disabilities. LEAs receiving a determination of "Needs Intervention" and identified as having low performance in English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency are encouraged to participate in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Furthermore, the SSIP/SPDG team analyzes annual Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) proficiency rates for all districts. They proactively reach out to districts with less than 50% proficiency among their general education students in kindergarten through third grade to offer support and resources.

7. **Quality Standards:** Idaho prioritizes high standards for educators through the Idaho Professional Standards Commission. This commission guides educator preparation, ensuring teachers are not only skilled and knowledgeable but also dedicated to ethical practices and student success. All teacher candidates are expected to meet rigorous standards of the Idaho Core Teacher Standards and those specific to their subject areas.

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.

1. **Governance:** To improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities, Idaho focused on increasing participation in its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The state targeted Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with lower reading scores and successfully recruited 7 LEAs (9 schools) in the 2023-24 school year. This expansion of SSIP activities was supported by a detailed application process and ongoing communication from the State Leadership Team. To further enhance literacy education, the Special Education and Content Department streamlined professional development by integrating activities from the SSIP and Idaho's SMART Project. This strategic alignment reflects the state's commitment to a unified and effective approach to improving literacy instruction.

2. **Finance:** Awarded on October 1, 2020, the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) has significantly driven Idaho's SiMR achievement through a strategic financial approach. The infrastructure improvement strategy, focused on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), involved a meticulous system for awarding, monitoring, and reimbursing Local Education Agencies (LEAs). This system facilitated quarterly reimbursement submissions, resulting in 21 SSIP LEAs receiving subawards. SPDG funds were instrumental in supporting LEAs, enabling them to implement sustained improvement strategies and engage instructional staff and coaches. This financial backing was crucial for ensuring participation during off-contract times, and it also provided the flexibility to hire substitute teachers when needed. Additionally, the state implemented comprehensive assessment and communication strategies. These included efficient subaward setups, quarterly fund withdrawals, regular reminders, and informative webinars designed for LEA Business Managers. The state's evaluation process encompassed tracking expenditures, monitoring quarterly fund drawdown percentages, and gathering valuable feedback from LEAs. Overall, this emphasis on effective financial management has proven integral to the sustainability and success of the SSIP in Idaho.

3. **Personnel/Workforce:** During the reporting period, Idaho's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) demonstrated significant advancements in personnel/workforce development, directly supporting the State Identified Measurable Results (SiMR). The ongoing focus on infrastructure improvement has resulted in the creation of sustainable training materials for Local Education Agency (LEA) personnel, with a particular emphasis on addressing the characteristics of dyslexia, aligning with recent state legislation. The provision of virtual dyslexia training and updates to existing Professional Development (PD) and Technical Assistance (TA) resources have enhanced support for instructional staff. Increased engagement with these resources, evidenced by heightened traffic to the SSIP website, underscores the effectiveness of these initiatives. Moreover, the implementation of a dedicated website has streamlined access to these essential resources, further promoting the sustainability of SSIP efforts.

4. **Data System:** The State Leadership Team is instrumental in maintaining a comprehensive data system that tracks both implementation progress and student outcomes using a variety of tools and surveys. The Idaho State Department of Education (IDE) has fostered a culture of data-driven decision-making to promote continuous improvement. To further strengthen our analytical capacity and support ongoing improvement efforts, the utilization of an external evaluator has been instrumental. This strategic addition has enhanced the State Leadership Team's ability to analyze project data, generate valuable insights, and provide informed recommendations for optimizing project outcomes. The external evaluator has conducted case study interviews, refined survey instruments, and performed additional analyses to support the achievement of project goals and objectives. Additionally, Idaho continues to leverage a virtual coaching platform for instructional staff and coaches.

5. **Professional Development:** LEAs received individualized technical assistance (TA) based on their specific needs and project timelines, catering to the

various roles within the initiatives. To enhance this support system, the infrastructure improvement strategy continued with monthly reminder newsletters to keep all participants informed of upcoming activities and requirements. Furthermore, monthly virtual calls continued for building administrators, focusing on training in Implementation Science, addressing implementation challenges, and discussing project activities and timelines. Additionally, monthly cohort Collaboration Calls were held to offer training and technical assistance to instructional staff and LEA/school coaches on the project's evidence-based practices.

These strategies led to positive short-term and intermediate outcomes, including increased participation and activity completion rates, greater project clarity, and improved implementation fidelity. The combination of monthly reminder newsletters, administrative calls, and collaboration calls fostered a more knowledgeable and engaged participant community. Moreover, the administrative and collaborative calls provided a forum for sharing targeted strategies related to the implementation of evidence-based and Implementation Science practices. This focused guidance enhanced implementation fidelity, leading to improved student outcomes and reinforcing the commitment to achieving the SiMR. This comprehensive approach ensured the sustainability of system improvement efforts and positioned the initiative for successful expansion by refining and optimizing support mechanisms.

6. **Accountability/Monitoring:** The SSIP, a four-year project, includes a Sustainability Assessment in the final year to help LEAs determine if they need additional support to continue using the evidence-based practices implemented during the project. The Sustainability Checklist has seven sections: Cost/benefit, funding stability, partnerships, organizational capacity, program evaluation, communication, and strategic planning. During monthly calls, staff from Scale-Up Districts receive guidance on completing the Checklist. The State Leadership Team then evaluates the information to determine if any further assistance is required and to what extent. Two schools completed the Sustainability Checklist, revealing key insights into their sustainability efforts. Partnership and Program Evaluation emerged as areas of strength, both with an average score of 3.75. Conversely, Funding Stability, with an average score of 2, presents an opportunity for growth. This data informs the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by providing the State Leadership Team with valuable information on the strengths and concerns of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) as they strive to sustain their work moving forward.

7. **Quality Standards:** Idaho teachers continue to meet the requirements from the past year.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

1. **Governance:** To enhance evidence-based practices and reach more schools, the State Leadership Team will conduct targeted outreach to LEAs with below-average reading scores, encouraging them to apply for the SSIP. The goal is to add ten new LEAs and 20 schools. The application period will run from January 16 to March 31, 2023, with selection notifications in mid-April 2023. Additionally, the State Leadership Team will continue to collaborate with LEAs to align SSIP activities with the new legislative PD requirements for dyslexia, as well as the recent funding for optional full-day kindergarten.

a. **Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:** In preparation for the 2023-24 school year, the SSIP will launch a recruitment campaign to encourage participation from LEAs with below-average reading scores. We will work closely with the new Superintendent of Public Instruction to ensure that SSIP activities support their priorities for improved literacy outcomes. Additionally, activities will continue to be aligned with the professional development efforts of Idaho's Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART) Project and Content Department initiatives to streamline literacy support within LEAs. The SSIP remains committed to ongoing improvement and will adapt its training to meet the requirements of the new dyslexia legislation.

b. **Anticipated Outcomes:** In the upcoming phase, the project will expand by strategically adding new LEAs to increase its impact. The goal is to recruit 10 new LEAs, providing them with the benefits of project participation while working to improve reading proficiency for students with disabilities. Key priorities include enhancing explicit reading instruction by instructional staff, building LEA capacity for effective coaching, and improving MTSS-R implementation in schools for a comprehensive literacy approach. Additionally, the project aims to develop the leadership skills of LEA and school leaders to effectively guide implementation teams and foster a culture of continuous improvement.

2. **Finance:**

a. **Next Steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:** To ensure LEAs have clear direction and ownership in utilizing funds for the SSIP project, each LEA will collaborate with its business manager to develop a detailed budget outlining specific spending categories aligned with project requirements and addressing the unique needs of the LEA in fulfilling project objectives. This budget will also include a comprehensive rationale for each category and associated expenses. To facilitate responsible and transparent financial management, the SSIP will provide LEAs and their business managers with clear spending guidelines, empowering them with direct control over project funds. All budgets will be subject to review and approval by the SSIP coordinator.

b. **Anticipated Outcomes:** Allowing LEAs to create and manage their own budgets, with the support of their business managers, fosters local control. LEAs possess invaluable insights into their specific needs and are best positioned to strategically allocate project funds to effectively address those needs.

3. **Personnel/Workforce:**

a. **Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:** To enhance LEA and teacher implementation of Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs), personalized coaching was integrated through two on-site visits to each LEA. These visits, embedded within LEA-developed action plans created in collaboration with fidelity teams, provided tailored support. During each visit, coaches offered valuable assistance by either modeling effective lessons or observing teachers during direct instruction, facilitating ongoing improvement in EBP implementation.

b. **Anticipated Outcomes:** By implementing in person coaching visits, teachers will have direct access to technical assistant SMART coaches with improved lines of communication that can directly support teachers implementing of EBP into the classroom with fidelity.

4. **Data System:**

a. **Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:** To reduce the burden on participants, it was decided to streamline our assessment process by offering a pre- and post-skills and knowledge assessment test, along with beginning and end-of-year surveys. Additionally, participants have access to a Coaching Survey throughout the year. The Integrated Literacy Instruction Fidelity Tool (I-LIFT Rubric) provides formal progress monitoring of evidence-based practices for both teachers and coaches. IRI data will be integrated as an ongoing assessment. Recognizing survey fatigue, we've condensed our surveys and will gather qualitative data through anecdotal feedback and testimonials throughout the year.

b. **Anticipated Outcomes:** By streamlining the assessment process, the aim is to reduce participant burden, effectively monitor progress, and gather rich qualitative and quantitative data. This includes pre- and post-tests, beginning and end-of-year surveys, the I-LIFT Rubric, and IRI data. Additionally, the collection of anecdotal feedback and testimonials can take place throughout the year.

5. **Professional Development:**

a. **Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:** To improve support, the SSIP will move to a hybrid model that combines online and in-person elements. Participants will have access to a dedicated SMART Coach who visits monthly to help them achieve their literacy instruction goals. Additionally, the MTSS contractor will provide customized, on-site support during the first two weeks of school to develop a systemic plan tailored to each school's specific needs. The SSIP will also streamline our Admin Calls into more efficient Admin Check-Ins that build on the work done during the MTSS In-District Visits. These Check-Ins focus on professional development and allow administrative and MTSS teams to review their goals and action steps, receive targeted MTSS training, and identify any adjustments needed to stay on track.

b. **Anticipated Outcomes:** The SSIP's enhanced support strategies anticipate improved literacy instruction through personalized guidance from

SMART Coaches, tailored systemic plans developed with on-site MTSS contractor support, and enhanced professional development via streamlined Admin Check-Ins. These focused efforts aim to equip administrators and teachers with the necessary knowledge and skills for effective implementation and monitoring of literacy initiatives. By streamlining processes and providing targeted support, the SSIP ultimately strives to increase efficiency, promote goal attainment, and foster better student outcomes through improved literacy instruction and support.

6. Accountability/ Monitoring Enhancement:

- a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy: The School Support and Improvement Plan (SSIP) is enhancing accountability monitoring by streamlining processes. This includes consolidating surveys and gathering pre- and post-data through these surveys and beginning-of-year assessments. Additionally, the SSIP has implemented the I-Lift rubric to monitor the fidelity of literacy instruction practices among teachers involved in the project.
 - b. Anticipated Outcomes: These improvements are expected to yield several positive outcomes. First, they will increase fidelity in the implementation of best practices in early literacy instruction. Second, by utilizing non-identifiable data linked to student outcomes, the SSIP will enable a more granular analysis of student progress. Finally, the initiative will reveal trends directly connecting teaching practices to student outcomes.
7. Quality Standards: Idaho teachers are dedicated to providing a high-quality education, and they continue to meet the rigorous standards set by the Idaho Professional Standards Commission. Adherence is measured by teachers' completing surveys and classroom observations coaches.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The Department 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 practice.

1. Implementation Science Framework: Implementation science uses methods and techniques to improve how well programs and practices are adopted, implemented, and sustained (Eccles & Mittman, 2006). The Implementation Science Framework, including 161 Part B, offers methods and strategies to enhance implementation quality and the use of evidence-based practices. The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) uses resources from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN), based at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, to support its efforts.
2. Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): Throughout the four phases of the project (Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up, corresponding to years 1-4), Local Education Agencies (LEAs) use Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) guided by implementation science principles to drive ongoing improvement. The project has chosen the plan-do-study-act (PDSA) cycle as the primary EBP to promote change within the LEA system.
3. IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide: The Institute of Education Sciences' Practice Guide, "Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade," offers four research-backed recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills. These recommendations provide specific strategies for effective instruction, including: teaching academic language skills, including inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary, developing awareness of speech sounds and their relationship to letters, teaching decoding, word analysis, and both word writing and recognition, and ensuring daily engagement with connected text to improve reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.
4. Instructional Coaching: Instructional coaches, selected by Local Education Agencies (LEAs), receive specialized training in coaching practices. This equips them to support instructional staff in their professional development and in effectively implementing explicit instruction. These coaches play an active role in the classroom, providing modeling, offering constructive feedback, and conducting targeted observations of specific teaching practices.
5. Explicit Instruction: Within the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), instructional staff receive training and support to use explicit instruction strategies for effective reading instruction for students with disabilities. Explicit instruction, defined by Dr. Anita Archer and Dr. Charles Hughes as "systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented," is a key focus. The SSIP provides training sessions for teachers and coaches, emphasizing effective implementation during the Fall Institute and monthly instructional/coaching calls. Coaches receive additional training on explicit instruction components within the Comprehensive Decoding RESET Rubric, enabling them to support teachers in using these practices and assessing their implementation fidelity. Throughout the year, instructional staff implement these strategies, assess progress, and receive coaching to address any areas for improvement. Expert technical assistance is provided by SSIP staff and contracted coaches to further enhance understanding and implementation.

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.

1. Implementation Science Framework: The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) utilizes the Implementation Science Framework, specifically the Implementation 161 Part B framework, drawing on resources from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN). This approach strengthens state-level infrastructure via the State Leadership Team. Simultaneously, Local Education Agencies (LEAs) implement Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) guided by the framework. LEA teams receive training through activities such as the Fall and Spring Institutes, In-District Visits, and LEA Leadership and Administrator Calls. They use tools like the NIRN Initiative Inventory, Communication Plan Template, and PDSA cycle, with data collected on attendance, surveys, and training materials. Ultimately, this use of Implementation Science empowers LEAs to assess and improve their reading programs, leading to better student outcomes.
2. Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): In years 2, 3, and 4 of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), Local Education Agencies (LEAs) use the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle for continuous improvement. This evidence-based practice (EBP) drives change within LEA and school systems. Building teams complete the PDSA cycle yearly after their MTSS-R review. SSIP staff offer technical assistance through monthly calls and visits to support effective implementation. Using tools like Action Plans and collecting data on various aspects, this approach helps achieve the State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR). The PDSA cycle enables leadership teams to track progress, use student data, improve instruction, and align efforts to boost student outcomes.
3. IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide: The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) provides guidance on teaching foundational reading skills, emphasizing academic language, phonemic awareness, decoding, and daily reading practice. SSIP staff and coaches receive annual training on these evidence-based practices (EBPs), starting with a comprehensive 20-module online course during the Readiness year's Fall Institute. This ensures thorough understanding and participant satisfaction. A hybrid course version is available to accommodate staff turnover. In subsequent years, professional development (PD) focused on the IES recommendations is provided during the Fall Institute, In-District Visits, and Collaborative Calls. The SSIP utilizes various tools, including contracted reading specialists, flexible training formats, and a dedicated website to support effective implementation. Data on attendance, surveys, and training materials demonstrate the positive impact of these efforts on student reading outcomes (SIMR) by enhancing staff knowledge and skills in delivering explicit instruction aligned with research-based reading foundations.
4. Instructional Coaching: To support classroom-level growth for students with disabilities, LEAs and schools strategically implement instructional coaching. Coaches receive extensive training in both explicit instruction and coaching methods. During the Fall Institute, they participate in specialized training tailored to their experience level, focusing on areas like foundational reading skills, data-driven decision-making, vocabulary, and comprehension. They also receive training on the RESET Comprehensive Decoding Rubric, a tool used to assess the fidelity of explicit instruction implementation. This equips coaches to guide teachers in using high-quality instructional practices. Additionally, a three-year cycle of coaching-focused training is conducted annually, emphasizing Jim Knight's coaching strategies. Various activities, strategies, and tools support this comprehensive

approach, enabling effective data collection and analysis. Ultimately, this investment in professional development empowers instructional coaches to improve teacher effectiveness, leading to enhanced student outcomes, as reflected in the SiMR.

5. **Explicit Instruction:** To effectively teach reading to students with disabilities, LEA staff utilize explicit instruction—a systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented approach. During the Fall Institute, teachers and coaches receive comprehensive training on implementing explicit instruction, with a focus on the seven components of the RESET Rubric. This training empowers staff to implement these techniques, assess progress, and receive coaching support throughout the year. Additionally, expert technical assistance is provided through various channels, including in-person visits, virtual calls, and online resources. Activities such as videotaping lessons, self-reflection, and coaching observations help ensure high-quality instruction. This multifaceted approach, supported by data collection and analysis, enhances staff expertise, ensures the effective delivery of explicit instruction, and ultimately leads to improved student reading outcomes (SiMR).

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Idaho employs a multi-faceted approach to assess fidelity of implementation, utilizing various instruments and processes at the state, building, and classroom levels. The following section provides an overview of these methods and summarizes the data collected during FFY 2023-2024.

State-level systems assessment using the SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components Worksheet

Idaho utilizes the SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components worksheet to track the performance of its evidence-based practices. This comprehensive tool, completed in the early part of 2024 by the SPDG State Leadership team, details professional development efforts undertaken to achieve specific competencies. This worksheet focuses on the areas- training, coaching, data systems that support decision making, and systemic leadership support, and is used to identify and address implementation gaps through a continuous improvement action plan. The team refined data collection methods to better assess the impact of professional development initiatives on coaching and technical assistance needs with the assistance of the external evaluator.

Building-level systems assessment using the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support-Reading (MTSS-R) Checklist and Action Planning Tool

Idaho utilized the MTSS-R Checklist, developed by the National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), to guide building leadership teams in evaluating, prioritizing, and planning for school infrastructure to support high-quality reading instruction. The Checklist is used in conjunction with a Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycle for ongoing improvement. The State Leadership Team monitors progress using the data generated from the Checklist at the building, cohort, and project levels.

Element 1: Core Reading Instruction and Intervention; 60.79% (4.58% decrease)

Element 2: Data Use; 41.72% (7.14% decrease)

Element 3: Professional Development and Coaching; 35.83% (4.45% decrease)

Element 4: MTSS-R School Leadership; 51.16% (7.34% decrease)

Element 5: Mutual Support Involving Families and the School; 33.85% (11.05% decrease)

All five elements showed a decline in improvement from SY2022-23 to SY2023-24.

Classroom-level Fidelity (explicit instruction assessment): Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers, also known as RESET Rubric or Comprehensive Decoding Rubric and Surveys

The RESET Rubric, developed by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES), is designed to assess decoding lessons that employ explicit, systematic instruction. It consists of 7 components and 18 individual practices, with a focus on the areas of sound-symbol relationships, word reading, encoding, and reading connected text. Within the SSIP project, instructional staff utilize a virtual coaching platform to submit self-reflection videos to their LEA coaches. Coaches then assess fidelity to the rubric, collaborate with staff on action plans, and formally complete the RESET Rubric twice a year. To address challenges with data collection, a collaborative effort was initiated in FFY 2022 to enhance the virtual coaching platform. In Spring 2024, data showed that 100% of teachers successfully met the implementation targets outlined in the rubric. Furthermore, an End of Year Survey, with 24 respondents, indicated positive perceived skill growth among instructional staff in key areas such as delivering foundational reading skills instruction and utilizing explicit instructional strategies.

Fidelity of coaching assessment using the Coaching Literacy Instruction Fidelity Tool (C-LIFT)

During FFY 2021, Idaho developed the C-LIFT rubric to assess the fidelity of instructional coaching provided by LEA coaches. This rubric, aligned with the coaching training curriculum, was implemented in FFY 2022-2023. Analysis of the C-LIFT data from the FFY 2023-2024 showed a slight improvement in coaching practices. Teachers met the 90% adherence target in all three areas.

Observation: Fall – 100%; Spring – 100%

Modeling: Fall - 88%; Spring – 99%

Performance Feedback: Fall – 100%; Springs – 98%

Alliance-Building Strategies: Fall – 96%; Springs – 96%

Training fidelity of implementation using the High-Quality Professional Development (HQPDP) Observation Checklist

The HQPDP Observation Checklist, used to assess the quality of professional development, consists of 21 items across six domains: Preparation, Introduction, Demonstration, Engagement, Evaluation/Reflection, and Mastery. During FFY 2023-2024, each SSIP training session was observed by two evaluators who independently rated the session using the Checklist and then aligned their scores. Following each session, the internal evaluator prepared a summary report highlighting strengths and areas for improvement. This report was then shared with the trainer within three weeks of the training and used to discuss strategies for enhancing future training sessions. The overall HQPDP Checklist score for each training session was calculated as the percentage of items observed, with a target implementation rate of 90%.

MTSS-R Training: 98.3% (3.3% increase)

Reading content training sessions: 99% (4% increase)

RESET Rubric sessions: 92.5% (7.5% decrease)

Leading by Convening: 85% (7% increase)

Serving on Groups: 100% (5% increase)

Library training: 92% (6% increase)

Coaching Training: 93.3% (4.2% decrease)

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.

To monitor the implementation of evidence-based practices and ensure ongoing improvement, the State Leadership Team utilizes a variety of data sources. These include student progress monitoring, SSIP progress monitoring, and feedback gathered through surveys conducted after training sessions, coaching trainings, the Spring Institute, in-district visits, librarian training, and at the end of the year surveys.

Student progress monitoring
Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI)

The State Leadership Team monitored monthly student progress through the IRI. Data was analyzed and detailed reports were provided at the Fall 2023 Data Drill Down. These reports focused on overall literacy scores from SY2022-2023 to SY2023-2024, with breakdowns by literacy components. The data was used to identify areas for improvement and support the continued implementation of evidence-based practices, and to identify proficiency

levels in literacy for 4th-grade students with disabilities. The reports, disaggregated by demographics, served as informal progress monitoring tools. The SSIP internal evaluator used raw monthly data for state-level planning and SiMR progress estimation. Additionally, the State Leadership Team collaborated with SSIP Literacy Consultants to develop targeted training materials based on identified areas of literacy improvement. School-level IRI reports were then used to provide focused assistance during In-District visits in February 2024.

SSIP participant progress monitoring

Essential Components for Reading Instruction (ECRI) Part I & II online training modules

Idaho's SSIP utilizes ECRI online modules to enhance reading instruction skills for instructional staff and coaches. The State Leadership Team closely monitors progress through module completion data and learning analytics. Post-module surveys assess training quality, participant satisfaction, and perceived improvements in teaching ability. The team analyzes survey feedback, collaborates with consultants, and promptly addresses reported issues to ensure optimal training effectiveness. There were 138 participants utilizing the ECRI Modules in the FFY 2023-2024. 74 participants completed the ECRI Module 1; 0 participants completed the ECRI module 2; 9 participants submitted their final assignment for the ECRI 2. From the Readiness Cohort, 94.2% completed the segment (10 modules) or higher by the end of the school year (n=129). 8 participants started the modules. ECRI Part 1 (modules 1-10): 87% (n=591) of Part 1 survey respondents reported satisfaction with the training modules. 30% (n=204) indicated their ability to teach proficiently the main strategy prior to the modules, while 59.2% (n=403) indicated their ability to teach proficiently the main strategy after the modules. 86.8% (n=590) indicated that they would likely use the strategies presented in the modules. ECRI Part 2 (modules 11-20): 79.8% (n=764) of Part 2 survey respondents reported satisfaction with the training modules. 23.5% (n=225) indicated their ability to teach proficiently the main strategy prior to the modules, while 59.8% (n=572) indicated their ability to teach the main strategy proficiently after the modules. 80.6% (n=772) indicated that they would likely use the strategies presented in the modules.

Post-training surveys

Fall Institute Post-Training Survey

The Fall Institute starts the SSIP training with a comprehensive training program. This program uses both in-person and virtual formats to effectively train LEA and school participants in evidence-based practices tailored to their specific roles. Training includes the MTSS-R Checklist and specialized sessions designed for various roles. To ensure ongoing effectiveness, the State Leadership Team gathers feedback through post-training surveys. These surveys measure participant satisfaction and perceived skill improvement, allowing for adjustments and refinements to future training sessions. The following section analyzes these survey responses, highlighting participant satisfaction and perceived learning outcomes from the Fall Institute sessions. A detailed breakdown of satisfaction percentages for each session is provided below:

MTSS-R – Improved ability to implement effective MTSS-R leadership team meetings: 14.5% - extremely improved; 60.2% - much improved; 21.7% - somewhat improved; 3.6% - little improved; (83 participants). Overall satisfaction: 96.4% (80/83)

Reading Content sessions: Foundational Skills (42/43 - 97.7%), Data Based Decision Making (19/19 100%), Academic Language and Vocabulary Instruction (44/44 100%); Researched Based Practices to Support Comprehension (11/11 100%)

Leading by Convening: (9/9, 100%)

Serving on Groups: (4/4, 100%)

Percent that increased skills because of the training (LT=learning target):

MTSS-R (LT1 49/51, 96%; LT2 80/83, 96%; LT3 82/83, 99%; LT4 133/134, 99%; LT5 133/134, 99%)

Reading Foundational Skills (LT1 42/43, 98%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 19/19, 100%; LT2 19/19, 100%), Academic Language and Vocabulary Instruction (LT1 44/44, 100%); Researched Based Practices to Support Comprehension (LT1 11/11, 100%)

Leading by Convening (LT1 10/10, 100%; LT2 10/10, 100%; LT3 10/10, 100%; LT4 9/10, 90%, LT5 10/10, 100%)

Serving on Groups (LT1 4/4, 100%; LT2 4/4, 100%; LT3 4/4, 100%; LT4 4/4, 100%)

As the skills assessed were tied to the evidence-based practices of the SSIP, when participants reported increasing their skills at high rates (>80%), trainings were determined to be effective, and the State Leadership Team continued providing the trainings. When low participants reported increasing their skills at percentages lower than 80%, the training was reviewed and modified.

Coaching Training Survey

To enhance instructional coaching skills, a training program was held in December 2023 for LEA coaches participating in years 2, 3, and 4 of the SSIP. A post-training survey was conducted to gather feedback and identify areas for improvement. All 13 respondents reported satisfaction with the training and indicated that it helped them improve their skills in the targeted areas. This valuable feedback will be used to refine future training sessions and ensure they effectively address the needs of LEA coaches.

Spring Institute Post-Training Survey

The Spring Institute provides data training each year. In May 2024, participants gained valuable insights during the annual training session. Following the institute, a post-training survey was conducted to gather feedback on the quality and effectiveness of the training, which helps to continually improve future institutes. The results were overwhelmingly positive, with 100% of the 44 respondents expressing satisfaction with the training.

In-District Visit Surveys

Reading consultants from the SSIP conduct fall and spring visits to each school, where they observe classroom instruction, provide feedback to teachers, and offer coaching support. Following each visit, participants complete a survey to share their feedback. These surveys reveal that the visits are highly valued. 94.4% (117 of 124 respondents) believe the support they received will improve their teaching skills, and the vast majority (93.5% of 124 respondents) express satisfaction with the quality of the visit.

Librarian Training Survey

To better support struggling readers, librarians from schools participating in the SSIP, including their public library counterparts, completed a training program consisting of 4 hours of asynchronous virtual learning and a 1-hour live debriefing session. While the program saw participation from 11 librarians, a post-training survey revealed positive results. 100% of participants expressed their intention to apply what they learned and their overall satisfaction with the training.

End of Year Survey

In June 2024, an end-of-year survey with role-specific questions was sent to all SSIP participants. Of the 33 respondents, 78.79% (n=26) expressed satisfaction with the overall support received throughout the year.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practice and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

1. Implementation Science Framework: The State Leadership Team remains committed to supporting the development of strong leadership teams capable of implementing evidence-based practices. This ongoing support includes continuous review and improvement of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports for Reading (MTSS-R) process within Local Education Agencies (LEAs), as well as helping instructional staff and coaches as they work to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.

2. Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): The State Leadership Team is dedicated to helping schools build strong leadership teams that can effectively use the Multi-Tiered System of Supports for Reading (MTSS-R) to identify student needs. To achieve this, the team will guide schools in creating a continuous improvement cycle. This cycle will empower administrators, coaches, and teachers to address and close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.

a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:

i. Continuing with the addition of two calls a year for schools to visit with the National Center for Improving Literacy to focus and review their schools'

Action Plans (PDSA).

3. IES Foundational Skills Practice: The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support instructional staff to implement evidence-based instruction practices.
 - a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:
 - i. Continue to strengthen educators' understanding and application of effective reading instruction, the Science of Reading will continue to be seamlessly integrated into all professional development (PD) and technical assistance (TA) initiatives. This integration emphasizes evidence-based instructional practices, with a particular focus on reinforcing the use of explicit and systematic instruction in the classroom.
 - b. Anticipated Outcomes:
 - i. Empower educators with the knowledge and skills to effectively implement explicit and systematic instruction, grounded in the Science of Reading, to improve literacy outcomes for all students.
 4. Instructional Coaching:
 - a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:
 - i. Continue to deepen their expertise, coaches will receive specialized support focused on the Science of Reading, with a particular emphasis on understanding the neurological processes involved in reading acquisition and how students learn to read effectively.
 - b. Anticipated Outcomes
 - a. This understanding will enable coaches to provide clearer, more targeted feedback to teachers, ultimately improving the quality of reading instruction.
 5. Explicit Instruction:
 - a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR
 - i. Continue to provide educators with effective tools and models for teaching, new instructional resources featuring explicit teaching routines have been developed, and existing resources have been updated.
 - b. Anticipated Outcomes
 - i. To support effective teaching and coaching, coaches will have access to a collection of clear, well-defined models for delivering systematic and targeted instruction aligned with evidence-based practices.
 - ii. These sustainable resources will be readily available to enhance instruction and professional growth.

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.

During the FFY 2023, there have been additional changes to activities and strategies to the SSIP as a result of a decision by the State Department teams to merge two programs, the SMART Project and Cultivating Readers Project. The reasoning for the merger of these two projects was to better streamline the process of systemically supporting LEAs in providing high quality early literacy training for teachers.

These changes include:

Data Systems: To optimize data collection and minimize participant burden, a streamlined system has been implemented. This system comprises several key components: pre- and post-tests for assessing knowledge and skill acquisition; beginning- and end-of-year surveys for comprehensive feedback; and an ongoing coaching survey to facilitate continuous improvement. Furthermore, the Integrated Literacy Instruction Fidelity Tool (I-LIFT Rubric) is utilized to monitor the effective implementation of evidence-based practices by both teachers and coaches. Student reading progress is tracked via IRI data. To enrich quantitative findings, anecdotal feedback and testimonials are also encouraged throughout the year, providing valuable qualitative insights. This multi-faceted approach ensures the collection of robust data while prioritizing participant experience.

Professional Development: To enhance professional development efficacy and provide targeted support, a shift was implemented from an online platform to a blended model incorporating both in-person and virtual components. This facilitated a more personalized approach, exemplified by the introduction of monthly on-site visits from SMART Coaches who provided individualized guidance to educators in achieving their literacy instruction goals. Furthermore, to ensure alignment with individual school needs, an MTSS contractor conducted in-person consultations at each site during the initial weeks of the academic year, collaborating with staff to develop customized systemic plans. Ongoing support was provided through focused Admin Check-In sessions, replacing previous administrator calls. These sessions enabled administrators and MTSS teams to collaboratively review goals, action steps, and progress, while also receiving targeted professional development on effective MTSS implementation. This comprehensive and responsive approach aimed to optimize professional learning opportunities and support continuous improvement in literacy instruction.

Coaches: Individualize, monthly coaching sessions for each teacher through the support of a SMART Coach and an Identified In-Build Coach (IIBC) will be built into the project. Through this model, teachers will be provided with one-to-one feedback on instructional practices and enter into meaningful coaching cycles of improvement that support the goals of this project.

Following a recent merger, this project now offers two distinct participation tracks. The first track provides ongoing support to schools previously involved in the Cultivating Readers Project, with an emphasis on refining school-wide systems for enhanced early literacy instruction. The second track offers individual teachers an opportunity to deepen their expertise in evidence-based literacy practices.

The SiMR also requires revision. Using 4th-grade ISAT scores as the basis for the SiMR is no longer appropriate, as participating teachers instruct students in grades K-3. The SiMR should be adjusted to reflect K-3 student outcomes and accurately measure the impact of project implementation in those grades. Revising the SiMR will enable more effective use of student outcome data by allowing analysis at the teacher level. It is known that before any changes can be made, stakeholder input is required.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

1. Special Education Advisory Groups

- a. Directors Advisory Council (DAC): This group of at least 14 special education directors, nominated by their peers, provides valuable input on target setting. With two representatives from each region, the DAC ensures diverse perspectives are included. Its members come from small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), reflecting the wide range of demographics across the state.
- b. Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP): Members include parents of students with disabilities, representatives from higher education and correctional facilities (both juvenile and adult), LEA superintendents, special education directors and teachers, and staff from key state agencies like the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), and the State Department of Education. The panel also includes representation from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center, and charter schools, ensuring a wide range of perspectives are considered.

2. SSIP participants

- a. Special education director meetings: Each Local Education Agency (LEA) has a dedicated special education director who supports strong reading instruction. They do this by staying up-to-date on the latest research and best practices through a variety of channels, including Special Education newsletters, webinars, state-sponsored conferences, and educational meetings. This knowledge is then used to provide comprehensive support to teachers and students in special education programs. The special education director plays a key role in improving literacy outcomes for struggling readers by fostering a culture of continuous learning and collaboration within their LEA.
- b. Parent group meetings: Each Local Education Agency (LEA) selects at least one parent to act as a liaison between the school and families. These parent representatives receive training at the Fall Institute and participate in monthly support calls and leadership meetings. This provides them with the tools and knowledge to effectively support students and their families. By fostering strong communication and collaboration, these parent groups create a more supportive and inclusive educational experience for everyone.
- c. District Leadership meetings: In each Local Education Agency (LEA), a building leadership team is formed, bringing together parents, administrators, general and special education teachers, and an instructional coach. These teams collaborate to elevate the quality of reading instruction. The meetings serve as a hub for communication, ensuring everyone is on the same page and working towards common goals. By aligning instructional strategies and providing ongoing support, these teams create a strong partnership focused on improving reading outcomes for all students.
- d. Individual SSIP participants: Parents play an active role through monthly support calls, staying informed and engaged in their child's education. They provide valuable guidance and contribute to a collaborative learning environment. Administrators also participate in these calls, ensuring that teaching strategies align with broader school goals. Teachers benefit from dedicated monthly meetings organized by cohort, where they can share best practices and collaborate with colleagues. Instructional coaches further enhance this support system with monthly cohort-based calls, offering targeted assistance and contributing to the improvement of reading instruction across participating schools.

3. Other SSIP partners:

- a. Idaho Commission for Libraries: This organization works hand-in-hand with school librarians to create custom literacy programs. They provide resources and support to help librarians reach struggling readers and offer professional development to ensure a collaborative approach that addresses the unique needs of each student.
- b. Boise State University: Partnering with the Idaho Commission for Libraries, Boise State University provides specialized training to school librarians. This training enhances their skills and knowledge, ultimately improving student reading proficiency.
- c. Metis Education Consulting: As state-contracted literacy coaches, Metis Education Consulting plays a critical role in improving reading skills for all students. They provide targeted support and professional development to teachers and instructional coaches, ensuring the use of evidence-based practices. Their expertise fosters a more inclusive and effective learning environment for all readers.
- d. Idaho Parents Unlimited: This organization empowers parents to actively participate in their child's literacy development. They offer workshops, resources, and guidance to help parents understand and advocate for their child's reading needs. By facilitating collaboration between parents and schools, they create a supportive network that promotes successful reading outcomes.
- e. University of Idaho: The University of Idaho provides crucial evaluation services for the SSIP. Their expertise ensures a comprehensive and data-driven assessment of the program's effectiveness. This partnership highlights a commitment to continuous improvement and helps ensure the SSIP is achieving its goals and positively impacting students.
- f. Lee Pesky Learning Center: Idaho's partnership with the Lee Pesky Learning Center strengthens the use of evidence-based literacy instruction. They provide support to teachers and coaches, ensuring the effective use of the RESET rubric for a standardized and impactful approach to literacy education.
- g. National Center on Improving Literacy: This center provides valuable support to Idaho's Multi-System of Support for Reading. They offer evidence-based resources, research, and professional development opportunities, empowering LEAs to implement effective literacy interventions and strategies that improve student reading outcomes.

4. ISDE collaboration

- a. During the 2023-24 fiscal year, the Special Education and Content Department joined forces to streamline literacy projects. This initiative, driven by the Superintendent of Public Instruction's priorities, focused on integrating professional development activities with two key programs: Idaho's Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART) Project and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This collaborative approach aimed to maximize resources and create a more cohesive and effective literacy support system for Idaho students.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Idaho's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) prioritizes collaboration with a diverse array of educational partners, a term chosen over stakeholders. These partners contribute to the SSIP in varying capacities, depending on their backgrounds and familiarity with the project. While some partners provide valuable feedback and suggestions to the SSIP State Leadership Team on areas like challenges, best practices, and evaluation, others with deeper knowledge engage in co-creation of content and project activities. This collaborative approach, particularly with those possessing extensive experience, fosters a transformative level of engagement and ensures the SSIP remains responsive to diverse perspectives and needs. The following sections will detail the specific strategies employed to engage each group of educational partners and outline their respective contributions.

1. Special Education Advisory Groups - (Networking)

a. DAC:

b. SEAP:

The special education department facilitated quarterly meetings between the State Leadership Team and special education advisory groups to foster meaningful engagement and collaboration. During these meetings, the team presented project data, highlighted challenges and sought solutions, and shared evaluation results to gather input for continuous improvement. They also provide an opportunity to answer any questions the group might have. Directors participate in monthly webinars facilitated by the Special Education department, where project updates and key initiatives are discussed. This collaborative forum facilitated open communication, problem-solving, and collective efforts to enhance the effectiveness of special education initiatives.

2. SSIP participants – (Collaborating and Transforming):

a. Special education director meetings

b. Parent group meetings

c. District Leadership meetings

d. Individual SSIP participants

Monthly meetings brought together the State Leadership Team, SSIP partners, and SSIP participants to analyze project data and discuss progress towards building leadership team goals. These collaborative sessions focused on identifying successes, addressing challenges, and ensuring continuous improvement. A key component of these meetings involved evaluating the effective implementation of evidence-based practices. Throughout the year, SSIP participants received ongoing professional development and technical assistance, followed by surveys to gather feedback on how to improve SSIP activities. The State Leadership Team and SSIP partners carefully reviewed this feedback and developed action plans to enhance their support efforts.

3. SSIP partners (Collaborating and Transforming)

a. Idaho Commission for Libraries

b. Boise State University

c. Metis Education Consulting

d. Idaho Parents Unlimited

e. University of Idaho

f. Lee Pesky Learning Center

g. National Center on Improving Literacy

The State Leadership Team works closely with a variety of SSIP partners, including government agencies, universities, non-profits, and private companies, to continually improve the SSIP. Each partner meets with the State Leadership Team at least quarterly to collaborate on a detailed scope of work for the year. These meetings include joint activities like reviewing training feedback, analyzing participant data, and developing action plans for improvement. Partners also share feedback gathered from events they've led, ensuring participant input is addressed. By regularly reviewing project implementation and outcome data together, the State Leadership Team and partners can effectively collaborate and strategically plan next steps for the SSIP initiative.

4. ISDE collaboration (Informing to Transforming)

a. Coordination with Idaho SMART project

To ensure a cohesive approach to literacy improvement, the State Leadership Team actively collaborated with other departments within the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE). This collaboration was particularly important with the Content and Curriculum Department's launch of the Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART) project, a multi-year initiative providing training and coaching to K-3 educators statewide. Recognizing the potential benefits for SSIP schools, the SSIP State Leadership Team worked with the SMART Director to enable interested teachers to participate in the SMART project. This collaborative effort aimed to provide educators with multiple pathways and enhanced support to improve reading outcomes for students.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The State Leadership Team gathered feedback from educational partners through various channels like surveys, meetings, and in-district visits to identify and address challenges within the SSIP. The team categorized these challenges as either "technical" or "adaptive." Technical challenges, such as providing effective professional development, aligning instructional materials with research, overcoming technology limitations, and establishing efficient data analysis systems, were addressed through collaborative problem-solving and shared expertise among SSIP project members. Solutions often involved a combination of teacher training, resource development, and ongoing support.

Adaptive challenges, however, were more complex and involved shifts in mindset and practice. These included fostering a culture of continuous learning, overcoming resistance to change, and personalizing instruction to meet diverse student needs. Addressing these challenges required targeted meetings and collaborative efforts to find acceptable solutions. Staff turnover presented a significant adaptive challenge, with the State Leadership Team working closely with each LEA to develop tailored solutions. This highlights the complexities of implementing large-scale educational initiatives and the need for ongoing adaptation and support. Furthermore, the collaboration between the Idaho SMART project and the SSIP faced challenges in identifying coaches within the SMART project who could effectively implement SSIP objectives and navigate new contractual processes.

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.

Please see above sections.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Barriers:

Accurately monitoring the success of the project has been hindered by challenges in identifying and utilizing a meaningful subset population for analysis. Currently, progress towards the State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is tracked annually using a cohort of all LEAs that initially started the project, even those that withdrew before completion. Schools that withdrew from the project did participate in the project for at least two years before leaving the project. This cohort also includes all elementary schools within those LEAs, regardless of their actual participation in the SSIP. Consequently, the data reflects 93 elementary schools, while only 30 actively participate in the project. If deemed appropriate, adjustments to both the SiMR and subset will be made to reflect any needed changes.

To enhance support for teachers, the project recognized the need for increased one-on-one coaching to ensure the accurate implementation of instructional practices. Additionally, administrators expressed a desire for more relevant professional development tailored to their needs and focused on supporting school-wide implementation. To address this, SMART coaches and Identified In-Building Coaches were integrated into the project to provide monthly coaching cycles for teachers. Furthermore, monthly check-ins and targeted professional development were implemented for administrators to strengthen their capacity to support their building and teachers in achieving SSIP goals.

The Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) process was disconnected from reading instruction and professional development, making it challenging for teachers to integrate high-quality early literacy practices within a coherent framework. To address this disconnect and create a more cohesive approach, MTSS contractors and SMART coaches will collaborate to support educators in implementing effective reading instruction within a comprehensive framework.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Indicator 18: General Supervision

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2023 submission, use FFY 2022, July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023)
- b. # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

$$\text{Percent} = [(b) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100$$

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage. OSEP assumes that the State's FFY 2023 data for this indicator is the State's baseline data unless the State provides an explanation for using other baseline data.

Targets must be 100%.

Report in Column A the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) and report in Column B the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance.

Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, States will be required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 18, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.

In the last row of this General Supervision Data Table, States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 4B. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	2	0	2	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 4B due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

The difference in the number of findings was due to Dispute Resolution. Idaho's Special Education DR office maintained data regarding any correction actions that are in place due to state administrative complaint findings or due process orders and monitored each district's compliance. When the DR office found an LEA out of compliance at the conclusion of state administrative complaint investigations and due process hearing matters, the Department ordered the LEA to complete, within 365 days, a unique Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Each CAP required the LEA to submit evidence of completion of multiple case-specific tasks designed to clear the LEA's noncompliance at the student level and to provide for the collection and verification of subsequent data to ensure the LEA's implementation of IDEA-compliant practices and protocols. The Department monitored and enforced the LEA's compliance with each active CAP and provided case-specific oversight—including appropriate guidance, resources, and corrections, which culminated in the Department's final verification of CAP completion and case closure.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

For the two findings of noncompliance in Column B, verification was conducted to ensure that each LEA with identified noncompliance correctly implemented specific regulatory requirements, based on a review of updated documentation and subsequent data collected through a secure data collection platform (such as a secure server or the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT)). Following the issuance of noncompliance, LEAs were required to complete a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or comply with the final orders of an impartial hearing officer. These plans included both case-specific and systemic tasks, such as providing compensatory services, reconvening IEP meetings, updating evaluations, and reimbursing parents for individual students, as well as participating in staff training, adopting the Special Education Manual, updating internal policies, and issuing guidance memos to ensure sustainable future compliance. CAPs and orders were monitored and enforced through the review of submitted updated documentation and data provided subsequent to any identification of noncompliance, the provision of targeted oversight and resources, and verification of the completion of all required actions prior to case closure. The state verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data by reviewing the data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

For the two findings of noncompliance in Column B, verification also ensured that each LEA corrected individual cases of child-specific noncompliance identified through state administrative complaints or due process hearings. Following the issuance of noncompliance, LEAs were required to complete a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or comply with the final orders of an impartial hearing officer. These plans included both case-specific and systemic tasks, such as providing compensatory services, reconvening IEP meetings, updating evaluations, and reimbursing parents for individual students, as well as participating in staff training, adopting the Special Education Manual, updating internal policies, and issuing guidance memos to ensure sustainable future compliance. CAPs and orders were monitored and enforced through the review of submitted updated documentation and data provided subsequent to any identification of noncompliance, the provision of targeted oversight and resources, and verification of the completion of all required actions prior to case closure. The state verified that the LEA corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, and no outstanding corrective action existed under a state complaint or due process hearing decision for the child.

Indicator 9. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 9 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

There are no differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 9.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

Idaho did not issue a finding of noncompliance related to this indicator.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Idaho did not issue a finding of noncompliance related to this indicator.

Indicator 10. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 10 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

There are no differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 10.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Idaho did not issue a finding of noncompliance related to this indicator.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Idaho did not issue a finding of noncompliance related to this indicator.

Indicator 11. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
72	9	72	9	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 11 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

The difference in the number of findings was due to Dispute Resolution. Idaho's Special Education DR office maintained data regarding any correction actions that are in place due to state administrative complaint findings or due process orders and monitored each district's compliance. When the DR office found an LEA out of compliance at the conclusion of state administrative complaint investigations and due process hearing matters, the Department ordered the LEA to complete, within 365 days, a unique Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Each CAP required the LEA to submit evidence of completion of multiple case-specific tasks designed to clear the LEA's noncompliance at the student level and to provide for the collection and verification of subsequent data to ensure the LEA's implementation of IDEA-compliant practices and protocols. The Department monitored and enforced the LEA's compliance with each active CAP and provided case-specific oversight—including appropriate guidance, resources, and corrections, which culminated in the Department's final verification of CAP completion and case closure.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

To ensure that all LEAs identified with noncompliance in Column A correctly implemented the regulatory requirements to align more closely with 23-01, the Department conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. They reviewed updated Child Find 60-day timeline data through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA that had shown noncompliance. After this subsequent review of updated data, the Department determined that all LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. LEAs were also required to share improvement activities, such as training or changes in policies, practices, or procedures, to address the causes of noncompliance. The Department confirmed that these activities were completed and targeted the noncompliance issues. All LEAs corrected their noncompliance within 365 days of noncompliance notification. Using updated data, the Department verified that all LEAs passed the two verification tests and corrected the noncompliance identified in Indicator 11. The Department confirmed that the LEAs were in full compliance with IDEA regulations.

For the nine findings of noncompliance in Column B, verification was conducted to ensure that each LEA with identified noncompliance correctly implemented specific regulatory requirements, based on a review of updated documentation and subsequent data collected through a secure data collection platform (such as a secure server or the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT)). Following the issuance of noncompliance, LEAs were required to complete a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or comply with the final orders of an impartial hearing officer. These plans included both case-specific and

systemic tasks, such as providing compensatory services, reconvening IEP meetings, updating evaluations, and reimbursing parents for individual students, as well as participating in staff training, adopting the Special Education Manual, updating internal policies, and issuing guidance memos to ensure sustainable future compliance. CAPs and orders were monitored and enforced through the review of submitted updated documentation and data provided subsequent to any identification of noncompliance, the provision of targeted oversight and resources, and verification of the completion of all required actions prior to case closure. The state verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data by reviewing the data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

For the 72 findings of noncompliance in Column A, the Department confirmed that all individual cases of noncompliance were corrected by reviewing updated data and ensuring LEAs completed all initial eligibility evaluations. The Department investigated each case of noncompliance at the student level and verified that all students had an evaluation, even if it was late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. If eligible, an IEP was created and implemented with parental consent for placement. The Department tracked and documented this review in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

For the nine findings of noncompliance in Column B, verification also ensured that each LEA corrected individual cases of child-specific noncompliance identified through state administrative complaints or due process hearings. Following the issuance of noncompliance, LEAs were required to complete a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or comply with the final orders of an impartial hearing officer. These plans included both case-specific and systemic tasks, such as providing compensatory services, reconvening IEP meetings, updating evaluations, and reimbursing parents for individual students, as well as participating in staff training, adopting the Special Education Manual, updating internal policies, and issuing guidance memos to ensure sustainable future compliance. CAPs and orders are monitored and enforced through the review of submitted updated documentation and data provided subsequent to any identification of noncompliance, the provision of targeted oversight and resources, and verification of the completion of all required actions prior to case closure. The state verified that the LEA corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, and no outstanding corrective action existed under a state complaint or due process hearing decision for the child.

Indicator 12. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
9	0	9	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 12 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

There are no differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 12.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

To ensure that all LEAs identified with noncompliance in Column A correctly implemented the regulatory requirements to align more closely with 23-01, the Department conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. They reviewed updated Early Childhood Transition timeline data through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA that had shown noncompliance. After this subsequent review of updated data, the Department determined that all LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. LEAs were also required to share improvement activities, such as training or changes in policies, practices, or procedures, to address the causes of noncompliance. The Department confirmed that these activities were completed and targeted the noncompliance issues. All LEAs corrected their noncompliance within 365 days of noncompliance notification. Using updated data, the Department verified that all LEAs passed the two verification tests and corrected the noncompliance identified in Indicator 12. The Department confirmed that the LEAs were in full compliance with IDEA regulations.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

The Department verified the correction of all noncompliance by reviewing updated data and confirming that the LEAs identified in Column A completed all early childhood transitions. The Department investigated each instance of noncompliance at the student level. The department ensured that all eligible students had evaluations and IEPs developed and implemented, even if delayed, and were either receiving special education services or the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. All verification and documentation were tracked in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). LEAs were also required to share improvement activities, such as training or changes in policies, practices, or procedures, to address the causes of noncompliance. The Department confirmed that these activities were completed and targeted noncompliance issues. All LEAs corrected their noncompliance on time.

Indicator 13. 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 and 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 a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected)
5	6	5	6	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 13 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

The difference in the number of findings was due to Dispute Resolution. Idaho’s Special Education DR office maintained data regarding any correction actions that are in place due to state administrative complaint findings or due process orders and monitored each district’s compliance. When the DR office found an LEA out of compliance at the conclusion of state administrative complaint investigations and due process hearing matters, the Department ordered the LEA to complete, within 365 days, a unique Corrective Action Plan (CAP). Each CAP required the LEA to submit evidence of completion of multiple case-specific tasks designed to clear the LEA’s noncompliance at the student level and to provide for the collection and verification of subsequent data to ensure the LEA’s implementation of IDEA-compliant practices and protocols. The Department monitored and enforced the LEA’s compliance with each active CAP and provided case-specific oversight—including appropriate guidance, resources, and corrections, which culminated in the Department’s final verification of CAP completion and case closure.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

To ensure system-level compliance, the LEAs identified in Column A submitted additional student files after the initial notification, showing 100% compliance with regulatory requirements. The Department, along with Idaho SESTA, reviewed improvement plans, documentation, and subsequent files and verified that all of the LEAs corrected findings of noncompliance, demonstrated 100% compliance, and were correctly implementing regulatory requirements consistent with QA 23-01. All reviews and verifications were documented in the CTT using updated data.

For the findings of noncompliance reported in Column B, verification was conducted to ensure that each LEA with identified noncompliance correctly implemented specific regulatory requirements, based on a review of updated documentation and subsequent data collected through a secure data collection platform (such as a secure server or the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT)). Following the issuance of noncompliance, LEAs were required to complete a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or comply with the final orders of an impartial hearing officer. These plans included both case-specific and systemic tasks, such as providing compensatory services, reconvening IEP meetings, updating evaluations, and reimbursing parents for individual students, as well as participating in staff training, adopting the Special Education Manual, updating internal policies, and issuing guidance memos to ensure sustainable future compliance. CAPs and orders were monitored and enforced through the review of submitted updated documentation and data provided subsequent to any identification of noncompliance, the provision of targeted oversight and resources, and verification of the completion of all required actions prior to case closure. The state verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data by reviewing the data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:

For the findings of noncompliance in Column A, the Department verified correction of all noncompliance within 365 days of notification. LEAs submitted updated student files for the students with identified noncompliance, demonstrating correction at the individual level, and the Department verified that each individual student record/case of noncompliance was corrected and demonstrated 100% compliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

For the findings of noncompliance reported in Column B, verification also ensured that each LEA corrected individual cases of child-specific noncompliance identified through state administrative complaints or due process hearings. Following the issuance of noncompliance, LEAs were required to complete a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or comply with the final orders of an impartial hearing officer. These plans included both case-specific and systemic tasks, such as providing compensatory services, reconvening IEP meetings, updating evaluations, and reimbursing parents for individual students, as well as participating in staff training, adopting the Special Education Manual, updating internal policies, and issuing guidance memos to ensure sustainable future compliance. CAPs and orders were monitored and enforced through the review of submitted updated documentation and data provided subsequent to any identification of noncompliance, the provision of targeted oversight and resources, and verification of the completion of all required actions prior to case closure. The state verified that the LEA corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, and no outstanding corrective action existed under a state complaint or due process hearing decision for the child.

Optional for FFY 2023, 2024, and 2025:

Other Areas - All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).

Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
		0

Explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas):

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
86	17	86	17	0

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2022	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
103	103		100%	100.00%	N/A	N/A

Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	0.00%
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2022 (the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023)	103
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding)	103
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year	0

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	0
5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")	0
6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 4B	

6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 9	
6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 10	
6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 11	
6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 12	
6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 13	
6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - All other findings	
7. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected	0

Subsequent correction: If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline year for this indicator, using FFY 2023, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

18 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Chynna Hirasaki

Title:

Director, Special Education

Email:

chirasaki@sde.idaho.gov

Phone:

2083326806

Submitted on:

04/24/25 6:53:29 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Idaho 2025 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
77.50%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	11	55.00%
Compliance	22	22	100.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2025: Part B."

2025 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	98%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	96%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	22%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	89%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	22%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	87%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	98%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	96%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	37%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	89%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	17%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	93%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	17	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma*	62	0

*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2025 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	96.61%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	94.81%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	97.66%	YES	2
Indicator 18: General Supervision	100.00%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/FFY2023-Part-B-SPP-APR-Reformatted-Measurement-Table.pdf>

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, 13 and 18.

Data Rubric

Idaho

FFY 2023 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
18	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	22
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2023 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	27

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 7/31/24	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 3/5/25	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 3/5/25	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 3/5/25	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/8/25	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/13/24	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 9/4/24	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.28571429) =	27.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.28571429 points are subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	27
B. 618 Grand Total	27.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	54.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	54.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.28571429.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2025 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described in the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	FS002 & FS089	7/31/2024
Part B Personnel	FS070, FS099, FS112	3/5/2025
Part B Exiting	FS009	3/5/2025
Part B Discipline	FS005, FS006, FS007, FS088, FS143, FS144	3/5/2025
Part B Assessment	FS175, FS178, FS185, FS188	1/8/2025
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/13/2024
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	9/4/2024

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data and metadata responses submitted to *EDFacts* align. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection.

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Idaho

School Year: 2023-24

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	53
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	39
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	32
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	38
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	1
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	14

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	27
(2.1) Mediations held.	18
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	6
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	2
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	12
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	12
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	9

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	12
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	2
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	2
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	3
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	2
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	1
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	0
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	9

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	1
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	0
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	1
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
Idaho

These data were extracted on the close date:
11/13/2024

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2025 will be posted in June 2025. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 20, 2025

Honorable Debbie Critchfield
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Idaho Department of Education
650 West State Street
Boise, ID 83702

Dear Superintendent Critchfield:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2025 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Idaho needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Idaho's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Idaho's 2025 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2025 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2025: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2025, as it did for Part B determinations in 2015-2024. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Idaho).

In making Part B determinations in 2025, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment);
- (2) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2023-2024) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2025 determinations, OSEP is using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Bureau of Indian Education, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2025 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2024 determination. OSEP used the publicly available NAEP data for the Bureau of Indian Education that was comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico; specifically OSEP did not use NAEP participation data in making the BIE's 2025 determination because the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the BIE that is publicly available is 2020, whereas the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico that is publicly available is 2024);
- (3) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (4) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2025 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered performance on timely correction of noncompliance requirements in Indicator 18. While the State's performance on timely correction of noncompliance was a factor in each State or Entity's 2025 Part B Compliance Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2025 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2026 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Idaho's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Idaho-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Idaho's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 18, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Idaho is required to take. The actions that Idaho is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Idaho's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2025 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Idaho's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2023-2024," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Idaho's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Idaho's 2025 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2025 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State's or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2022, 2023, and 2024), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2025 determination.

Idaho's determination for 2024 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Idaho of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following website: [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring Idaho to work with appropriate entities. The Secretary directs Idaho 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. We strongly encourage Idaho to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. Idaho must report with its FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission, due February 2, 2026, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Idaho received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Idaho took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.606, Idaho must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

The Secretary is considering modifying the factors the Department will use in making its determinations in June 2026 and beyond, as part of the Administration's priority to empower States in taking the lead in developing and implementing policies that best serve children with disabilities, and empowering parents with school choice options. As we consider changes to data collection and how we use the data reported to the Department in making annual IDEA determinations, OSEP will provide parents, States, entities, and other stakeholders with an opportunity to comment and provide input through a variety of mechanisms.

For the FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2026, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2024-25 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR and the 2026 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and data submitted during correction opportunities will not be used for these purposes. The 2024-25 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the appropriate EDFacts system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Idaho must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Idaho on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Idaho's submission of its FFY 2023 SPP/APR. In addition, Idaho must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Idaho must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Idaho's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the [ed.gov](#) website.

OSEP appreciates Idaho's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Idaho over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

David J. Cantrell

David J. Cantrell
Deputy Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Idaho Director of Special Education