

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2021**

**Idaho**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2023**

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

## Introduction

### Instructions

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

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) strategic plan aligns with the Governor's Task Force recommendations. The current strategic plan includes the following goals.

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

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

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

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

Strategies Include:

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

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

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

Strategies Include:

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

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

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

Strategies include:

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

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

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

Strategies include:

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

The ISDE would like to note that starting in January of 2023, Idaho has a newly elected Superintendent of Public Instruction and an interim State Director of Special Education.

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Indicators 1, 2: Data are lag year data. The ISDE showed that COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for these indicators. The COVID-19 health crisis impacted indicators 1 and 2 percentages in the FFY 2021 reporting year. Students who may have been on a trajectory to exit through the Received a Certificate (Completed - Adapted Requirements) category for 2019-2020 remained in education and continued services in the 2020-2021 school year to ensure they completed their goals. Those students who otherwise would have exited in the 2019-2020 school year instead exited in the 2020-2021 school year, increasing the denominator for indicators 1 and 2. Data shows inflated counts for the categories of Reached Maximum Age, Received a Certificate, and normalized counts for Dropped Out, while students exiting as having Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma increased, but at a more normalized rate when compared to other exit categories.

Indicator 3: The ISDE shows no impact on the validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 3 data due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Indicator 4A, and 4B: Data are lag year data. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for these indicators. As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, many of Idaho's local education agencies (LEAs) were in a hybrid format for at least a portion of the school year. Schools were not in regular session and disciplinary actions for the 2020-2021 school year dropped even further from the prior school year.

Indicators 5, 9, and 10: The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for these indicators.

Indicator 6: The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for this indicator. COVID-19 has impacted the Indicator 6 percentage. Many childcare centers which have historically provided more inclusive environments have shut down or are now running at limited capacity due to the COVID-19 pandemic and staffing shortages.

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

Indicator 8: The ISDE does not show evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for this indicator.

Indicator 11: COVID-19 has directly impacted Indicator 11. Idaho has a significant staffing shortage for school psychologists, which the COVID-19 pandemic has further exacerbated. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, Idaho has seen substantial turnover and increases in unfilled positions at all levels. These shortages result in a reduction of resources necessary to complete evaluations in a timely manner, reduced communication between program and data recording staff, and a reduced understanding of appropriate data and reporting for the indicator.

Indicator 12: COVID-19 has directly impacted Indicator 12. Idaho has a significant staffing shortage for school psychologists, which the COVID-19 pandemic has further exacerbated. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, Idaho has seen substantial turnover and increases in unfilled positions at all levels. These shortages result in a reduction of resources necessary to complete evaluations in a timely manner, reduced communication between program and data recording staff, and a reduced understanding of appropriate data and reporting for the indicator.

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

validity, or reliability of data for this indicator.

Indicator 14: The ISDE does not show evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for this indicator. Reduced response rates are attributed to fewer large LEAs participating in the opt-in data collection process.

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

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

Indicator 17: The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 17 data.

## **Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

180

### **General Supervision System:**

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

##### General Supervision File Review (GSFR)

Annually Idaho requires all school districts and charters, also known as local education agencies (LEAs), to provide a selection of student files to review for compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The general supervision file review (GSFR) focuses LEAs processes and procedures around identification (eligibility) and service delivery (IEPs). The ISDE selects and reviews a sample of the student files to ensure compliance with the IDEA including Indicator 13 – Secondary Transition. All reviews, issuance of notifications of noncompliance, improvement activities, and verification of correction are completed within the compliance tracking tool (CTT). For additional information see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6> and access the GSFR (General Supervision File Review) under RDA Topics. LEAs identified as having issues of noncompliance for 3 consecutive years or who had 13 or more issues of noncompliance during the most recent GSFR review period as needing Technical Assistance (TA). LEAs identified as having issues of noncompliance for 4 or more consecutive years based on historical GSFR results are identified for Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA).

LEAs who have been identified as TA must participate in assigned TA based on the LEA's historical GSFR data and specific issues of noncompliance found in the LEA. LEAs who have been identified must participate in assigned TTA based on historical GSFR data and results of a qualitative review of the LEA's special education system. The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) aim to align resources, and TA focused on the issues found out of compliance.

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

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

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

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

##### Monitoring

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

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

Prong 2 – the LEA demonstrates that it is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, e.g., data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the state data collection system. LEAs are also required to address instances of noncompliance through improvement activities aimed at addressing factors contributing to the issue(s) of noncompliance. The ISDE and Idaho SESTA review improvement activities to make sure that the improvement activity(s) are designed to address the issue(s) of noncompliance and verify that the activities took place.

##### Local Determination and Differentiated Levels of Support

The ISDE uses the RDA Monitoring System to evaluate LEAs and includes performance and compliance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. LEAs are placed into one of three differentiated levels of support: Level 1: Supporting and Guiding; Level 2: Assisting and Mentoring; Level 3: Directing. Supports range from required attendance at specific ISDE-sponsored training, submission of letters of assurance, and more intensive supports, including up to three years of TA to address improvement areas. For additional information, see the ITC at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6>.

##### Dispute Resolution

Several mechanisms are available through the Idaho State Department of Education's (SDE) 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 complaints, due process hearings, and expedited due process hearings. Idaho's DR office makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve disputes at the least adversarial and most local level appropriate.

The DR office contracts with more than a dozen third-party experts who provide facilitation, mediation, complaint investigation, and due process hearing services under the supervision of the SDE's DR office. Nearly 20% of these contractors are qualified to serve as due process hearing officers. Each DR contractor brings unique experience and talent to the SDE, but all have significant knowledge and expertise in both special education regulations and practices, and conflict resolution. Contractors and hearing officers are assigned on a rotational and geographic basis and are required to participate in regular training and stay up to date on current issues related to special education. The DR office provides its contractors with national legal updates, current OSEP/OSER and state level guidance, annual in-person training hosted by the DR office staff, quarterly remote meetings that include DR updates and Q&A discussions, and regular opportunities to attend national and/or regional training such as LRP, PNWI, and TAESE training. Facilitations accounted for the majority (75%) of the caseload in dispute resolution. In FFY 2021 (SY 2021-2022), Idaho received 149 facilitation requests, resulting in 133 facilitation matters in which at least one meeting was held. The agreement rate of the facilitated matters was 93%; in addition, two or more matters were successfully resolved without a meeting. The FFY 2021 count represents an increase of 57% from FFY 2020.

### **Technical Assistance System:**

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

Two websites house special education resources for LEAs, the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) <https://idahotc.com/> and ISDE's Special Education webpage <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/index.html>. Instructional webinars, training modules, and quick guides are available on the ITC website on a variety of special education topics, including: Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA); Accessible Educational Materials; Assistive Technology; Autism and Low Incidence; Behavior; Comprehensive Evaluation; Cultivating Readers (SSIP); Early Childhood; Educational Services for Deaf and Blind; Idaho Tiered Behavior Supports; IEP (Individualized Education Program); Paraprofessionals; Parent Resources, Principals Corner; Pyramid Collaborative; RDA Monitoring System; School-Based Medicaid; Secondary Transition; Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities; and Universal Design for Learning. Informative and instructive documents and forms, including, but not limited to, the Idaho State Special Education Manual and Reporting Special Education Data through ISEE are posted on the ISDE's website. ISDE Special Education Division personnel provide technical assistance on a case-by-case basis to answer queries from LEAs, parents, and other individuals via phone and email.

Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) is a statewide training and technical assistance project funded through the ISDE. Idaho SESTA assists the ISDE by providing professional development and monitoring supports to build the capacity of district administrators and school-based personnel to (a) increase positive student outcomes in inclusive environments through evidence-based practices and (b) increase achievement on IDEA indicators. Idaho SESTA provides support to school district personnel across the state and serves as a primary point of contact for LEAs. Idaho SESTA coordinators have expertise in instruction, behavior, and IDEA compliance and oversight. LEAs may request technical assistance and support throughout the year. Data from LEA requests are compiled and analyzed annually. Results from the analysis are an essential component used to identify the training and professional development needed for the following year. The ISDE develops technical assistance training for statewide initiatives, Corrective Action Plans, and LEA program requests.

Character limits did not allow for a full description of Idaho's technical assistance system. In FFY 2021 Idaho continued to see increases in the usage of online content and has continued to expand development of online training modules and resources. For additional information regarding technical assistance and training provided by the ISDE to special educators throughout the state, please see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/> and SESTA Home at <https://idahotc.com/SESTA?page13548=1&size13548=6>. For a list of face-to-face training provided in FFY 2021, please access the following links: <https://mailchi.mp/uidaho/zh62zd2cts-4805926> ; <https://idahotc.com/sesta/2021-22>.

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

1. New Teacher (Essential Components of the Special Education Process) <https://idahotc.com/SESTA/Essential>
2. Secondary Transition (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/ST?page13547=1&size13547=6>)
3. Funding and Fiscal Accountability (<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/funding/>)
4. Early Childhood (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/EC?page13538=1&size13538=6>)
5. Results Driven Accountability Monitoring System (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6>)
6. Stakeholders (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/Parents?page14423=1&size14423=6>)
7. Comprehensive Evaluation (<https://idahotc.com/Comprehensive-Evaluation?page14266=1&size14266=6>)
8. New Directors - Includes training and resources from all of the above training specifically tailored to new special education directors.

#### **Professional Development System:**

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

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

Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA);

- Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHD), University of Idaho, 875 Perimeter Drive MS 4061, Moscow, ID 83844-4061, Phone: (208) 885-6132, Fax: (208) 885-6145; and

- Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies, Boise State University, Ron and Linda Yanke Family Research Park 220 E. Parkcenter Blvd., Boise, ID 83706-3940.

Professional Development Projects hosted by the ISDE and Idaho SESTA:

1. Autism Supports: The Autism Supports project is designed to improve educational services to children with Autism by building the capacity of school personnel and teams to assess, set goals, determine placement, and implement instructional strategies and supports across a variety of environments within the school.
2. The Idaho Assistive Technology Project (IATP): The IATP is a federally funded program administered by the CDHD. The goal of the IATP is to increase the availability of assistive technology devices and services for older persons and Idahoans with disabilities.
3. Idaho AT4All: The Idaho AT4All website (<https://idaho.at4all.com/>) lists a variety of used equipment available for sale, give-away, or loan, including wheelchairs and scooters, walkers, personal care items, items for those with vision and hearing impairments, hospital beds, computers, adapted vehicles, etc.
4. Pyramid Model Collaborative: Idaho's Pyramid Model follows the guidance from the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI), a federally-funded project established to disseminate effective use of the Pyramid Model to support young children's social, emotional, and behavioral development through a variety of training and technical assistance activities. The Pyramid Model focuses on program leadership, creating internal coaching capacity, and building knowledge for teachers to support the development of social and emotional competencies in young children. The project provides technical assistance and professional development to teams, identified practitioner coaches, and instructional staff as part of the project.
5. Cultivating Readers: Idaho Cultivating Readers through Evidence-based Practices in Instruction and Coaching (Cultivating Readers) is a multi-year professional development (PD) project. This project is a collaborative effort between the Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) and local education agencies (LEAs) to improve the delivery of reading instruction to all students, including students with disabilities, in kindergarten through third grade. The Cultivating Readers project employs a design of PD with training, coaching, and follow-up supports, with a focus on increased ability of instructional staff to utilize explicit instruction when teaching reading to students with disabilities, increased capacity of instructional coaches to support implementation, and increased capacity of leadership to support staff and parents in building Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading (MTSS-R).
6. Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC): The ITC (<https://idahotc.com/>) is a website listing all current special education-related training and resources across the state and is sponsored by the ISDE to link special educators and parents of students with disabilities with training opportunities across multiple agencies and parent groups. The ITC houses numerous webinars covering a wide variety of special education subjects available for professional development use, including modules on highly effective instruction, developing high-quality IEPs, behavior, secondary transition, early childhood, etc.

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

1. Annually, the Division of Special Education, in collaboration with the Assessment and Accountability, provides information regarding data on students with disabilities as part of the Data Drill Down, conducted in multiple regional sites around the state.
2. The Division of Special Education participates as an active partner in the Assessment Roadshow with the Division of Assessment and Accountability. The Assessment Roadshow provides LEAs with information regarding the importance of statewide and interim assessments, available accommodations, the 1% cap on alternate assessment participation, and statewide assessment processes.
3. The ISDE Division of Special Education collaborates with the IDHW on the biannual Early Years Conference, promoting networking and strengthening early childhood partnerships, programs, and systems-building initiatives.
4. The ISDE collaborates with the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) and the National Technical Assistance Center for Transitions to provide regional and customized training to improve post-secondary outcomes for low-incidence disabilities and connect students to competitive

employment options.

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

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

#### **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

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

The ISDE solicited input regarding improvements and/or revisions to Idaho's target, baseline, policies, practices, and procedures from various stakeholders. The Idaho Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Idaho Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Head Start Collaboration Office, Idaho Association of the Education of Young Children, the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) (including community partners), individuals with disabilities, representatives from higher education, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Information Center, and the Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC) all took an active role in the development of this SPP/APR and provided the ISDE with quality input on improving performance on SPP/APR priority indicators including Indicator 17 the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

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

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

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

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

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

The ISDE used feedback collected through directors' webinars to craft training and data visualizations for the regional Data Drill Down training. In the Data Drill Down training conducted in the fall of 2021, ISDE provided LEA and state-level comparison information to LEA representatives, including special education directors, consulting teachers, and data enterers. Participants asked clarifying questions, provided feedback on changes and target setting, discussed supports and obstacles to improvement, and developed strategies for improving performance within their LEA(s).

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

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

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

For Indicator 3C, the ISDE informed stakeholders throughout the FFY 2020 target-setting process that Idaho would need to reset the baseline and establish targets for FFY 2021 because the FFY 2020 test administration utilized another consortium state's scoring to set proficiency levels. ISDE provided updates on Idaho's progress towards setting cut scores for proficiency on the IDAA in spring and fall 2022. In November 2022, after the Idaho State Board of Education accepted cut scores and released performance data, the ISDE met face-to-face with SEAP to discuss baseline and target setting for Indicator 3C. The ISDE provided updated data and information on changes and continued activities, including the Idaho Extended Content Standards Alignment Project. Stakeholders unanimously voted to use the FFY 2021 data as the baseline and then apply the target-setting methodology discussed in fall 2021 to establish targets.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, will be broken up by sub-indicator so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

The ISDE and Idaho SESTA also solicit feedback from LEA staff on a variety of special education topics through surveys. LEA staff included Special Education Directors, School Principals, Superintendents, Teachers, and Related Service Providers.

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

NO

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

41

#### **Parent Members Engagement:**

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

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

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

Each SSIP-participating LEA is required to have at least one parent as part of the leadership team providing input on SSIP.

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

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

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

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

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

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

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

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

To learn more specifics, please go to the "Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input" section for each performance indicator.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, will be broken up by sub-indicator so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

#### **Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

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

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

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

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

The ISDE developed English and Spanish surveys to identify potential stakeholders to involve in SPP/APR indicator discussions and target setting beyond existing stakeholder groups. The ISDE sent out surveys through ISDE coordinators supporting underrepresented populations, including Migrant,

Indian Education, English Learners (EL), and Homeless and McKinney Vento.

In the fall of 2021, Idaho developed updated layouts for indicator information based on stakeholder requests. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help stakeholders better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, will be broken up by sub-indicator so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback. The new informational layout aims to increase the accessibility and reliability of indicator data so that more stakeholders may provide informed input.

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

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

Current, relevant dispute resolution information is provided to LEAs, parents, and educational partners, in a variety of formats and locations. This is in an effort to ensure that all are aware that any of the dispute resolution options offered by SDE may be initiated at any time and in any sequence, without prerequisite actions, and that more than one DR process (e.g., facilitation and complaint investigation) may be in effect at the same time. The DR office regularly includes information on trending issues as part of monthly webinars provided by the SDE'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 regular updates to our educational partners, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and parents in partnership with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), in addition to annual training provided at the New Superintendent Orientation and the IDEA and Federal Program Workshop, both sponsored by the State Department of Education.

Idaho's Special Education Dispute Resolution Office regularly provides information on "hot topics" or "trending issues" as part of monthly webinars to local special education directors and presents at the annual New Superintendents' Orientation. The team has developed resources for local school principals related to discipline, IEP and evaluation processes, accommodations, etc.

New resources include but are not limited to:

Dispute Resolution Quick Guides – These convenient, easily-accessed, one-page guides provide current information about each dispute resolution process available through the DR office.

Parent's Guide to Facilitation – This guide provides a brief overview of the role of the facilitator and offers parents several tips for preparing for a facilitated meeting.

The Dispute Resolution office offers regular updates to stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and works closely with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), and Idaho Special Education Support & Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) to develop resources and training for parents and school districts.

#### **Soliciting Public Input:**

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

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

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

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

The ISDE discusses SPP/APR priority indicators and data with stakeholders regularly and began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized.

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

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

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

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular November 2021 meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were then grouped based on areas of interest, reviewed indicator information (i.e., description of changes to indicators, historical data, potential baseline, etc.), and participated in discussions.

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

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

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

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

Please go to the target's sections for each performance indicator to learn more specifics.

For Indicator 3C, the ISDE informed stakeholders throughout the FFY 2020 target-setting process that Idaho would need to reset the baseline and establish targets for FFY 2021 because the FFY 2020 test administration utilized another consortium state's scoring to set proficiency levels. ISDE provided updates on Idaho's progress towards setting cut scores for proficiency on the IDAA in spring and fall 2022. In November 2022, the ISDE provided updated data and information on changes and continued activities. Stakeholders unanimously voted to use the FFY 2021 data as the baseline and then apply the target-setting methodology discussed in fall 2021 to establish targets.

The ISDE provides information on special education topics and progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders at least quarterly.

The ISDE and Idaho SESTA also solicit feedback from LEA staff on a variety of special education topics through surveys. LEA staff have included Special Education Directors, School Principals, Superintendents, Teachers, and Related Service Providers.

#### **Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

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

Information is also shared with LEAs through LEA determinations and Data Drill Down training.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, will be broken up by sub-indicator so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback. The new informational layout aims to increase the accessibility and relatability of indicator data so that more stakeholders may provide informed input. Once finalized, the indicator information is posted to the Idaho State Department of Education Special Education website.

#### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, 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/results.html>

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**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**



As directed by the Department and per its determination received in June of 2022, the ISDE is reporting on: (1) the technical assistance (TA) sources from which the state received assistance; and (2) the actions the state took as a result of that technical assistance.

The information below includes the list of national TA resources accessed and actions taken by Idaho as a result of that TA to meet the requirements pursuant to 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a). Please see specific indicators for additional information on how TA interactions contributed to Idaho's systems.

#### Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Education (CADRE)

- Attended CADRE Webinars and Learning Communities
- Consulted CADRE staff for information about resources for dispute resolution
- Participated in list-serve exchanges on dispute resolution topics
- Used dispute resolution materials in advising parents and LEAs about dispute resolution

#### Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)

- Consulted with CIFR staff on improvements to update the content of our IDEA Part B application
- Shared the Idaho fiscal monitoring system with other states

#### The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy)

- Added processes to improve data quality around Early Childhood Transition and Early Childhood Outcomes
- Improved collaboration and communication between Part C and Part B providers at the SEA-level
- Developed data visualizations for data training as a result of available DaSy tools and resources
- Consulted on final development for modernization of the notification of potentially eligible students 34 CFR 303.209(b)
- Consulted on a new application for tracking early childhood transition
- Clarified transition to kindergarten processes to develop LEA guidance

#### Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center

- Consulted on final development for modernization of the notification of potentially eligible students 34 CFR 303.209(b)
- Participated in Leadership and Project Directors Conference
- 619 calls

#### IDEA Data Center (IDC)

- Participated in Stakeholder Cadre Meetings
- Participated in Interactive Institute and SPP/APR Summit
- Coordinated to review and improve the clarity of descriptions in the SPP/APR
- Utilized resources for stakeholder input
- Develop guidance for LEAs regarding federal requirements and tracking of CCEIS
- Aligned and improved processes across ISDE Divisions regarding the reporting of 618 data
- Utilized 618 Pre-submission edit check tools
- Consulted on public reporting
- Utilized Data Meeting Toolkit to inform Data Drill Down training content

#### National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)

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

#### National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER)

- Consulted NIEER staff for information about resources for early childhood research-based practices
- Utilized resources to coordinate policies and practices across statewide systems

#### National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)

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

#### State Director participated in monthly technical assistance calls

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

- Shared resources cross-state
- Participated in twice-monthly technical assistance calls
- Collaborated to provide comments during the open comment period for Determinations

#### Special Education Data Managers Affinity Group (SEDMAG)

- Improved data quality
- Shared resources cross-state
- Participated in monthly calls (technical assistance, leadership, and OSEP)
- Received technical assistance for Part B Data Managers
- Collaborated to provide comments during the open comment period for EDFacts and Determinations

#### National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO)

#### NCEO 1% Cap Community of Practice

- Participated in bi-monthly calls
- Shared resources cross-state regarding alternate assessment
- Obtained resources to help provide oversight and support to LEAs that exceed the 1.0% Cap on Alternate Assessment participation

#### Participated in the Peer Learning Group - Empowering Families to Understand the Role of Assessments in State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIPs)

#### National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL)

- Provided TA and PD to the ISDE and LEAs related to evidence-based literacy practices for Idaho's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
- Partnered to develop evaluation and fidelity tools to measure literacy practices for Idaho's SSIP
- Continued development of sustainable training materials on Multi-Tiered Systems of Support-Reading for ISDE to house on its SSIP/SPDG website
- Developed resources for LEAs and parents related to the foundations of reading

#### National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)

- Continued participation in Cross-State Learning Collaboratives
- Utilized resources to support LEAs in the implementation of language and literacy practices
- Consulted monthly on SSIP/SPDG problem solving
- Facilitated training with collaboration from NCSI, IDC, and CIFR for ISDE and Idaho SESTA teams to clarify the integration and collaboration of Idaho's system for general supervision

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

- Refined Idaho Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Monitoring System
- Discussed improving communications with LEAs
- Discussed improved stakeholder interaction
- Collaborated to provide comments during the open comment period for EDFacts and state Determinations

#### Evidence-Based Practices Learning Collaborative

- Maintained ongoing consultation with NCSI state contact
- Supported the development and usage of evaluation tools
- Continued refinement of the evaluation plan

- Improved stakeholder engagement plan
  - Collaborated on evaluation data and reporting
  - Collaborated on the evidence-based practices implementation timeline
  - Continued learning about effective PD related to stages, implementation, rubric, and data collection National Implementation Research Network (NIRN)
  - Used resources to inform the scale-up of Idaho's Pyramid Model implementation
  - Used information and resources to inform training provided to SSIP LEAs on implementation science National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT: C)
  - Collaborated with the IDVR and NTACT: C to develop programs to improve secondary transition
  - Received one-on-one consultation and support from designated TA center representative
  - Utilized web tools related to evidence-based practices and training shared with LEAs, schools, and service providers SPED/VR/Corrections Community of Practice
  - Participated in TA calls
- B14 Community of Practice
- Participated in TA calls
  - Identified opportunities to improve Indicator 14 data quality
  - Trained LEAs on survey techniques for opt-in Post-School Outcomes collection
- Signetwork
- Monthly SPDG Project Directors' Webinars
  - Evaluation Fidelity Friday meetings
  - States with Small Populations Work Group
  - Team Functioning Work Group
  - Communications Workgroup
- Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE)
- Accessed resources provided by TAESE that contributed to multiple actions listed above
- Training and Assessment System for K-12 Educational Interpreters Program (TASK12)
  - Participated in quarterly training workshops for dispute resolution complaint investigators
  - Consulted regarding dispute resolution processes
  - Established and maintained a national assessment and training system for educational sign language interpreters
  - Provided skill-improvement training program for educational sign language interpreters with a progress assessment
- WestEd
- Consulted for training development, fiscal monitoring assistance, fiscal oversight, and federal statute support
  - Cross-Role Data Quality Peer Group
  - 619 Data Quality Peer Group
  - Significant Disproportionality Peer to Peer

## **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

## **Intro - Required Actions**

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	63.84%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	90.00%	65.40%	65.48%	70.70%	63.84%
Data	60.46%	60.95%	65.48%	62.45%	71.51%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student

outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. Consensus was established for the use of FFY 2019 data as baseline. The FFY 2019 data represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and was the first year that reflected changes in Idaho's aggregation for 618 Program Exit.

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

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

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

The ISDE provides information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders. As part of the meetings, ISDE also includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A draft of the template was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,184
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	NA
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	380
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	60
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	340

#### FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1,184	1,964	71.51%	63.85%	60.29%	Did not meet target	Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The COVID-19 health crisis impacted percentages for Indicator 1 in the FFY 2020 and 2021 reporting year. Counts of students who were on track to graduate and meet regular state graduation were not affected, but the count of students who dropped out, completed adapted requirements, and reached maximum age were impacted as a result of the COVID-19 health crisis.

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

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

2019-2020 school year instead exited in the 2020-2021 school year. Data shows inflated counts for the categories of Reached Maximum Age, Received a Certificate, and normalized counts for Dropped Out, while students exiting as having Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma increased, but at a more normalized rate when compared to other exit categories.

### **Graduation Conditions**

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

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

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

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

NO

#### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

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

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

Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (Idaho's Plan) is designed to identify schools performing among the lowest 5% in the state for subgroup graduation rates. These school leaders are then required to develop and follow a plan to address the specific area of improvement. While Indicator 1 no longer directly ties to Idaho's Plan accountability indicators, Idaho's Plan has increased focus on graduation for students with disabilities. The ISDE Special Education team is involved in discussions with stakeholders to establish new targets for Idaho's Plan.

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

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

Idaho has seen substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff in the local education agencies. Short staffing, including limited numbers of substitute teachers, has reduced LEA team's flexibility to attend professional development or training. LEAs have shown an increase in new hires certified through alternative authorizations to fill positions. To address training needs, the ISDE Secondary Transition Coordinator now maintains a secondary transition staff list and conducts monthly recorded webinars on secondary transition, program exit, and other secondary special education topics to improve access to training. By maintaining communication and providing directed webinars at the teacher and provider level, the ISDE is working to make sure that training reaches the necessary individuals. For more information on Idaho's secondary training offerings, please see the Secondary Transition section within the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/ST?page13547=1&size13547=6>).

The ISDE provides exit data and coding training to LEA personnel through the annual regionally offered Data Drill Down training, the New and Experienced Federal Directors Meeting, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, Secondary Institute, and monthly special education Directors Webinars. The Secondary Coordinator participates as part of the Data Drill Down, providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data, available supports, and strategies for improvement.

In November of 2021, the Transition Institute was provided in both face-to-face and virtual format to facilitate health and safety recommendations from the CDC. The Transition Institute hosted in the fall of 2022 returned to a face-to-face-only layout which better encourages involvement in the institute. Lead state partner agencies included the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL), Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities (ICDD), Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ICBVI), and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL). The 2022 Transition Institute linked 54 LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. A total of 275 individuals participated in the institute representing staff from LEAs, IDVR, ICBVI, Career Technical Education (CTE), colleges and universities, and IPUL. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. As a result of activities initiated at the Transition Institute, 41 of the participating LEAs have developed annual District Action Plans to improve transition at the local level. District Action Plans were turned in to the ISDE for follow-up activities. Idaho intends to continue the Transition Institute and expects growth for students with disabilities in future Secondary Transition, Program Exit, and Post School Outcomes data.

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

### **1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **1 - OSEP Response**

### **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.

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

#### Measurement

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 data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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.

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

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 Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	17.90%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	3.58%	3.08%	2.58%	2.08%	17.70%
Data	6.42%	4.32%	7.63%	5.18%	14.87%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The ISDE used feedback from directors' webinars to craft training and data visualizations for the regional Data Drill Down training. In the Data Drill Down training conducted in the fall of 2021, ISDE provided LEA and state-level comparison information to LEA representatives, including special education directors, consulting teachers, and data enterers. In training, participants had opportunities to review the data, which incorporated changes from FFY 2020 to reporting for Indicator 2 and showed impacts on their LEA(s) versus the state. Participants asked clarifying questions, provided feedback on changes and target setting, discussed supports and obstacles to improvement, and developed strategies for improving graduation within their LEA(s). In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on the following:

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

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

clarified questions, and functioned as the discussion facilitator. Members participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after group session discussions were complete.

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

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

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

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

The ISDE provides information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders. As part of the meetings, ISDE also includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent. Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A draft of the template was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,184
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	NA
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	380
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	60
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	340

#### FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
340	1,964	14.87%	17.50%	17.31%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Dropouts are defined as students who:

1. were enrolled in school and exited, but;
2. did not graduate from high school.
3. did not complete a state or district-approved educational program.
4. did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
  - a. transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program;
  - b. temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness;
  - c. death.

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

NO

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

### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

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

The ISDE showed that COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for Indicator 2. The COVID-19 pandemic impacted indicator 2 percentages in the FFY 2021 reporting year. Students who may have been on a trajectory to exit through the Received a Certificate (Completed - Adapted Requirements) category for 2019-2020 remained in education and continued services in the 2020-2021 school year to ensure they completed their goals. Those students who otherwise would have exited in the 2019-2020 school year instead exited in the 2020-2021 school year, increasing the denominator for indicators 1 and 2. Data shows inflated counts for the categories of Reached Maximum Age, Received a Certificate, and normalized counts for Dropped Out, while students exiting as having Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma increased, but at a more normalized rate when compared to other exit categories.

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

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

Idaho has seen substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff in the local education agencies. Short staffing, including limited numbers of substitute teachers, has reduced LEA team's flexibility to attend professional development or training. LEAs have shown an increase in new hires certified through alternative authorizations to fill positions. To address training needs, the ISDE Secondary Transition Coordinator now maintains a secondary transition staff list and conducts monthly recorded webinars on secondary transition, program exit, and other secondary special education topics to improve access to training. By maintaining communication and providing directed webinars at the teacher and provider level, the ISDE is working to make sure that training reaches the necessary individuals. For more information on Idaho's secondary training offerings, please see the Secondary Transition section within the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/ST?page13547=1&size13547=6>).

The ISDE provides exit data and coding training to LEA personnel through the annual regionally offered Data Drill Down training, the New and Experienced Federal Directors Meeting, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, Secondary Institute, and monthly special education Directors Webinars. The Secondary Coordinator participates as part of the Data Drill Down, providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data, available supports, and strategies for improvement.

Idaho has also established partnerships with other state agencies to improve secondary outcomes. One of the main events resulting from the cross-agency collaboration is the Transition Institute. Lead state partner agencies included the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL), Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities (ICDD), Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ICBVI), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), and the ISDE. In November of 2021, the Transition Institute was provided in both face-to-face and virtual format to facilitate health and safety recommendations from the CDC. The Transition Institute hosted in the fall of 2022 returned to a face-to-face-only layout which better encourages involvement in the institute. The 2022 Transition Institute linked 54 LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. A total of 275 individuals participated in the institute representing staff from LEAs, IDVR, ICBVI, Career Technical Education (CTE), colleges and universities, and IPUL. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. As a result of activities initiated at the Transition Institute, 41 of the participating LEAs have developed annual District Action Plans to improve transition at the local level. District Action Plans were turned in to the ISDE for follow-up activities. Idaho intends to continue the Transition Institute and expects growth for students with disabilities in future Secondary Transition, Program Exit, and Post School Outcomes data.

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

## **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 EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

In preparation for the November 2021 SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular meeting. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were grouped based on areas of interest and participated in discussions regarding indicators. Each group had an SDE staff member who provided additional information on the indicators, clarified questions, and functioned as the discussion facilitator. Members participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after group session discussions were complete.

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

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

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

In the small group discussions, SEAP members expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19-related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment.

Stakeholders approved of the continued alignment of assessment participation (Indicator 3A) with ESEA and the Idaho Consolidated State Plan at 95% per year for each grade level. The baseline was established using data from the 2020-2021 administration, as this is the only year that includes the current Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). The change in assessment has resulted in a change in the collection methodology.

In fall 2022, the ISDE discussed target setting for Indicator 3C and provided clarification assuring stakeholders that the test administration remained the same and did not impact FFY 2021 Indicator 3A.

The ISDE provides information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, ISDE also includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, will be broken up by sub-indicator so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

## FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	3,022	2,780	2,235
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,277	2,104	1,675
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	536	390	236
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	153	158	138

### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

### Date:

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	3,024	2,775	2,227
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,799	1,314	1,260
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,011	1,170	640
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	156	159	135

\*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 pre-filled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,966	3,022	97.29%	95.00%	98.15%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,652	2,780	95.37%	95.00%	95.40%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2,049	2,235	90.34%	95.00%	91.68%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,966	3,024	97.22%	95.00%	98.08%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,643	2,775	95.50%	95.00%	95.24%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2,035	2,227	90.14%	95.00%	91.38%	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.**

Public reporting of participation and performance is located on the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), Special Education, Public Reporting page <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/> and Idaho's Report Card at <https://idahoschools.org/>. To access information specific to LEA annual performance as compared to state targets and data required for 20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f) go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/> and select State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report. Information is then separated by reporting year. For direct access, use the following link.  
<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-State-Performance-Plan/2021-2022-Assessment-Participation-and-Performance.xlsx>.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The ISDE shows no impact on the validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 3 data due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan) established targets for all students on statewide assessments. The Plan has increased focus on improving participation and outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities as a subgroup. Idaho's identified Annual Measurement of Achievement (ESEA section 111(c)(4)(E)(iii)) reads as follows: Idaho understands that to provide a fair and accurate picture of school success, and to help parents, teachers, school leaders, and state officials understand where students are struggling and how to support them, the state must ensure high participation in statewide assessments. According to the current Idaho Administrative Code (IDAPA 08.02.03.112(e)), "failure to include ninety-five percent (95%) of all students and ninety-five percent (95%) of students in designated subgroups automatically identifies the school as not having achieved measurable progress in ISAT proficiency." For the purposes of this plan, "measurable progress on ISAT proficiency" is defined as not having met the school's interim progress measure toward its long-term goals in any group where 95% participation is not attained. Additionally, "If a school district does not meet the ninety-five percent (95%)

participation target for the current year, the participation rate can be calculated by the most current three (3) year average of participation." Should a school or LEA not meet the 95% participation minimum standard, the local school board will be notified by the State Board of Education that the school or district has failed to meet the minimum standard of reporting and that this will be reflected on the state report card. The ISDE will support the school or LEA to write a parent outreach plan addressing how it will engage parents and community members to meet the 95% participation minimum standard. In addition, ISDE will develop policies requiring the LEA to use a portion of its funds pursuant to 33-320, Idaho Code (Continuous Improvement Plans) for local school board and superintendent training on data-driven decision-making and assessment literacy.

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

The ISDE provides training to LEAs regarding assessment data and coding through the regionally offered Data Drill Down training and special education director webinars. In fall of 2021 the Division of Special Education partnered with the Assessment and Accountability Division to have joint training sessions on accessing statewide assessment data, analysis techniques, and conducting root-cause analysis.

Idaho expanded training on IDAA developing participation criteria training, online training vignettes, and an IDAA participation worksheet designed to assist IEP team member discussions during the IEP meeting. As a result of training and a better understanding of the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA) participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams more accurately qualify students to take the IDAA. The ISDE continues to improve systems to address the needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities. Idaho has developed online training modules cross-walking Idaho's extended content standards. For more information on these modules and training related to students with significant cognitive disabilities, please go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/SCD?page14378=1&size14378=6>. For resources related to IDAA available on the ISDE website, please go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/sped/>.

In the summer and fall of 2022, Idaho discussed the logistics of adjusting the reported grade level for high school IDAA to match the reported grade level used for the regular statewide assessments. Discussions were held with technical assistance providers and the Accountability Oversight Committee (AOC) of the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education. The AOC members represent the ISDE, State Board of Education, Colleges and Universities, and LEA leadership, including representation of district and charter school administrators, assessment coordinators, and special education directors. The changes will take effect in the 2022-2023 assessment administration and reporting.

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

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

### **3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3A - OSEP Response**

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

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities, if any, participating in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and/or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

### **3A - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3B - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

- How to get involved;
- Types of groups;
- Understanding data;
- Roles of families on groups; and

- Skills for serving on groups.

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

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

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

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

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

In the small group discussions, SEAP members approved of the change in the baseline year. Stakeholders also expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19-related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment.

For assessment, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative target increases. FFY 2020 Math assessment results were well below baseline data, and stakeholders noted that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline for multiple years would present challenging targets. Reading assessments did not show the same decrease in proficiency, but stakeholders indicated that consistency between target progression would be beneficial. The aligned target progressions between Math and Reading would be easier to communicate with stakeholders and reduce confusion while promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, will be broken up by sub-indicator so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

The ISDE provides information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, ISDE also includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent.

Idaho adopted new general education Idaho Content Standards in 2022. An alignment study is upcoming to determine the alignment of Idaho's current statewide assessments and the new content standards. Stakeholders are being updated throughout the process.

#### FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

##### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

##### Date:

04/05/2023

##### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	2,813	2,494	1,911
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	405	185	234
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	69	28	28

##### Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

##### Date:

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 8</b>	<b>Grade HS</b>
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	2,810	2,484	1,900
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	418	89	55
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	46	26	11

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	474	2,813	14.27%	14.20%	16.85%	Met target	No Slippage
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	213	2,494	8.65%	8.10%	8.54%	Met target	No Slippage
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	262	1,911	10.76%	10.30%	13.71%	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	464	2,810	14.25%	16.15%	16.51%	Met target	No Slippage
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	115	2,484	3.87%	4.04%	4.63%	Met target	No Slippage
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	66	1,900	2.46%	3.12%	3.47%	Met 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.**

Public reporting of participation and performance is located on the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), Special Education, Public Reporting page <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/> and Idaho's Report Card at <https://idahoschools.org/>. To access information specific to LEA annual performance as compared to state targets and data required for 20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f) go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/> and select State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report. Information is then separated by reporting year. For direct access, use the following link.  
<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-State-Performance-Plan/2021-2022-Assessment-Participation-and-Performance.xlsx>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The ISDE shows no impact on the validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 3 data due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Idaho adopted new general education Idaho Content Standards in 2022. An alignment study is upcoming to determine the alignment of Idaho's current statewide assessments and the new content standards. Stakeholders are being updated throughout the process. The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of Reading and Math for all students. Idaho does not have a unified curriculum for instruction. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers. ISDE is currently accessing national technical resource centers and leveraging internal resources to address this gap. Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan) established targets for all students on statewide assessments. The Plan has increased the focus on improving outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities as a subgroup. Included as part of the Plan is the identification of buildings for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI). School buildings that meet or exceed a 35-percentage point achievement gap between all students and any subgroup are required to develop and follow a plan leveraging available resources to address the achievement gap for the specific subgroup. Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education uses performance and compliance indicators, including Indicator 3 as part of LEA level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the ISDE developed several self-assessment protocols to help conduct a root cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including Indicator 3. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. To address issues identified in instruction, ISDE continues to collaborate across Divisions. The Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content divisions cooperate in providing teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and teaching of the Idaho Content Standards. The Fall 2021 Conference on Connecting Assessment and Instruction provided regional training linking assessment data and instructional practices. The conference offered separate strands for Reading, Math, and Science. The ISDE also provides training to LEAs regarding assessment data and coding through the regionally offered Data Drill Down training and special education director webinars. The fall of 2021 Data Drill Down was conducted in collaboration with the Fall 2021 Conference on Connecting Assessment and Instruction to offer joint training sessions on accessing statewide assessment data, analysis techniques, and conducting root-cause analysis. In addition, training from Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) provides additional support for implementing instruction for students with disabilities with fidelity. Idaho recognizes that performance on statewide assessments needs improvement. Idaho has implemented initiatives around early literacy, including Idaho's Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) to address low performance and developed new training and tools for LEA staff. See Indicator 17 and resources at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Readers>. The ISDE has developed training to give administrators and those who support teachers the knowledge and tools to lead data-based decision-making discussions and support the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) in schools and classrooms. The IRI is an early reading screener and diagnostic assessment administered to all K-3 public school students. The screener is mandatory for Idaho public school students in the Fall and Spring, with optional winter administration. Progress monitoring is also available for all students.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments, and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

## 3B - Required Actions



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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3C - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	43.14%	43.50%	43.75%	44.00%	44.25%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	46.20%	46.50%	46.75%	47.00%	47.25%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	50.72%	51.00%	51.25%	51.50%	51.75%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	41.67%	42.00%	42.25%	42.50%	42.75%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	36.48%	36.75%	37.00%	37.25%	37.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	37.78%	38.00%	38.25%	38.50%	38.75%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. In September 2020, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) provided descriptions of the basic proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts on Idaho's educational systems. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and about future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021. In the fall of 2021, Idaho, through its parent center, began providing the Serving on Groups training to stakeholders to improve their ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on the following:

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

In preparation for the November SEAP meeting, Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators. The packet was sent to members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular meeting. FFY 2020 was the first administration of the current assessment. No additional data were available to review for Indicator 3C. Before reviewing performance indicators, members received portions of the Serving on Groups training to improve their understanding of their role in the target-setting process. Members were grouped based on areas of interest and participated in discussions regarding indicators. Each group had an SDE staff member who provided additional information on the indicators, clarified questions, and functioned as the discussion facilitator. Members participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after group session discussions were complete. In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students.

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

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

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

Stakeholders indicated that consistency between target progression across assessment indicators would be beneficial. Reasoning that aligned target progressions would be easier to communicate to stakeholders and reduce their confusion while still promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Idaho's stakeholders noted that the ISDE should use a similar progression for both Reading and Math on the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). Stakeholders noted that further review would be necessary once additional information is available to show a trend for IDAA in Math and Reading. The ISDE informed stakeholders throughout the target-setting process that Idaho would need to reset the baseline and establish targets for FFY 2021 because the FFY 2020 test administration utilized another consortium state's scoring to set proficiency levels. ISDE provided updates on Idaho's progress towards setting cut scores for proficiency on the IDAA in spring and fall 2022. In November 2022, after the Idaho State Board of Education accepted cut scores and released performance data, the ISDE met face-to-face with SEAP to discuss baseline and target setting for Indicator 3C. The ISDE provided updated data and information on changes and continued activities, including the Idaho Extended Content Standards Alignment Project. Stakeholders unanimously voted to use the FFY 2021 data as the baseline and then apply the target-setting methodology discussed in fall 2021 to establish targets. The baseline was established using data from the 2021-2022 FFY 2021 test administration, as this is the only year that includes current Idaho-approved cut scores for the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). Per stakeholder recommendations, the ISDE is applying a .25 percentage point increase annually to each group and subject area. FFY 2022 targets show a slight variance to the incremental target increase to create a more orderly target progression. The change in assessment scoring has resulted in a change in the collection methodology for 3C. Idaho will continue to provide data in infographics and other user-friendly accessible formats to help stakeholders relate to the information and better facilitate meaningful input.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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	153	158	138
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	66	73	70

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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	156	159	135
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	65	58	51

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	66	153	35.48%	43.14%	43.14%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	73	158	43.33%	46.20%	46.20%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	70	138	39.22%	50.72%	50.72%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	65	156	22.29%	41.67%	41.67%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	58	159	44.37%	36.48%	36.48%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	51	135	26.32%	37.78%	37.78%	N/A	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Public reporting of participation and performance is located on the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), Special Education, Public Reporting page <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/> and Idaho's Report Card at <https://idahoschools.org/>. To access information specific to LEA annual performance as compared to state targets and data required for 20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f) go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/> and select State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report. Information is then separated by reporting year. For direct access, use the following link.

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-State-Performance-Plan/2021-2022-Assessment-Participation-and-Performance.xlsx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The ISDE shows no impact on the validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 3 data due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Idaho has established new baseline and targets for Indicator 3C. The baseline uses data from the 2021-2022 (FFY 2021) test administration, as this is the only year that includes current Idaho-approved cut scores for the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). Per stakeholder recommendations, the ISDE is applying the target increase methodology established in FFY 2020, which equals approximately a .25 percentage point increase annually to each group and subject area. FFY 2022 targets show a slight variance to the incremental target increase to create a more orderly target progression. The change in assessment scoring has resulted in a change in the collection methodology for 3C. Idaho will continue to provide data in infographics and other user-friendly accessible formats to help stakeholders relate to the information and better facilitate meaningful input.

The ISDE recognizes that overall, there is a continuing issue related to instruction in the content areas of Reading and Math for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Idaho has developed online training modules cross-walking Idaho's extended content standards. Idaho adopted new general education Idaho Content Standards in 2022. The ISDE has established the Idaho Extended Content Standards Alignment Project to align the current Idaho Extended Content Standards with the newly adopted Idaho Content Standards. Educational stakeholders from across the state are assigned to content and grade-band-specific committees to review and offer suggestions for revision to the current Idaho Extended Content Standards to ensure proper alignment with the Idaho Content Standards and appropriate reductions in depth, breadth, and complexity. Participants include representatives from special education, general education, school administrators, parents, university faculty, the Special Education Advisory Committee, and the Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities. This work spans from November 2022 through April 2023. Idaho will provide additional information on subsequent submissions for Indicator 3C. Idaho also partnered with state and national resources to develop training on establishing high expectations for students with significant cognitive disabilities. For more information on these modules and training related to students with significant cognitive disabilities, please go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/SCD?page14378=1&size14378=6> and <https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/970>. In addition, Special Education teachers are often involved in training specific to special education and related services and do not have access to the same content training provided to general education teachers. ISDE is currently accessing national technical resource centers and leveraging internal resources to address this area of need. For resources related to IDAA available on the ISDE website, please go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/sped/>.

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

To address issues identified in instruction, ISDE continues to collaborate across Divisions. The Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content divisions cooperate in providing teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and teaching of the Idaho Content Standards. In addition, training from Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) provides additional support for implementing instruction for students with disabilities with fidelity.

Idaho expanded training on IDAA developing participation criteria training, online training vignettes, and an IDAA participation worksheet designed to assist IEP team member discussions during the IEP meeting. As a result of training and a better understanding of the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA) participation criteria and issues related to the 1% cap on IDAA participation, IEP teams more accurately qualify students to take the IDAA. The ISDE has also developed parent resources related to IDAA. The resource, A Parent Guide to the IDAA, is posted to both the Idaho Training Clearing House at <https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/653> and the ISDE website under the Assessment & Accountability page at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/sped/>.

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

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

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

### **3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3C - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision. The State revised its targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the district and/or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

### **3C - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	37.94	37.92	37.21	36.50	35.79
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	45.87	45.85	44.98	44.12	43.25
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	49.77	49.75	48.81	47.86	46.92
Math	A <=	Grade 4	33.80	33.78	33.15	32.52	31.89
Math	B <=	Grade 8	36.60	36.58	35.89	35.21	34.52
Math	C <=	Grade HS	30.21	30.19	29.63	29.07	28.51

## **Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

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

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

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

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

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

In response to SEAP members' concern about the proposed baseline data being old, ISDE also updated the baseline year to the 2018-19 school year (FFY 2018). The 2018-19 school year represents the most recent data that was not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis and reflected changes in Idaho processes based on Idaho Consolidated State Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training.

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

In the small group discussions, SEAP members approved of the change in the baseline year. Stakeholders also expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19-related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment.

For assessment, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative target increases. FFY 2020 Math assessment results were well below baseline data, and stakeholders noted that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline for multiple years would present challenging targets. Reading assessments did not show the same decrease in proficiency, but stakeholders indicated that consistency between target progression would be beneficial. The aligned target progressions between Math and Reading would be easier to communicate with stakeholders and reduce confusion while promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Stakeholders further encouraged alignment of progression across assessment indicators, including Indicator 3D, with the same justification. Idaho will continue to provide data with estimates on student counts to help stakeholders relate to the information and provide meaningful input.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, will be broken up by sub-indicator so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

The ISDE provides information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, ISDE also includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent.

Idaho adopted new general education Idaho Content Standards in 2022. An alignment study is upcoming to determine the alignment of Idaho's current statewide assessments and the new content standards. Stakeholders are being updated throughout the process.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:** 04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	23,106	24,667	22,710
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	2,813	2,494	1,911
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11,933	13,322	13,870
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	101	49	40
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	405	185	234
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	69	28	28

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:** 04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	23,124	24,713	22,695
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	2,810	2,484	1,900
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11,191	8,832	7,509
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	78	35	19
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	418	89	55
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	46	26	11

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16.85%	52.08%	35.31	37.94	35.23	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.54%	54.21%	46.85	45.87	45.67	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	13.71%	61.25%	49.33	49.77	47.54	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	16.51%	48.73%	31.10	33.80	32.22	Met target	No Slippage
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	4.63%	35.88%	32.00	36.60	31.25	Met target	No Slippage
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	3.47%	33.17%	30.13	30.21	29.70	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The ISDE shows no impact on the validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 3 data due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Idaho adopted new general education Idaho Content Standards in 2022. An alignment study is upcoming to determine alignment of Idaho's current statewide assessments and the new content standards. Stakeholders are being updated throughout the process.

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

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

To address issues identified in instruction, ISDE continues to collaborate across Divisions. The Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content divisions cooperate in providing teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and teaching of the Idaho Content Standards. In addition, training from Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) provides additional support for implementing instruction for students with disabilities with fidelity.

The ISDE provides training to LEAs regarding assessment data and coding through the regionally offered Data Drill Down training and special education director webinars. The fall of 2022 Data Drill Down focused on Idaho Reading Indicator data because regular statewide assessment data were unavailable at the time of the training.

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

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

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.08%	0.00%

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

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

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

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

The ISDE provides information on special education topics and progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders at least quarterly. As part of the meetings, ISDE also includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A draft of the template was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December of 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

172

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0.00%	0.00%		N/A	N/A

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

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

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

The calculation for Indicator 4A, a significant discrepancy in long-term out-of-school suspensions or expulsions, uses the following criteria:

Cell size = 5

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 1

Threshold (i.e., state suspension/expulsion-rate bar) = 1 percentage point over the state rate.

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

The formula for FFY2021 is as follows:

$$((\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2020-2021} > 10 \text{ days}) / (\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs in the state for SY 2020-2021})) * 100$$

Total # of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2020-2021 > 10 days = 30

Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2020-2021 = 35,536

State-level suspension/expulsion rate = (30 / 35,536) x 100

Application of data:

$$\text{State-level suspension/expulsion rate} = 30 / 35,536 \times 100 = 0.08\%$$

The state suspension/expulsion-rate bar is  $0.08\% + 1.00\% = 1.08\%$ .

An LEA will have 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-level bar of 1.08% for FFY 2021 data.

For Indicator 4A, Idaho has established a minimum cell size of 5 and an n-size of at least 30. 43 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size of 30 students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA, and 0 LEAs met the minimum cell size of 5 instances of out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days. All 172 LEAs in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for Indicator 4A for FFY 2021.

As a result of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen a substantial decrease in the number of disciplinary instances, including the number of students reported as receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days. Only 19 LEAs in the state for the school year 2020-2021 reported issuing out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days for students with disabilities. The number of students per LEA receiving this form of disciplinary action ranged between one and three. The median number of students with disabilities receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days at the LEA level was one.

#### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Indicator 4A data for the FFY 2021 reporting year are from the 2020-2021 school year. Many of Idaho's local education agencies (LEAs) were in a hybrid format for at least a portion of the school year. The hybrid learning format was designed to improve social distancing and limit the spread of COVID-19. Schools were not in regular session and disciplinary actions for the 2020-2021 school year dropped further from the prior year. Idaho saw a reduction in the number of reported instances but did not note any impact on data validity, reliability, or completeness as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The ISDE, in collaboration with stakeholders, has endeavored to develop a more unified system to support equity. Indicators 4A and 4B now utilize the Self-Assessment for Discipline as part of the process to determine if the identification of significant discrepancy is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The ISDE developed the Self-Assessment Protocol for Discipline as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. Using the same tool for Indicator 4 and significant disproportionality improves alignment and reduces confusion for LEAs and stakeholders.

To mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Division of Special Education immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. The ISDE conducted webinars on an as-needed basis to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services during the COVID-19 pandemic. Information provided during the webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Division of Medicaid also presented as part of the webinar series.

ISDE and Idaho SESTA developed several resources for educators related to disciplinary action and behavioral intervention specific to students with disabilities. Training and documents are available to all levels, but many resources focus on new principals and superintendents. For additional information and to view resources related to disciplinary action, go to <https://idahotc.com/> and search for discipline. Behavior resources are available directly through the following link, <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Behavior?page13537=1&size13537=6>. For materials specific to principals, including the Discipline Flowchart, Manifest Determination Flowchart, and Student Removal Quick Guide go to ITC Principals Corner at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Principals-Corner?page13542=1&size13542=6>. Also available on the ITC are the Discipline Resources for Principals Module at [https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#/,](https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#/) The Educators Guide to Student Discipline and Supports at [https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/738,](https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/738) and Idaho Tiered Behavior Supports at <https://idahotc.com/itbs?page15083=1&size15083=6>. After receiving guidance from OSEP in the fall of 2022 related to discipline, the ISDE provided additional information to LEAs through webinars vetted through its legal counsel. The regionally offered Data Drill Down training also added new sections specific to disciplinary action. Data displays were available at the state and local levels for comparison. The displays showed the difference between counts of disciplinary actions of all students, students with disabilities, and the percentage that students with disabilities contributed to all students' disciplinary action. Data were aggregated by disciplinary action type and included in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and expulsions over the last three years of reporting. Before reviewing and discussing the disciplinary action data, LEA teams received an overview of the data collection source, the definition of each discipline type, and selected questions from the Discipline Self-Assessment Protocol. A majority of LEAs who returned action items at the close of each training indicated one or more action items related to disciplinary action.

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

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

#### **Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

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

Idaho did not identify any instances of significant discrepancy for FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data.

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

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

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 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

As noted in the FFY 2021 Part B SPP/APR General Instructions, the State’s methodology for examining data must be reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. The Part B SPP/APR General Instructions also noted that factors OSEP may consider when determining reasonableness of a State’s methodology include whether none, or a very low percentage of, the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology, and whether statistically sound alternative methodologies exist or are being used by similarly-situated States. OSEP notes that the State included none of its LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported, "As a result of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen a substantial decrease in the number of disciplinary instances, including the number of students reported as receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days." Additionally, OSEP notes that the State’s chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States that use a rate ratio.

**4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

172

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Idaho calculates each of the seven racial/ethnic categories to determine if there is a significant discrepancy in long-term out-of-school suspensions or expulsions by race/ethnicity in an LEA. The ISDE has maintained the use of a state suspension/expulsion-rate bar for students with disabilities (SWD) for calculation of Indicator 4B. Idaho has defined Significant Discrepancy as one percentage point or more above the reporting year's State suspension/expulsion-rate for students with disabilities. The calculation for Indicator 4B compares the LEA suspension/expulsion rate by race/ethnicity to the state suspension/expulsion-rate bar.

The calculation for significant discrepancy uses the following criteria:

Cell size = 5

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 1

Threshold (i.e., state suspension/expulsion-rate bar) = 1 percentage point over the state rate for students with disabilities.

The cell size criteria reflect the count of students of the racial/ethnic category of analysis with long-term out-of-school suspension/expulsion. The n-size criteria reflect the count of students with disabilities of the racial/ethnic category of analysis included as part of Child Count. For FFY 2021, an LEA will be flagged with significant discrepancy if the rate of suspension/expulsion for students with disabilities in the racial/ethnic category of analysis is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.08%.

The calculation is performed separately for each race/ethnicity.

An example of the formula for FFY2021 using the Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity is as follows:

Calculate the suspension/expulsion rate for SWD of Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity.

$((\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the LEA of Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity for SY 2020-2021} > 10 \text{ days}) / (\text{Total} \# \text{ of Hispanic/Latino SWDs in the LEA for SY 2020-2021})) * 100$

Next, calculate the state suspension/expulsion rate and establish the state suspension/expulsion-rate bar.

$((\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2020-2021} > 10) / (\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs in the state for SY 2020-2021})) * 100$

State-level SWD suspension/expulsion rate =  $(30 / 35,536) \times 100$

Application of data:

State-level SWD suspension/expulsion rate =  $30 / 35,536 \times 100 = 0.08\%$

The state suspension/expulsion-rate bar is  $0.08\% + \text{one percentage point} = 1.08\%$ .

Then compare the LEA suspension/expulsion rate for the Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity to the state suspension/expulsion-rate bar. If the LEA rate for Hispanic/Latino students with disabilities is equal to or greater than the state suspension/expulsion-rate bar, the LEA will be flagged as having a

significant discrepancy in long-term out-of-school suspension/expulsion for students with disabilities of Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity. No LEAs met the criteria for both cell and n-size based on data for the 2020-2021 school year. 61 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size of 30 students with disabilities in one or more racial/ethnic categories for students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA, and 0 LEAs met the minimum cell size of 5 instances of out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days by race/ethnicity. All 172 LEAs in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for Indicator 4B for FFY 2021.

As a result of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen a substantial decrease in the number of disciplinary instances, including the number of students reported as receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days. Only 19 LEAs in the state for the school year 2020-2021 reported issuing out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days for students with disabilities. The number of students per LEA receiving this form of disciplinary action ranged between one and three. The median number of students with disabilities receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days at the LEA level was one.

#### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Indicator 4B data for the FFY 2021 reporting year are from the 2020-2021 school year. Many of Idaho's local education agencies (LEAs) were in a hybrid format for at least a portion of the school year. The hybrid learning format was designed to improve social distancing and limit the spread of COVID-19. Schools were not in regular session and disciplinary actions for the 2020-2021 school year dropped further from the prior year. Idaho saw a reduction in the number of reported instances but did not note any impact on data validity, reliability, or completeness as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The ISDE, in collaboration with stakeholders, has endeavored to develop a more unified system to support equity. Indicators 4A and 4B now utilize the Self-Assessment for Discipline as part of the process to determine if the identification of significant discrepancy is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The ISDE developed the Self-Assessment Protocol for Discipline as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. Using the same tool for Indicator 4 and significant disproportionality improves alignment and reduces confusion for LEAs and stakeholders.

To mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) Division of Special Education immediately began developing resources, communication, and guidance for LEAs and families. The ISDE conducted webinars on an as-needed basis to address questions and concerns specific to IDEA Part B special education and related services during the COVID-19 pandemic. Information provided during the webinars addressed LEA questions, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, as well as Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) guidance. Representatives from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Idaho's Parent Center, and the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Division of Medicaid also presented as part of the webinar series.

ISDE and Idaho SESTA developed several resources for educators related to disciplinary action and behavioral intervention specific to students with disabilities. Training and documents are available to all levels, but many resources focus on new principals and superintendents. For additional information and to view resources related to disciplinary action, go to <https://idahotc.com/> and search for discipline. Behavior resources are available directly through the following link, <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Behavior?page13537=1&size13537=6>. For materials specific to principals, including the Discipline Flowchart, Manifest Determination Flowchart, and Student Removal Quick Guide go to ITC Principals Corner at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Principals-Corner?page13542=1&size13542=6>. Also available on the ITC are the Discipline Resources for Principals Module at [https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#/,](https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#/) The Educators Guide to Student Discipline and Supports at [https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/738,](https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/738) and Idaho Tiered Behavior Supports at <https://idahotc.com/itbs?page15083=1&size15083=6>. After receiving guidance from OSEP in the fall of 2022 related to discipline, the ISDE provided additional information to LEAs through webinars vetted through its legal counsel. The regionally offered Data Drill Down training also added new sections specific to disciplinary action. Data displays were available at the state and local levels for comparison. The displays showed the difference between counts of disciplinary actions of all students, students with disabilities, and the percentage that students with disabilities contributed to all students' disciplinary action. Data were aggregated by disciplinary action type and included in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and expulsions over the last three years of reporting. Before reviewing and discussing the disciplinary action data, LEA teams received an overview of the data collection source, the definition of each discipline type, and selected questions from the Discipline Self-Assessment Protocol. A majority of LEAs who returned action items at the close of each training indicated one or more action items related to disciplinary action.

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

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

#### **Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

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

Idaho did not identify any instances of significant discrepancy for FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data.

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

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

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 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported its definition of significant discrepancy and methodology for determining significant discrepancies as, "The formula for FFY2021 is as follows: ((# of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2020-2021 > 10 days)/(Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2020-2021))\*100 Total # of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2020-2021 > 10 days = 30 Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2020-2021 = 35,536 State-level suspension/expulsion rate = (30 / 35,536) x 100." It is unclear whether the State's methodology considers significant discrepancy by race and ethnicity, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

As noted in the FFY 2021 Part B SPP/APR General Instructions, the State's methodology for examining data must be reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities among LEAs in the State or compared to the rates for nondisabled children within those LEAs. The Part B SPP/APR General Instructions also noted that factors OSEP may consider when determining reasonableness of a State's methodology include whether none, or a very low percentage of, the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology, and whether statistically sound alternative methodologies exist or are being used by similarly-situated States. OSEP notes that the State included none of its LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported, "As a result of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen a substantial decrease in the number of disciplinary instances, including the number of students reported as receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days." Additionally OSEP notes that the State's chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States that use a rate ratio.

**4B- Required Actions**



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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

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

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the group discussions, numerous members requested further information on how SPP/APR targets will impact districts, charters, and student outcomes. Stakeholders also requested that the ISDE provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. Stakeholders also noted concern that listing specific targets for inclusive environments could result in teams establishing inclusion quotas. ISDE clarified that Idaho's training and guidance for the least restrictive environment (LRE) reflect that placement is based on the IEP team's decisions specific to the student's individual needs. In addition, ISDE supports compliance with IDEA requirements regarding placement through the annual General Supervision File Review process.

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

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

In the discussions, SEAP members expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. Overall for educational environments for student's age 5 enrolled in kindergarten through age 21, stakeholders advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding towards more challenging targets.

Stakeholders justified the recommendation indicating that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline will allow general and special education staff time to train and implement system changes. Another major reason stakeholders recommended maintaining targets near baseline was to encourage communication with families. Parents especially noted that their students experienced frequent changes in placement in the 2019-20 and 2021-22 school years. Additional changes without time to plan and communicate between LEAs and families would strain parent/family involvement in education.

The ISDE provides information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, ISDE also includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A draft of the template was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	34,568
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	22,538
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,130
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	310
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	23
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	35

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	22,538	34,568	63.75%	63.80%	65.20%	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	3,130	34,568	9.58%	9.55%	9.05%	Met 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]	368	34,568	1.11%	1.10%	1.06%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

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

Idaho includes Indicator 5 information as part of regional training for Data Drill Down, New and Experienced Federal Directors Meeting, and Director's Webinars to improve LEA understanding of data and appropriate environment coding. In the last year, ISDE emphasized proper coding of kindergarten age eligible students. The ISDE and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) have developed additional guidance and resources to help teams plan for students transitioning from preschool-grade level to kindergarten. Guidance and resources focused particularly on timelines, proper consideration of grade level coding, access to typically developing peers, and access to general education curriculum for kindergarten age eligible students. The ISDE also developed changes to validations within Idaho's statewide longitudinal data system, the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE), to address coding issues.

Idaho developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. For Indicator 5: Educational Environments (students age five enrolled in kindergarten through age 21) data, Idaho EdPlan uses information entered into the service grid and enrollment type. The system automatically generates the appropriate educational environment code once the user finalizes the service grid and enrollment sections. This process-based approach improves educational environment data quality by limiting user coding errors and ensuring the finalization of all necessary documentation.

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

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

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

**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 EDFacts file specification FS089.

### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .

### Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	35.40%	36.40%	37.40%	38.40%	12.56%
A	Data	28.73%	24.43%	25.35%	27.01%	12.56%
B	Target <=	46.30%	45.30%	44.30%	43.30%	71.04%
B	Data	51.25%	54.59%	53.18%	53.14%	71.04%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

In the spring and fall of 2020, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) discussed Indicator 6 for FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR submissions and data collection and reporting changes. The ISDE informed stakeholders it anticipated inclusion rates to decrease substantially as students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten shifted to school age reporting as part of EDFacts FS002 starting in FFY 2020. Idaho does not have a state-funded preschool program. As a result, students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten previously contributed substantially to Idaho's indicator 6a inclusion rate. As part of these discussions, stakeholders noted that while reducing percentages for indicator 6a, the change will more accurately reflect information and data on students age 3-5 enrolled in early childhood programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the discussions, members expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Stakeholders identified that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, such as staffing losses, shifting between virtual and in-person learning, and a lack of universal preschool. Also, Idaho's legislature refused to accept the Preschool Development funds applied for and received. For Indicator 6, stakeholders advocated for maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding towards conservative target increases. FFY 2020 was the first year of implementing the changes in collection for 618 reporting, which constituted a change in collection methodology. Based on the change in collection methodology and stakeholder input, the ISDE is established FFY 2020 data as the baseline for Indicator 6. For early childhood placement, stakeholders unanimously recommended that Idaho maintain targets near the baseline for multiple years and then proceed towards conservative increases for end-year targets. Idaho's lack of universal preschool and the state legislators' refusal to accept additional federal preschool funds was cited as major reasons for stakeholders recommending conservative targets. Group discussions noted that in Idaho, current inclusion issues are less about students with disabilities being placed in restrictive environments and more about finding and encouraging typically developing peers to attend available early childhood programs. Stakeholders are interested and encouraged by developments in the Idaho pyramid model collaborative and improved training regarding inclusion practices.

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

Since target setting, the ISDE has presented additional information to stakeholders regarding Idaho's progress toward the established state targets. Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A draft of the template was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December of 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

## Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

### Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/06/2022

\*\* indicates an area that has been suppressed to protect student identifiable counts of less than 5.

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	717	1,246	340	2,303
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	65	158	53	276
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	447	731	193	1,371
b2. Number of children attending separate school	**	**	**	294
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	**	**	**	**
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	**	**	**	**

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

NO

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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	276	2,303	12.56%	12.57%	11.98%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,665	2,303	71.04%	71.03%	72.30%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	**	2,303	**	NA	**	N/A	N/A

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

In the last three years, many childcare centers which provided more inclusive environments shut down or are now running at limited capacity due to the COVID-19 pandemic and staffing shortages. Idaho is now back to normal operations, but childcare facilities that shut down are not fiscally able to reopen. The IdahoSTARS Project received participation from nearly 500 owners and directors of childcare programs across the state in a survey conducted in November of 2022. Results posted in the Early Childhood Care and Workforce Report show that 41% of respondents indicated that there are no openings for any age ranges in their childcare facility(ies). Idaho already has limited options that offer inclusive early childhood environments. The lack of childcare openings means that even in these inclusive options, there is no availability to access typically developing peers. To view a copy of the report, access the following link: [https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport\\_2022.pdf](https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport_2022.pdf).

Idaho does not have a state-funded universal preschool program. LEAs are encouraged to develop inclusive programs through the use of Title I funds, collaborating with local Head Start and private preschool programs. Without support from state funding, many LEA programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in more students participating in less inclusive environments. The ISDE has made a concerted effort to provide training and clarification related to students who are kindergarten age eligible but may receive special education and related services in an early childhood classroom. These clarifications have impacted the overall count of students listed in early childhood environments and the shift in coding has had a minor impact on LRE percentages.

Idaho has seen substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff in the local education agencies. Short staffing, including limited numbers of substitute teachers, has reduced LEA team’s flexibility to attend professional development or training. LEAs have shown an increase in new hires certified through alternative authorizations to fill positions. Evidence collected through communication and training indicates that LEA teams need added training and resources related to how to approach discussions with families. Specifically how to discuss what settings the student is involved with beyond the educational setting at the LEA.

The ISDE Early Childhood Coordinator is working to establish monthly virtual training for new and returning early childhood staff to improve

understanding of early childhood topics, including but not limited to outcome ratings, least restrictive environment (LRE), and transition. ISDE plans to create new resources to establish knowledge checks as part of further training.

#### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

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

Historically, Idaho has struggled to improve inclusion for the early childhood age group. A substantial contributing factor is that Idaho does not have a state-funded universal preschool program. LEAs are encouraged to develop inclusive programs through the use of Title I funds, collaborating with local Head Start and private preschool programs. Without support from state funding, many LEA programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in higher numbers of students participating in less inclusive environments.

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

#### **Communication and Training:**

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

Idaho's 619 (Early Childhood) Coordinator facilitates LEA team training upon request. In response to feedback from locally facilitated training, the ISDE team developed additional disaggregations for early childhood LRE. All LEAs received a copy of the new disaggregations as part of the annual regionally offered Data Drill Down training. Since including early childhood data in the Data Drill Down, the ISDE has seen increased awareness and understanding of data. Data-related training incorporating early childhood information includes the Data Drill Down, New and Experienced Federal Directors meeting, and the Director's Webinars.

The ISDE partners with other state agencies to increase training, resources, and develop guidance documents related to inclusionary practices.

IdahoSTARS provides oversight and training to childcare providers across the State. Materials, including guidance documents and training, are shared with childcare providers and made available to the public on the IdahoSTARS Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS).

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

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

The ISDE Early Childhood Coordinator is working to establish monthly virtual training for new and returning early childhood staff to improve understanding of early childhood topics, including but not limited to outcome ratings, least restrictive environment (LRE), and transition. ISDE plans to create new resources to establish knowledge checks as part of further training.

#### **Data Quality:**

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. Idaho currently has 112 LEAs implementing the optional IEP software, with 18 more applying for the next implementation cohort.

For Indicator 6: Preschool Environments data, Idaho EDPlan routes users through the decision tree process to determine the student's educational environment. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate educational environment code based on responses to decision tree questions. The process-based approach improves data quality by ensuring that all necessary documentation is finalized and limits user coding errors. In the last year, ISDE and SESTA have added functionality to address documenting changes to LRE as students transition to Kindergarten.

## **6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **6 - OSEP Response**

## **6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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



## 7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

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

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

In preparation for the target and baseline reset, communication and training with stakeholders began early in the spring of 2020 and included discussions regarding the proposed FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package. The soft-closure of Idaho schools beginning March 17, 2020, due to the COVID-19 crisis, which shifted students to remote learning substantially impacted outcomes for early childhood students and LEA team's ability to conduct face-to-face assessments. Idaho's results in all outcome measures dropped dramatically. Throughout the Fall of 2020, ISDE presented data and information and held discussions with stakeholders regarding the Indicator 7 target and baseline reset. Discussions carefully considered the potential consequence of resetting targets based on COVID-19 impacted data. Stakeholder groups discussed options, including delaying target resetting until FFY 2020 and establishing targets as part of the new SPP/APR package. Stakeholder groups independently determined that resetting the baseline and

target for FFY 2019 was the most appropriate action, citing that the targets established in 2013 were not relevant to current collection processes, targets were unattainable based on existing data, and that COVID-19 would have a residual impact on ECO results. In accordance with stakeholder feedback, Idaho established the baseline and target for Indicator 7 utilizing FFY 2019 data. OSEP did not accept these targets based on COVID-19 impact, and Idaho began reexamining data with stakeholders in the spring of 2021. The ISDE recommended using FFY 2018 or FFY 2020 data as a baseline as data were collected through normal processes through the current tool.

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

Idaho developed stakeholder information packets for all performance indicators for review in November. The packet was sent to SEAP members ahead of time and discussed as part of the regular meeting. Members were grouped based on areas of interest and participated in discussions regarding indicators. Each group had an SDE staff member who provided additional information on the indicators, clarified questions, and functioned as the discussion facilitator. Each member participated in two sessions and provided feedback and a summary after completing group session discussions. Stakeholders unanimously agreed that Idaho should pursue conservative targets for Indicator 7 with a yearly percentage point increase of 0.2. Idaho's lack of universal preschool was noted as a significant obstacle to making large gains in early childhood outcomes. Members noted that the impacts from COVID-19 would be long-lasting. For these reasons, stakeholders supported the use of the most recent year's data from FFY 2020 for baseline. Since target setting, the ISDE has presented additional information to stakeholders regarding Idaho's progress toward the established state targets. Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, will be broken up by sub-indicator so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. A draft of the template was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

1,046

**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	35	3.35%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	273	26.10%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	272	26.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	245	23.42%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	221	21.13%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	517	825	70.12%	70.32%	62.67%	Did not meet target	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>	466	1,046	48.76%	48.96%	44.55%	Did not meet target	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	18	1.72%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	370	35.37%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	522	49.90%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	119	11.38%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	17	1.63%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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: <math>(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</math></i>	641	1,029	69.49%	69.69%	62.29%	Did not meet target	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: <math>(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</math></i>	136	1,046	16.14%	16.34%	13.00%	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	25	2.39%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	282	26.96%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	209	19.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	256	24.47%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	274	26.20%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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: <math>(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</math></i>	465	772	65.60%	65.80%	60.23%	Did not meet target	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: <math>(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</math></i>	530	1,046	55.76%	55.96%	50.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>Studies show that students with disabilities show the most growth when they have access to typically developing peers. In the last three years, many childcare centers which provided more inclusive environments shut down or are now running at limited capacity due to the COVID-19 pandemic and staffing shortages. Idaho is now back to normal operations, but childcare facilities that shut down are not fiscally able to reopen. The IdahoSTARS Project received participation from nearly 500 owners and directors of childcare programs across the state in a survey conducted in November of 2022. Results posted in the Early Childhood Care and Workforce Report show that 41% of respondents indicated that there are no openings for any age ranges in their childcare facilities). Idaho already has limited options that offer inclusive early childhood environments. The lack of childcare openings means that even in these inclusive options, there is no availability to access typically developing peers. To view a copy of the report, access the following link: <a href="https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport_2022.pdf">https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport_2022.pdf</a>.</p> <p>Idaho does not have a state-funded universal preschool program. LEAs are encouraged to develop inclusive programs through the use of Title I funds, collaborating with local Head Start and private preschool programs. Without support from state funding, many LEA programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in more students participating in less inclusive environments.</p> <p>In the 2021-2022 school year, several LEAs and school buildings experienced intermittent short-term closures during the school year. The short-term closures resulted from widespread staff and student illness, including multi-variants of COVID-19 and influenza, which negatively impacted student progress. With the return to regular face-to-face operations, Idaho has seen students return to public school after families declined services in a prior school year in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The resulting long-term break in services impacted student progress.</p> <p>Idaho has seen substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff in the local education agencies. Short staffing, including limited numbers of substitute teachers, has reduced LEA team's flexibility to attend professional development or training. LEAs have also shown an increase in new hires certified through alternative authorizations to fill open positions. Idaho's Higher Education Consortium has prioritized the workforce gap to address shortages.</p> <p>The ISDE Early Childhood Coordinator is working to establish monthly virtual training for new and returning early childhood staff to improve understanding of early childhood topics, including but not limited to outcome ratings, least restrictive environment (LRE), and transition. ISDE plans to create new resources to establish knowledge checks as part of further training.</p>
A2	See the "Reasons for slippage" statement for A1.
B1	See the "Reasons for slippage" statement for A1.
B2	See the "Reasons for slippage" statement for A1.
C1	See the "Reasons for slippage" statement for A1.
C2	See the "Reasons for slippage" statement for A1.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

Early Childhood Outcome rating data and information are collected and incorporated into the Early Childhood IEP using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process. ISDE mandated that all IEP platforms fully integrate the update no later than FFY 2018. Once documented as part of the ECO/IEP, ECO entry ratings are then reported to the ISDE in the Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System. The ECO application establishes records for students based on demographic data reported to the statewide longitudinal data system. Using demographic and enrollment data helps guarantee that students are recorded under the correct LEA and eliminates records duplication. Upon student exit, LEA staff finalize the student record by submitting ECO exit and progress ratings. The system uses validations on entry and exit date fields to ensure that only students who have received special education and related services for at least six months are reported to the federal level. In addition to the Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. For Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcome data, Idaho EdPlan routes users through the Early Childhood Outcome Decision Tree for Summary Ratings process for each outcome area. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate rating based on the user's responses to decision tree questions. The process-based approach reduces the risk of recording errors and ensures that progress is tracked appropriately for exit ratings. Idaho currently has 112 LEAs implementing the optional IEP software with 18 more applying for the next implementation cohort.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Idaho does not show evidence that COVID-19 impacted the collection, validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 7 data for the FFY 2021 reporting year.

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

**Communication and Training:**

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

In October 2021, ISDE provided a third round of statewide training in using Visual Phonics intervention. Visual Phonics is an intervention to help preschool students improve their pre-literacy skills and specifically address Outcome 2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication). ISDE staff annually conduct the training in multiple sessions. Over the last three years, more than 300 Speech-Language Pathologists and special education teachers across the state participated. Currently, 12 trainers around the state have completed training and co-teaching.

An Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Process online training is available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse <https://idahotc.com/Resources/view/ID/959> with an Indicator 7 Guidance document. The training and guidance outline the Idaho ECO process, including updated state-approved anchor assessments, entrance and exit activities, data collection, and reporting requirements. In addition, an ECO module specific for speech-language pathologists was created and went live in February 2022.

ISDE team has fully integrated early childhood information into annual data training. By providing early childhood data at the same events as school-age data, ISDE increases awareness and understanding of data and appropriate environment coding for all age groups. Data-related training incorporating early childhood information included the Data Drill Down, the New and Experienced Federal Programs Directors meeting, and the Director's Webinars. ISDE partners with other agencies and resources to increase training and develop guidance documents related to inclusionary practices. IdahoSTARS provides oversight and training to childcare providers across the state. Materials, including guidance documents and training, are shared with childcare providers and made available to the public on the IdahoSTARS Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS).

Idaho continues to scale up Idaho's Pyramid Model Collaborative, a social and emotional program for early childhood settings. Idaho joined a national initiative to address inclusive policies and practices at the state, local program leadership, and early care and education environments levels. The State Department of Education, Idaho SESTA (Special Education Support & Technical Assistance), Idaho Head Start Collaborative Office, Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHC/University of Idaho), IdahoSTARS, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), and Boise State University are working together to improve early childhood outcomes and increase positive social-emotional competencies for all children. In the 2021-2022 school year, there were sixteen programs in the project, eight school districts, three Head Start programs, and five childcare early education programs.

Idaho's Pyramid Model follows the guidance from the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI), a federally-funded project established to disseminate the effective use of the Pyramid Model to support young children's social, emotional, and behavioral development through a variety of training and technical assistance activities. The Pyramid Model focuses on program leadership, creating internal coaching capacity, and building knowledge for teachers to support the development of social and emotional competencies in young children. The project provides technical assistance and professional development to teams, identified practitioner coaches, and instructional staff as part of the project. For a complete listing of outcomes from Idaho's Pyramid Model Collaborative, please see the final report on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse by accessing the following link <https://idahotc.com/Resources/File-View/ResourceID/1146/FileID/56595/Track/No>.

Data Quality:

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system. Idaho currently has 112 LEAs implementing the optional IEP software, with 18 more applying for the next implementation cohort. For Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcome data, Idaho EdPlan routes users through the Early Childhood Outcome Decision Tree for Summary Ratings process for each outcome area. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate rating based on the user's responses to decision tree questions. The process-based approach reduces the risk of recording errors and ensures that progress is tracked appropriately for exit ratings.

## **7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **7 - OSEP Response**

## **7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, 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 questions, processes, and targets for the Indicator 8 collection. SEAP membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, 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. Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the SEAP and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. Discussions beginning in September of 2020 included descriptions of the basic proposed changes, anticipated impacts for the state, and an overview of state historical data. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021. Changes to Indicator 8 in the new package were negligible as Idaho was already conducting representative analysis on multiple demographic areas and regional and LEA size-based comparisons.

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

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

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

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

Upon reviewing historical Indicator 8 Parent Involvement survey processes, data, and national comparisons, stakeholders recommended resetting the

baseline and targets. In the 2017-2018 school year, Idaho made a concerted effort to improve its response rate. The ISDE reviewed Indicator 8 processes from other states with input from Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), IDEA Data Center (IDC), and stakeholders. Idaho determined that providing the survey in more than one format could positively impact the response rate and improve families' access to the survey. The ISDE then coordinated with its vendor to provide the survey first in a web-based format and then a follow-up mail-out format. For the FFY 2017 collection year, the survey was also modified to a four-option Likert scale, removing the neutral option so that survey responses clearly illustrated agreement or disagreement of family engagement. Stakeholders also approved the inclusion of emoji icons to communicate response options further through visual cueing. ISDE also added a N/A option for questions focused on specific age groups per stakeholder request. At the time, these changes were considered nominal and deemed not to constitute a change to the collection methodology. The ISDE maintained the calculation of responses on a 100-point scale and made no changes to the participant selection process, LEA participation cycle, or survey questions. After reviewing subsequent data, the ISDE and stakeholders determined that changes to the FFY 2017 data collection resulted in increased response rates and substantially impacted the data trend. Updating the baseline to FFY 2017 captures the change in process and better aligns targets to current data. With stakeholder input, the ISDE selected FFY 2017 as the baseline year; the data was at 70.26%. Targets were established with a .25% percentage point increase every two years. Idaho surveys LEAs on a two-year rotation, so increasing targets every two years better aligns indicator results and targets, allowing both sample groups to be evaluated against the same objectives. A minimal increase was added between baseline and FFY 2020 to create a more orderly target progression.

The ISDE provided information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders quarterly. As part of the meetings, ISDE also includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	70.26%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	55.50%	55.75%	55.75%	56.00%	70.50%
Data	59.88%	70.26%	68.29%	71.74%	71.50%

#### Targets

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

#### FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
802	1,138	71.50%	70.75%	70.47%	Did not meet target	Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Throughout 2019-20 and 2020-21, per National Association of Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) communications, most states reported decreases in parent satisfaction and increases in the number of complaints related to special education. Idaho did not have this reaction from families of students with disabilities. Feedback from parent stakeholders during this period indicated support for education and a sense that everyone was doing their best. The school year 2021-2022 (FFY 2021) represented a return to normal face-to-face operations for Idaho's schools. Educators, families, and students experienced difficulties climatizing back to the traditional face-to-face format. Idaho's 618 data shows increased disciplinary action and dispute resolution complaints for the school year 2021-2022. These increases are interpreted as a decrease in successful collaboration between families and the local education system.

Idaho has seen substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff in the local education agencies. Short-staffing areas include teachers, paraprofessionals, related service providers, and even substitute teachers. These staffing issues have increased LEA staff members' stress and responsibilities and reduced their flexibility to attend professional development or training. LEAs have also shown an increase in new hires certified through alternative authorizations to hire for unfilled positions.

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

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

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

4,430

**Percentage of respondent parents**

25.69%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	26.00%	25.69%

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

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

The ISDE special education team is investigating potential options of merging with the ISDE parent engagement survey used as a non-academic indicator for the Idaho Consolidated State Plan. This parent survey is provided to all families annually and would improve access to participation. This option had previously been discussed and received positive feedback from stakeholders. Another area of consideration is oversampling of underrepresented populations to increase the likelihood of respondent information more accurately representing Idaho's students with disabilities demographics. Oversampling was presented as an option in national technical assistance calls to improve the representation of underrepresented populations.

During the 2021-2022 survey collection, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) received increased communications from survey participants verifying that the ISDE was the survey requestor. The ISDE hypothesizes that this is related to increased exposure to virtual phishing and a better understanding of cyber security. The ISDE continues to consult with stakeholders to identify better ways to distribute surveys and increase participation without increasing burdens on local education agencies.

**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.**

Idaho examined three criteria to determine nonresponse bias. The first criterion examined was the overall response rate. A high response rate limits the maximum nonresponse bias. Idaho's response rate is 25.69%, which is relatively high for surveys. The FFY 2021 response rate is similar to last year's response rate of 26.00%. Second, ISDE examined the representativeness of the responses. As described in the analysis for representativeness, ISDE found no significant differences by grade. Differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity. The results did not identify any significant differences in the positivity of the actual responses of parents by racial/ethnic subgroups. Third, ISDE compared the response of parents who responded early in the process to those who responded later in the process. This comparison targets the idea that parents who did not immediately respond and needed multiple prompts to respond are different in some meaningful way from those who respond immediately. These results showed no significant differences between parents who responded earlier and parents who responded later in the collection period. Based on the analysis of these three criteria, although the responses were not representative of the parents by race/ethnicity, the ISDE concludes that nonresponse bias was not an issue within Indicator 8 data with respect to student grade level or race/ethnicity.

Historically there has been a substantial number of undocumented immigrants within Idaho's Hispanic/Latino community. ISDE coordinators working with these populations through Title programs (Migrant and English Learner) note that the population is often reticent to respond to any communications from state or local agencies out of fear that the response may result in the deportation of a family member.

Improving response rates for Hispanic/Latino families will require support within these communities to foster trust. The Special Education team is coordinating with ISDE coordinators to contact local liaisons to encourage participation. The ISDE special education team is also investigating potential options of merging with the ISDE parent engagement survey used as a non-academic indicator for the Idaho Consolidated State Plan. This parent survey is provided to all families annually and would improve access to all families of students with disabilities. This option has been discussed with educational partners and received positive feedback. Another area of consideration is oversampling of underrepresented populations to increase the likelihood of respondent information more accurately representing Idaho's students with disabilities demographics. Oversampling was presented as an option in national technical assistance calls to improve the representativeness of response for underrepresented populations.

The ISDE's new administration has a strong emphasis on meaningful parent engagement. In addition to its other work to improve interactions with families, the Superintendent of Public Instruction is developing a new parent advisory group in addition to the already established Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP).

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

Based on the data analysis, no differences were found by grade level. For example, the SWD population consists of 6.50% of students in grade 12, and the respondents comprised 5.37% of students in grade 12. All grade level differences were within plus or minus three percentage points.

The ISDE identified two differences by race/ethnicity. The SWD population consists of 66.58% of parents of White students; but the respondents consist of 73.20% of parents of White students – a difference of 6.62 percentage points. Additionally, the SWD population consists of 26.26% of parents of Hispanic students; but the respondents consist of 22.26% of parents of Hispanic students – a difference of 4.00 percentage points. All other race/ethnicity categories were within the plus or minus three percentage point criteria.

Although parents of White students were over-represented in the response rate and parents of Hispanic students were under-represented, these parent subgroups did not have significantly different parent involvement percentages. Further, parents from a wide range of LEAs from across Idaho responded to the survey. Lastly, results are weighted by LEA to ensure that the parent survey results reflect the population of parents in terms of geographic distribution. The similarity in response between subgroups indicates that the survey is effectively measuring the overall parent involvement percentage despite the subgroup differences between the demographics of students with disabilities in the state and the parents that responded to the Indicator 8 Parent Involvement survey.



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

NO

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

It should be noted that historically there is a substantial number of undocumented immigrants within the Hispanic/Latino community in Idaho. ISDE coordinators working with these populations through Title programs (Migrant and English Learner) note that the population is often reticent to respond to any communications from state or local agencies out of fear that the response may result in the deportation of a family member.

Improving response rates for Hispanic/Latino families will require support within these communities to foster trust. The Special Education team is coordinating with ISDE coordinators to reach out to local liaisons to encourage participation. The ISDE special education team is investigating potential options of merging with the ISDE parent engagement survey used as a non-academic indicator for the Idaho Consolidated State Plan. This parent survey is pushed out through local-level correspondence and provided annually to all families. Including Indicator 8 collection within the parent engagement survey for all students was previously discussed and received positive feedback from educational partners. Parents and community members noted that combining the survey collections would reduce survey fatigue, improve the anonymity of responses, and increase access. Another area of consideration is oversampling of underrepresented populations to increase the likelihood of respondent information more accurately representing Idaho's students with disabilities demographics. Oversampling was presented as an option in national technical assistance calls to improve the representation of underrepresented populations. Before any final decisions, all options that may impact Idaho's current sampling plan will be thoroughly reviewed with educational partners, including its state advisory panel.

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

The metric used to determine representativeness is a +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group. Representativeness was analyzed for race/ethnicity, grade level, and geographic location.

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

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

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

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

To determine the percent of parents who report that schools facilitated parent involvement, a percent of the maximum score was calculated based on all 21 survey items. A percent of the maximum score of 66% is the minimum score required for a parent to report that the school facilitated his/her involvement. This rating indicates that, on average, the parent agreed with all items. After calculating the weighted rate, 70.48% of parents had a percent of the maximum score of 66% or above. For the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021-22 APR, based on responses to Idaho's Indicator 8 Parent Involvement survey, 70.48% of parents reported the school facilitated parent involvement.

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The ISDE does not show evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 8 data.

During the 2021-2022 survey collection, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) received increased communications from survey participants verifying that the ISDE was the survey requestor. The ISDE hypothesizes that this is related to increased exposure to virtual phishing and a better understanding of cyber security. The ISDE continues to consult with stakeholders to identify better ways to distribute surveys and increase participation without increasing burdens on local education agencies.

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

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

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

Last year, Idaho revised the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website to a more parent-friendly layout. Parents and families now have a dedicated tile with direct access to new and updated resources on behavior, dispute resolution, and the "What to Expect in Special Education" resource series. All of these resources focus on providing families with easy reference resources that are clear, concise, and allow families to access key pieces of information

quickly.

For more information or to view these resources, please access the following link: <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Parents?page14423=1&size14423=6> .

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

### Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Based on the data analysis, no differences were found by grade level. For example, the SWD population consists of 6.50% of students in grade 12, and the respondents comprised 5.37% of students in grade 12. All grade level differences were within plus or minus three percentage points.

The ISDE identified two differences by race/ethnicity. The SWD population consists of 66.58% of parents of White students; but the respondents consist of 73.20% of parents of White students – a difference of 6.62 percentage points. Additionally, the SWD population consists of 26.26% of parents of Hispanic students; but the respondents consist of 22.26% of parents of Hispanic students – a difference of 4.00 percentage points. All other race/ethnicity categories were within the plus or minus three percentage point criteria.

Although parents of White students were over-represented in the response rate and parents of Hispanic students were under-represented, these parent subgroups did not have significantly different parent involvement percentages. Further, parents from a wide range of LEAs from across Idaho responded to the survey. Lastly, results are weighted by LEA to ensure that the parent survey results reflect the population of parents in terms of geographic distribution. The similarity in response between subgroups indicates that the survey is effectively measuring the overall parent involvement percentage despite the subgroup differences between the demographics of students with disabilities in the state and the parents that responded to the Indicator 8 Parent Involvement survey.

It should be noted that historically there is a substantial number of undocumented immigrants within the Hispanic/Latino community in Idaho. ISDE coordinators working with these populations through Title programs (Migrant and English Learner) note that the population is often reticent to respond to any communications from state or local agencies out of fear that the response may result in the deportation of a family member.

Improving response rates for Hispanic/Latino families will require support within these communities to foster trust. The Special Education team is coordinating with ISDE coordinators to reach out to local liaisons to encourage participation. The ISDE special education team is investigating potential options of merging with the ISDE parent engagement survey used as a non-academic indicator for the Idaho Consolidated State Plan. This parent survey is pushed out through local-level correspondence and provided annually to all families. Including Indicator 8 collection within the parent engagement survey for all students was previously discussed and received positive feedback from educational partners. Parents and community members noted that combining the survey collections would reduce survey fatigue, improve the anonymity of responses, and increase access. Another area of consideration is oversampling of underrepresented populations to increase the likelihood of respondent information more accurately representing Idaho's students with disabilities demographics. Oversampling was presented as an option in national technical assistance calls to improve the representation of underrepresented populations. Before any final decisions, all options that may impact Idaho's current sampling plan will be thoroughly reviewed with educational partners, including its state advisory panel.

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. However, in its narrative, the State reported, "The SWD population consists of 66.58% of parents of White students; but the respondents consist of 73.20% of parents of White students – a difference of 6.62%. Additionally, the SWD population consists of 26.26% of parents of Hispanic students; but the respondents consist of 22.26% of parents of Hispanic students – a difference of 4.00%." Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

The State submitted a sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR. OSEP identified concerns in its evaluation of the sampling plan that indicated it may not yield valid and reliable data for this indicator. The State has not yet responded to OSEP's concerns. The State must submit by June 1, 2023 its revised sampling plan that the State plans to use for its FFY 2023 data collection and indicate how the revised plan addresses the concerns identified in OSEP's evaluation.

## 8 - Required Actions

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

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

#### FFY 2021 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.

18

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	162	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.

Risk ratio = DLR/DLRC

Alternate risk ratio = DLR/SLRC

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

The calculation for disproportionate representation uses the following criteria:

Cell size = 10

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 2

Threshold = 3

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

The number of LEAs analyzed for FFY 2021 was 162 (those meeting minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30 for at least one category of analysis).

Analysis of data showed zero instances of disproportionate representation.

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

By applying the risk and alternate risk ratio formula to LEA-level data, the ISDE identifies LEAs with a ratio equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, for two consecutive years in the same category of analysis as having disproportionate representation. Based on this analysis, no LEAs were flagged as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services for FFY 2021.

No LEAs were flagged as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services for FFY 2021.

When an LEA is flagged for disproportionate representation, the LEA must complete the Self-Assessment for Identification. The LEA must review policies, practices, and procedures related to referral as part of the self-assessment. The ISDE also selects student eligibility files to review. LEA responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by ISDE staff to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, the ISDE looks for a preponderance of evidence based on data collected to support eligibility for special education. The ISDE also verifies if the LEA has adequately addressed exclusionary factors. From this information, the ISDE determines whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification and, if it is, makes a finding of noncompliance regarding the appropriateness of the LEA's identification policies, practices, and procedures. No LEAs were identified as having a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services for FFY 2021.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

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

ISDE uses the Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification as part of the process to determine if disproportionate representation results from inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification was developed as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. Using the same tool for Indicators 9, 10, and significant disproportionality improves alignment and reduces confusion for LEAs and stakeholders. The self-assessment protocol works in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate the development and implementation of improvement plans. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

Idaho continues to develop evidence-based training to support LEAs and families through identification processes, including creating online training modules, quick guides, and guidance documents. Last year, Idaho revised the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website, which houses resources and training related to special education. A new topic page was created for Comprehensive Evaluation. The topic page provides quick access to resources, including information on referral, consent and evaluation, eligibility, reevaluation, etc. To view the Comprehensive Evaluation topic page, access the following link: <https://idahotc.com/Comprehensive-Evaluation?page14266=1&size14266=6>.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

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 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response****9 - Required Actions**

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for 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, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

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

**FFY 2021 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.**

59

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
4	0	121	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.

Risk ratio = DLR/DLRC

Alternate risk ratio = DLR/SLRC

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

The calculation for disproportionate representation uses the following criteria:

Cell size = 10

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 2

Threshold = 3

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

The number of LEAs analyzed for FFY 2021 was 121 (those meeting minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30 for at least one category of analysis).

Analysis of data flagged four LEAs for disproportionate representation.

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

By applying the risk and alternate risk ratio formula to LEA-level data, the ISDE flags LEAs with a ratio equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, for two consecutive years in the same category of analysis as having disproportionate representation. Four LEAs were flagged for the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories for FFY 2021.

LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation must complete the Self-Assessment for Identification and are required to review policies, practices, and procedures related to referral as part of the self-assessment. The ISDE also selects student eligibility files to review. LEA responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by ISDE staff to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, the ISDE looks for a preponderance of evidence based on data collected to support eligibility for special education. The ISDE also verifies if the LEA has adequately addressed exclusionary factors. From this information, the ISDE determines whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification and, if it is, makes a finding of noncompliance regarding the appropriateness of the LEA's identification policies, practices, and procedures.

Based on a review of policies, practices, procedures, and student files, the ISDE determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was not the result of inappropriate identification. All LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation by racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories demonstrated compliance with the IDEA.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The four LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation by racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories have also been identified as part of Idaho's significant disproportionality work. Two were identified as At-Risk Year 2, meaning the LEA has demonstrated two consecutive years of exceeding the state's threshold. These LEAs have conducted internal reviews and provided a copy of the completed Self-Assessment for Identification to the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE). These teams have also independently reached out for technical assistance, support, and training with ISDE and Idaho SESTA to address the factors that may contribute to disproportionate representation. The other two LEAs are currently identified as having significant disproportionality. LEAs have completed the Self-Assessment for Identification and are currently working to address issues of

disproportionality through a Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervention Plan. The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 10 data. ISDE uses the Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification as part of the process to determine if disproportionate representation results from inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Identification was developed as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. Using the same tool for Indicators 9, 10, and significant disproportionality improves alignment and reduces confusion for LEAs and stakeholders. The self-assessment protocol works in combination with SMART Goals to facilitate the development and implementation of improvement plans. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. ISDE staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process. Idaho continues to develop evidence-based training to support LEAs and families through identification processes, including creating online training modules, quick guides, and guidance documents. Last year, Idaho revised the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website, which houses resources and training related to special education. A new topic page was created for Comprehensive Evaluation. The topic page provides quick access to resources, including information on referral, consent and evaluation, eligibility, reevaluation, etc. To view the Comprehensive Evaluation topic page, access the following link: <https://idahotc.com/Comprehensive-Evaluation?page14266=1&size14266=6>. Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules from referral through eligibility determination. Ensuring LEA teams meet compliance requirements for evaluation and finalize all necessary documentation.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

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 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	91.40%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.60%	99.14%	98.36%	98.58%	97.98%

### Targets

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

### FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
6,837	6,643	97.98%	100%	97.16%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

194

**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.**

The need for additional assessments was listed as the primary reason for delay for ten instances where the initial eligibility determination exceeded 60 calendar days from receipt of signed parental consent. Delays in the initial eligibility determination primarily due to the need for additional assessments ranged between 9 and 145 days beyond 60 calendar days with a median of 45.5 days.

Scheduling difficulties were listed as the primary reason for delay for sixty-six instances where the initial eligibility determination exceeded 60 calendar days from receipt of signed parental consent. Delays in the initial eligibility determination primarily due to scheduling difficulties ranged between 1- 206 days beyond 60 calendar days with a median of 14.5 days.

Inaccurate calendaring was a primary reason for delay for ninety-nine instances. Seventy-nine of those indicated a direct relationship to inaccurate application of the state's exception rule. Initial eligibility determination that exceeded 60 calendar days with a primary reason for delay of an inaccurate calendaring ranged between 1-497 days beyond 60 calendar days with a median of 24 days.

Staffing issues were listed as the primary reason for delay for eighteen instances where the initial eligibility determination exceeded 60 calendar days from receipt of signed parental consent. Delays in the initial eligibility determination primarily due to staffing issues ranged between 1 -261 days with a median of 26.5 days.

The transfer of records between buildings was listed as the primary reason for delay for one and was delayed by 192 days.

Delays and count of days listed above reflect the total number of days beyond 60 calendar days from the date that signed parental consent for initial assessment to the initial date of determination of eligibility for special education and related services. Periods when regular school was not in session for five (5) or more consecutive school days (see Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03), were not factored into the ranges of days listed above. The ISDE is seeking additional information on initial eligibility determinations made 61 days or more beyond the 60-day timeline.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03 states;

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID-19 has had a direct impact on Indicator 11. Idaho has identified a major staffing shortage of school psychologists, which the COVID-19 health crisis has further exacerbated. The ISDE is coordinating with national resources to encourage certified individuals from around the nation to come to Idaho. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho has seen substantial turnover and increases in the number of unfilled positions at all levels. These shortages result in a reduction of resources necessary to complete evaluations in a timely manner, reduced communication between program and data recording staff, and a reduced understanding of appropriate data and reporting for the indicator. The ISDE recognizes there is a need for further training regarding timelines. The staffing shortages have reduced LEA teams' ability to secure time for professional development. To address needs for training without pulling staff away from the LEA, the ISDE and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) have developed online training modules, quick guides, and short informative videos. The most recent quick guide released provides information on calculating the 60-day timeline and the correct application of the state exception rule. The guide also clarifies how Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03 which specifies five consecutive school days impacts local education agencies that operate on a 4 day school week.

During the 2021-2022 school year many of Idaho's LEAs experienced one or more short term closures as a result of wide spread communicable disease. Illness related closures had a negative effect on initial eligibility timelines impacting staffing resources and access to students for observations and assessments.

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

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

Idaho has modernized the notification of potentially eligible students from Part C to Part B to a nightly automated notification. As part of this modernization, the ISDE also developed an application that allows LEAs to view and provide tracking for the full list of potentially eligible students. The modernizations for improved tracking of students referred as potentially eligible, enhanced communication between Part C and Part B through automated nightly uploads from ITP, and an interface with the state's longitudinal data system data to reduce duplication of effort. Idaho released the notification automation and ISDE application in October of 2022. As initial eligibility counts reflected in Indicator 12 also show up as part of Indicator 11, the release of these updates is being considered a change in collection methodology for both Indicator 11 and Indicator 12 for data collected in the school year 2022-2023 (FFY 2022).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
57	57	0	0

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure that the fifty-seven LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The ISDE reviewed updated Child Find 60-day timeline data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the ISDE identified noncompliance in FFY 2020. As a result of this subsequent review of updated data, the ISDE determined that all fifty-seven LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to the noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely identification for special education and related services. ISDE and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed. All fifty-seven LEAs have verified the correction of noncompliance in a timely manner. The ISDE confirmed the correction of noncompliance for all fifty-seven LEAs, and each passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the ISDE's review of subsequent updated data, the ISDE verified that all fifty-seven LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for Indicator 11 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

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

The ISDE verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the fifty-seven LEAs had completed all 138 initial eligibility evaluations. The ISDE investigated all instances of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 at the student level. The ISDE verified that all students had an evaluation, although late, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

To ensure that the fifty-seven LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The ISDE reviewed updated Child Find 60-day timeline data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the ISDE identified noncompliance in FFY 2020. As a result of this subsequent review of updated data, the ISDE determined that all fifty-seven LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to the noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely identification for special education and related services. ISDE and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed. All fifty-seven LEAs have verified the correction of noncompliance in a timely manner. The ISDE confirmed the correction of noncompliance for all fifty-seven LEAs, and each passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the ISDE's review of subsequent updated data, the ISDE verified that all fifty-seven LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for Indicator 11 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner. The ISDE verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the fifty-seven LEAs had completed all 138 initial eligibility evaluations. The ISDE investigated all instances of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 at the student level. The ISDE verified that all students had an evaluation, although late, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

**11 - OSEP Response**

**11 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	59.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.38%	99.82%	98.95%	96.95%	99.24%

#### Targets

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

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Category of analysis	Count
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	966

Category of analysis	Count
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	26
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	299
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.	602
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	5
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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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.	299	333	99.24%	100%	89.79%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Idaho has seen substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff and data stewards in the local education agencies. Turnover and shortages result in a reduction of resources necessary to complete evaluations in a timely manner, reduced communication between program and data recording staff, and a reduced understanding of appropriate data and reporting for the indicator. Short staffing, including limited numbers of substitute teachers, has reduced LEA team's flexibility to attend professional development or training. LEAs have also shown an increase in new hires certified through alternative authorizations to fill open positions. Idaho's Higher Education Consortium has prioritized the workforce gap to address shortages. The ISDE Early Childhood Coordinator is working to establish monthly virtual training for new and returning early childhood staff to improve understanding of early childhood topics, including but not limited to outcome ratings, least restrictive environment (LRE), and transition. ISDE plans to create new resources to establish knowledge checks as part of further training. The ISDE is collaborating with the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education (IOSBE) to improve data entry training and resources related to early childhood transition.

**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**  
34

**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.**

Data and reporting attribute the primary reason for the delay in the early childhood timeline for thirty-two instances as a lack of understanding of the early childhood transition timeline. Data from twenty-three of these instances indicate that teams better understand the requirement that initial eligibility must be determined by the student's third birthdate but need to accurately consider the date of the individualized education program as part of the timeline. In one of these instances, the state exception rule was listed as the primary reason for the delay. The state exception rule only applies to the timeline between receipt of signed parental consent for initial assessment and determination of initial eligibility. The range in days beyond the third birthday was 1-36 days, with a median of four days. The need for additional assessments was the primary reason for the delay in the early childhood timeline for one instance, which exceeded the timeline by twelve days. Scheduling difficulties were listed as the primary reason for the delay in the early childhood timeline for one instance, which exceeded the timeline by sixteen 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 ISDE collects Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition data through the statewide longitudinal data system Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE). After the school year's final data upload, a report is pulled from ISEE, representing all early childhood transitions for the year. Idaho does not have an automated system notifying Part B providers of potentially eligible early childhood children transitioning from Part C. A manual notification occurs between Part C and Part B providers, which notifies LEAs concerning potentially eligible students. The ISDE is copied on all notifications and receives an annual report of all students referred as potentially eligible. The ISDE then provides the annual information from Part C back to the LEAs to facilitate tracking of potentially eligible students. The ISDE added dropdown options into ISEE to allow LEAs to report students who previously did not meet the requirements for reporting in ISEE. Example: Part C refers a student to a Part B provider as potentially eligible. The family indicated an interest in proceeding through early childhood transition but then did not provide consent for the LEA to assess the student. The LEA may document this on the annual tracking report or as part of ISEE reporting. The ISEE Early Childhood Transition report and annual tracking, returned from LEAs, are then cross-verified to ensure that Part B providers account for all Part C potentially eligible students.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The COVID-19 pandemic has directly impacted Indicator 12. Idaho has seen an increase in the number of families that have elected to hold off on pursuing initial eligibility for Part B special education and related services due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, Idaho continues to have a major staffing shortage for school psychologists, which the COVID-19 pandemic has further exacerbated. The ISDE is coordinating with national resources to encourage certified individuals from around the nation to come to Idaho. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, Idaho has seen substantial

turnover and increases in the number of unfilled positions at all levels (special education teachers, administrators, consulting teachers, substitute teachers, related service providers, paraprofessionals, etc.). These shortages result in reduced resources necessary to complete evaluations in a timely manner, reduced communication between program and data recording staff, and a reduced understanding of appropriate data and reporting for the indicator. The staffing shortages have also reduced LEA teams' ability to secure time for training and professional development. The ISDE provided training in Director's Webinars clarifying Early Childhood Transition and Child Find timelines. The ISDE Early Childhood Coordinator is working to establish monthly virtual training for new and returning early childhood staff to improve understanding of early childhood topics, including but not limited to outcome ratings, least restrictive environment (LRE), and early childhood transition. ISDE plans to create new resources to establish knowledge checks as part of further training. The ISDE is also collaborating with the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education (IOSBE) to improve data entry training and resources related to early childhood transition.

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

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

Idaho has modernized the notification of potentially eligible students from Part C to Part B to a nightly automated notification. As part of this modernization, the ISDE also developed an application that allows LEAs to view and provide tracking for the full list of potentially eligible students. The enhancement allows for improved tracking of students referred as potentially eligible, enhanced communication between Part C and Part B through automated nightly uploads from ITP, and an interface with the state's longitudinal data system data to reduce duplication. Idaho released the notification automation and ISDE application in October of 2022. As initial eligibility counts reflected in Indicator 12 also show up as part of Indicator 11 the release of these updates is being considered a change in collection methodology for both Indicator 11 and Indicator 12 for data collected in school year 2022-2023 (FFY 2022).

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

#### FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

To ensure that the three LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The ISDE reviewed updated Early Childhood Transition data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the ISDE identified noncompliance in FFY 2020. As a result of this review of updated data, each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely transition from Part C to Part B. The ISDE and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed.

The ISDE confirmed correction of noncompliance passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the ISDE's review of subsequent updated data, the ISDE determined that all three LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for Indicator 12 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

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

The ISDE verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the three LEAs had completed all three early childhood transitions. The ISDE investigated all instances of noncompliance in FFY 2020 at the student level. The ISDE verified that all eligible students had an evaluation and IEP developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement, although late, and were either receiving special education and related services or had exited. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

To ensure that the three LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the ISDE conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The ISDE reviewed updated Early Childhood Transition data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the ISDE identified noncompliance in FFY 2020. As a result of this review of updated data, each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely transition from Part C to Part B. The ISDE and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed.

The ISDE confirmed correction of noncompliance passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the ISDE's review of subsequent updated data, the ISDE determined that all three LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for Indicator 12 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

The ISDE verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the three LEAs had completed all three early childhood transitions. The ISDE investigated all instances of noncompliance in FFY 2020 at the student level. The ISDE verified that all eligible students had an evaluation and IEP developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement, although late, and were either receiving special education and related services or had exited. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

**12 - OSEP Response**

**12 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	95.35%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	90.30%	98.62%	95.80%	90.48%	95.35%

### Targets

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

### FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
149	161	95.35%	100%	92.55%	Did not meet target	Slippage



**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Idaho has seen substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff in the local education agencies. Short staffing, including limited numbers of substitute teachers, has reduced LEA team’s flexibility to attend professional development or training. LEAs have shown an increase in new hires certified through alternative authorizations to fill positions.

IEPs reviewed for FFY 2021 data collection represented a time frame with reduced access to community-based employment and training opportunities due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The ISDE Secondary Transition Coordinator, to address training needs, now maintains a secondary transition staff list and conducts monthly recorded webinars on secondary transition, program exit, and other secondary special education topics to improve access to training. By maintaining communication and providing directed webinars at the teacher and provider level, the ISDE is working to make sure that training reaches the necessary individuals. For more information on Idaho’s secondary transition training offerings, please see the Secondary Transition section within the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/ST?page13547=1&size13547=6>).

As part of the General Supervision File Review (GSFR) process, LEAs may provide copies of existing documentation missing from the initial review to address areas of concern identified during the desk review. The ISDE has seen a reduction in the number of existing documents provided for secondary transition items. The ISDE is conducting further analysis to understand better if there is an increasing level of non-compliance or if fewer LEAs are providing additional existing materials based on noted areas of concern.

**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 data are collected as part of state monitoring in a process called General Supervision File Review (GSFR). All local education agencies (LEAs) with one or more secondary students are reviewed annually for Indicator 13 Secondary Transition requirements. Idaho’s GSFR is completed in a virtual layout. As a result, the COVID-19 did not impact the validity or reliability of the data collection. To complete GSFR, LEAs conducted an internal file review and provided the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) with an assurance of the review. Each LEA then provided a list of the students who underwent the internal review in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT) application and the Idaho State Department of Education selected files for review. The required sample is based on child count and represents a broad representation of the students served by the LEA, including a range of disability categories, environments, etc. ISDE staff then select one or more student files for review. The LEA provides self-review results, uploads all required materials to the CTT application, or grants access to student files through the optional statewide IEP software.

Before the 2020-2021 school year (FFY 2020), LEA teams had the authority to self-select files for GSFR. In FFY 2020, the ISDE established the change in process from self-selection to ISDE selection to improve internal review processes and compliance with IDEA. The 2021-2022 school year (FFY 2021) represents the second year of implementation of the change to collection processes.

For the 2021-2022 GSFR process, all LEAs with one or more secondary students, per the ISDE selection process, provided a minimum of one secondary file for review. Small groups of ISDE staff and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance SESTA staff conducted a desk review of all individual student files and documents submitted by LEAs. ISDE and SESTA staff entered data gathered during the desk review into the CTT student-by-student. LEAs were informed of desk review results and provided an opportunity to address any areas of concern resulting from an incomplete submission of review materials.

Areas of concern not addressed by providing existing documentation, missing from the initial review, received a final evaluation by ISDE staff. The final review determined if the area of concern constituted noncompliance.

All LEAs identified with noncompliance in Indicator 13 Secondary Transition received written notification of noncompliance on February 14-15, 2022.

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Data for Indicator 13 - Secondary Transition is collected as part of state monitoring in a process called General Supervision File Review (GSFR). Idaho’s GSFR is completed in a virtual layout. As a result, the COVID-19 pandemic did not impact the validity or reliability of data collection. Idaho does not specify an age younger than 16 that local education agencies must meet these requirements. Idaho rules establish that the IEP in effect when the student turns age 16 must meet these requirements. LEA teams may elect to include secondary transition elements prior to age 16 and include them for review as part of the State’s monitoring. All files submitted for secondary transition review as part of the State’s monitoring are included as part of the indicator and held to these requirements. For a full list of GSFR processes, see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse RDA Monitoring System page at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6> and select GSFR (General Supervision File Review).

IEPs reviewed for FFY 2021 data collection represented a time frame with reduced access to community-based employment and training opportunities due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

The Secondary Transition Coordinator participates as part of the annual data training, Data Drill Down, by providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data and indicators. The ISDE Secondary Transition Coordinator also hosts monthly webinars on secondary transition topics for secondary transition staff.

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

Joint ISDE and IDVR administrator training have resulted in LEA/IDVR funding partnerships to provide dedicated school-to-work counselors who are full-time or shared between smaller LEAs. LEAs engaged in these shared resource have begun to show an increase in their students connecting to pre-employment activities offered by IDVR.

In the last year, the ISDE and IDVR conducted two Transition surveys to gain additional information about the differences between the services accessed and what educators and counselors list as being available. One survey was sent to parents and families to learn what secondary transition

services they know of and are accessing. The second was issued to educators and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors to identify the type and availability of secondary transition services for students ages 15-21 with disabilities in Idaho. Idaho continues to analyze results to determine if there are regions with lower access to secondary transition services or if improved messaging is needed to inform families of available services. The Secondary Transition Coordinator has partnered with other state agencies to provide training and information to parents and LEAs about the availability of local resources and benefits. Partnering agencies include the IDVR, Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL), and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW). Communication with parents frequently illuminates a concern that the employment of the exited student with disabilities will result in a loss of benefits and services. There is a need to keep families and secondary transition students informed, so the IDHW is making a concerted effort to provide training regarding benefits in multiple formats to address various learning types and accessibility needs.

In November of 2021, the Transition Institute was provided in both face-to-face and virtual format to facilitate health and safety recommendations from the CDC. The Transition Institute hosted in the fall of 2022 returned to a face-to-face-only format which better encourages involvement in the institute. Lead state partner agencies included the IDVR, IDOL, ICDD, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ICBVI), and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL). The 2022 Transition Institute linked 54 LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. A total of 275 individuals participated in the institute representing staff from LEAs, IDVR, ICBVI, Career Technical Education (CTE), colleges and universities, and IPUL. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. As a result of activities initiated at the Transition Institute, 41 of the participating LEAs have developed annual District Action Plans to improve transition at the local level. District Action Plans were turned in to the ISDE for follow-up activities. Idaho intends to continue the Transition Institute and expects growth for students with disabilities in future Secondary Transition and Post School Outcomes data.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	4	2	0

#### FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Six local education agencies (LEAs) received notification of noncompliance related to six students. LEAs identified with compliance issue(s) were required to develop improvement activities documenting the LEA's plans to address underlying factors contributing to noncompliance. Once an LEA completed its improvement activities, they were required to demonstrate completion through assurances and documentation to ensure that the LEA correctly implemented the regulatory requirements. Four of the six LEAs showed completion of these activities in a timely manner, 365 days or less, through assurances and documentation. Two LEAs exceeded the 365-day timeline for correction but have subsequently verified the correction of noncompliance.

All improvement activities and documentation were recorded in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). LEAs were also required to submit additional student files subsequent to the notification of noncompliance, to demonstrate 100% compliance at the systems level and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. ISDE and Idaho SESTA reviewed improvement activities and implementation documentation to ensure the activities addressed contributing factors to the item(s) of noncompliance. ISDE verified that subsequent information provided through additional student files showed 100% compliance, indicating that the six LEAs are implementing the regulatory requirements correctly. The review of additional files was tracked and documented in the CTT.

ISDE passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on ISDE's review of subsequent information, ISDE determined that all six of the LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for Indicator 13 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements.

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

The ISDE verified the correction of the six instances of noncompliance by reviewing individual student files. Four of the six instances of noncompliance were verified within 365 days of issuance of written notification of noncompliance. Two instances were subsequently verified beyond 365. LEAs submitted student files showing correction of noncompliance at the student level. The ISDE has verified that all student files where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2020 were corrected to 100% compliance. For a full list of GSFR processes, see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse RDA Monitoring System page at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6> and select GSFR (General Supervision File Review).

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2019	1	1	0
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

#### FFY 2019

##### Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The remaining item of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 was included as part of a systemic state complaint filed under the general supervisory authority of the SEA. The correction of noncompliance for Indicator 13 was incorporated as part of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for the LEA. All CAP activities and documentation directly associated with Indicator 13 noncompliance were recorded into the CTT. The LEA was also required to submit additional student files subsequent to the notification of noncompliance, to demonstrate 100% compliance and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. ISDE and Idaho SESTA reviewed the completion of activities and documentation of implementation in the CTT. ISDE verified that subsequent information provided through additional student files showed 100% compliance, indicating LEA has implemented the regulatory requirements correctly. The review of additional files was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

ISDE passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on ISDE's review of subsequent information, ISDE determined that the LEA has corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for Indicator 13 Secondary Transition and has correctly implemented the regulatory requirements.

The LEA continues to receive support in secondary transition as part of Targeted Technical Assistance provided through Idaho SESTA. For a full list of

GSFR processes, see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse RDA Monitoring System page at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6> and select GSFR (General Supervision File Review).

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

The ISDE verified the correction of the instance of noncompliance through the review of the individual student's file. The LEA submitted student file information showing the correction of noncompliance at the student level. The ISDE verified that the student file that had noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 had been corrected to 100% compliance.

### **13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Six local education agencies (LEAs) received notification of noncompliance related to six students. LEAs identified with compliance issue(s) were required to develop improvement activities documenting the LEA's plans to address underlying factors contributing to noncompliance. Once an LEA completed its improvement activities, they were required to demonstrate completion through assurances and documentation to ensure that the LEA correctly implemented the regulatory requirements. Four of the six LEAs showed completion of these activities in a timely manner, 365 days or less, through assurances and documentation. Two LEAs exceeded the 365-day timeline for correction but have subsequently verified the correction of noncompliance.

All improvement activities and documentation were recorded in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). LEAs were also required to submit additional student files subsequent to the notification of noncompliance, to demonstrate 100% compliance at the systems level and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. ISDE and Idaho SESTA reviewed improvement activities and implementation documentation to ensure the activities addressed contributing factors to the item(s) of noncompliance. ISDE verified that subsequent information provided through additional student files showed 100% compliance, indicating that the six LEAs are implementing the regulatory requirements correctly. The review of additional files was tracked and documented in the CTT.

ISDE passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on ISDE's review of subsequent information, ISDE determined that all six of the LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for Indicator 13 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements.

The ISDE verified the correction of the six instances of noncompliance by reviewing individual student files. Four of the six instances of noncompliance were verified within 365 days of issuance of written notification of noncompliance. Two instances were subsequently verified beyond 365. LEAs submitted student files showing correction of noncompliance at the student level. The ISDE has verified that all student files where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2020 were corrected to 100% compliance. For a full list of GSFR processes, see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse RDA Monitoring System page at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6> and select GSFR (General Supervision File Review).

### **13 - OSEP Response**

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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. OSEP is unable to determine the number of findings identified in FFY 2020 because in its narrative, the State reported "[b]ased on ISDE's review of subsequent information, ISDE determined that all but two LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for Indicator 13 within 365 days and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements. The remaining two LEAs are still within the 365-day correction period."

### **13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education =  $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$ .
- 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 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

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

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

#### II. Data Reporting

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

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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

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

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	23.50%	24.00%	24.50%	25.00%	15.75%
A	15.75%	Data	16.93%	17.58%	21.41%	20.41%	15.75%
B	2020	Target >=	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	58.87%
B	58.87%	Data	38.19%	50.59%	55.31%	55.72%	58.87%
C	2020	Target >=	78.50%	79.00%	79.50%	80.00%	74.50%
C	74.50%	Data	59.45%	67.22%	69.38%	71.89%	74.50%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	15.85%	15.95%	16.05%	16.15%	16.25%
Target B >=	59.27%	59.67%	60.07%	60.47%	60.87%
Target C >=	75.39%	76.29%	77.18%	78.08%	78.97%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho began preparing stakeholder groups, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. SEAP membership represents parents and families of students with disabilities, self-advocates, higher education, Idaho correctional facilities, LEA superintendents, special education directors, teachers, Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Parents Unlimited, and the Idaho State Department of Education. DAC consists of a minimum of 14 special education directors nominated regionally by their peers. There are two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure the representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter local education agencies (LEAs) to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state. In September 2020, the ISDE provided descriptions of the proposed changes, an overview of state historical data, and anticipated impacts on Idaho’s educational systems. The ISDE provided additional information confirming changes to SPP/APR and future target-setting requirements to stakeholders in the spring of 2021.

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

- How to get involved;

- Types of groups;
- Understanding data;
- Roles of families on groups; and
- Skills for serving on groups.

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

Based on small group discussions, stakeholders recommended using the most current data available FFY 2020 as it best reflected current higher education and employment information. FFY 2020 data were the only data that captured information from the Office of the State Board of Education and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. Based on this change in collection methodology and stakeholder recommendations, Idaho established the baseline for Indicator 14 using FFY 2020 data. Stakeholders recommended an annual percentage point increase of 0.1 for Indicator 14A and 0.4 for Indicator 14B. Given Idaho's historical data, these small percentage point increases encourage rigorous yet achievable gains. As Idaho's current economy offers a wide range of job opportunities, stakeholders recommended a more rigorous target for Indicator 14C to improve 6% over baseline, equaling a 0.89 percentage point increase annually.

As part of the target-setting activities with stakeholders, the ISDE developed additional data visualizations for performance indicators. These were laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is revising these data visualizations into one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback. Idaho will continue to provide information using these updated formats and provide opportunities for stakeholders to evaluate the appropriateness of targets and recommend strategies for improving Indicator 14. The ISDE provides information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with stakeholders no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, ISDE also includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent.

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Area of Analysis	Count
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,703
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	845
Response Rate	49.62%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	151
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	310
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)	96
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).	59

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	151	845	15.75%	15.85%	17.87%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	461	845	58.87%	59.27%	54.56%	Did not meet target	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)	616	845	74.50%	75.39%	72.90%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	<p>Idaho's economy has bounced back from COVID-19 pandemic-related closures with many well-paying entry-level opportunities. The ISDE is conducting further analysis of data for Indicator 14B. As part of this analysis, the ISDE is reviewing Idaho Department of Labor data to determine if competitively employed individuals are less likely to respond to the Post-School Outcomes survey. The ISDE identified that the wording of one of the main questions regarding employment duration might cause confusion and result in an "I don't know" response. This response would prevent participants from being categorized in Measure 3, negatively impacting Measure B. The ISDE is working with stakeholders to ensure all questions are clear and understandable for survey participants.</p> <p>In the 2021-2022 data results, the ISDE saw a slight decrease in the participation of LEAs in the opt-in survey collection. The difference in the count of LEAs participating was minimal, reducing only by three. However, the LEAs that elected not to participate in the 2021-2022 data collection were much larger on average, representing approximately 21% of all completed surveys the prior year. LEAs that opted in for the 2021-2022 collection that did not participate the previous year represented 12.5% of respondents. Primary reasons listed by LEAs that have historically participated but declined to participate in the 2021-2022 opt-in collection noted staff fatigue and burnout as the main reasons for not participating.</p> <p>Idaho continues considering options to improve response rates, especially for underrepresented populations. The decline in the number of large LEAs participating in the opt-in data collection is considered a contributing factor to slippage in this area. LEA staff typically engage in a larger conversation with past students clarifying responses to specific questions. These clarifications are not possible when a vendor conducts phone interviews.</p> <p>The ISDE has announced its intent to apply for the Rehabilitation Training: Disability Innovation Fund (DIF) Program. The Special Education team is currently writing the application to support and increase competitive integrated employment (CIE) opportunities for youth with disabilities in the state. If granted access to the fund, the project would help sustainably increase past students' access to competitive integrated employment, positively impacting Idaho's Indicator 14B.</p>
C	<p>Idaho's economy has bounced back from COVID-19 pandemic-related closures with many well-paying entry-level opportunities. The ISDE is conducting further analysis of data for Indicator 14C. As part of this analysis, the ISDE is reviewing Idaho Department of Labor data to determine if competitively employed individuals are less likely to respond to the Post-School Outcomes survey. The ISDE identified that the wording of one of the main questions regarding employment duration might cause confusion and result in an "I don't know" response. This response would prevent participants from being categorized in Measure 3, negatively impacting Measure C. The ISDE is working with stakeholders to ensure all questions are clear and understandable for survey participants.</p> <p>In the 2021-2022 data results, the ISDE saw a slight decrease in the participation of LEAs in the opt-in survey collection. The difference in the count of LEAs participating was minimal, reducing only by three. However, the LEAs that elected not to participate in the 2021-2022 data collection were much larger on average, representing approximately 21% of all completed surveys the prior year. LEAs that opted in for the 2021-2022 collection that did not participate the previous year represented 12.5% of respondents. Primary reasons listed by LEAs that have historically participated but declined to participate in the 2021-2022 opt-in collection noted staff fatigue and burnout as the main reasons for not participating.</p> <p>Idaho continues considering options to improve response rates, especially for underrepresented populations. The decline in the number of large LEAs participating in the opt-in data collection is considered a contributing factor to slippage in this area. LEA staff typically engage in a larger conversation with past students clarifying responses to specific questions. These clarifications are not possible when a vendor conducts phone interviews.</p> <p>The ISDE has announced its intent to apply for the Rehabilitation Training: Disability Innovation Fund (DIF) Program. The Special Education team is currently writing the application to support and increase competitive integrated employment (CIE) opportunities for youth with disabilities in the state. If granted access to the fund, the project would help sustainably increase past students' access to competitive integrated employment, positively impacting Idaho's Indicator 14C.</p>

**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	2020	2021
Response Rate	57.62%	49.62%

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

ISDE continues to work to expand the Indicator 14 LEA opt-in opportunity and encourages all LEAs to conduct initial survey attempts. In school year 2021-2022, (FFY 2021), the ISDE again provided LEAs participating in the opt-in survey process access to additional funds through the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Grant. LEAs participating in the opt-in survey collection noted that response rates increased when contact was initiated by staff directly connected to the student's secondary program, i.e., case manager, teacher, secondary transition coordinator, etc. In school year 2021-2022 training, the ISDE strongly encouraged LEAs to have staff involved in past student education conduct surveys instead of general staff members. 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. ISDE anticipated these efforts would improve data quality and increase the response rate, particularly for past students who dropped out.

In the 2021-2022 data results, the ISDE saw a slight decrease in the participation of LEAs in the opt-in survey collection. The difference in the count of LEAs participating was minimal, reducing only by three. However, the LEAs that elected not to participate in the 2021-2022 data collection were much larger on average, representing approximately 21% of all completed surveys the prior year. LEAs that opted in for the 2021-2022 collection that did not participate the previous year represented 12.5% of respondents. Primary reasons listed by LEAs that have historically participated but declined to participate in the 2021-2022 opt-in collection noted staff fatigue and burnout as the main reasons for not participating.

Idaho continues considering options to improve response rates, especially for underrepresented populations. The special education team is in collaboration with coordinators from other divisions within the ISDE, including Migrant, English Learners, and Indian Education, to determine improvement strategies.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Idaho examined three criteria to determine nonresponse bias. The first criterion examined was the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias occurred. Idaho's response rate is nearly 50%, a very high survey response rate. Second, the ISDE examined the representativeness of the responses. As described in the analysis for representativeness, ISDE found no significant differences by disability category. Only one difference was found by race/ethnicity. Third, ISDE compared the responses of exiters who responded early to those who responded later in the process. This comparison focuses on the idea that individuals who did not immediately respond and need multiple prompts to respond are different in some meaningful way from those who respond immediately. These results showed no significant differences between exiters who responded earlier and exiters who responded later. The data illustrates the importance of Idaho conducting follow-up emails and phone calls with exiters as a majority, but not all exiters wish to communicate with LEA representatives.

In the review of supplementary data collected through the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education, the ISDE continues to show a percentage of youth participating in higher education that did not respond to the survey. In the prior year, the ISDE hypothesized that these exiters did not identify themselves as having been a student with disabilities. To ensure that survey language was not impacting the response of these individuals, the ISDE confirmed that survey questions did not directly reference participation in special education or related services. The ISDE continues to analyze this information to understand the lack of response. The ISDE is now reviewing supplementary materials such as cover letters and email notifications for language that may impact response from past students who received services but do not identify themselves as an individual with disabilities.

**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.**

The State compared the representation by race/ethnicity, disability, and geographic location in the population to the representation in the respondents using a +/- 3% criteria to identify over-or under-representation.

No differences were found by disability or geographic location based on using the +/- 3% methodology. Differences in response rate were found by race/ethnicity but not by the response. The SWD population consists of 69.00% of Whites, and the respondents consist of 73.14% of Whites. Therefore, there was a slightly higher percentage of white respondents in the respondent group than in the population.

All other racial/ethnic groups were within three percentage points of their population percentage.

Although white respondents were slightly over-represented, there were no differences in the actual responses by race/ethnicity. For example, there were no significant differences in Measurement C between White exiters and Hispanic exiters. Further, 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 ISDE training for opt-in data collection for the 2022-2023 school year provided additional examples of collecting survey information.

Communications with educational partners indicate that face-to-face discussions with a trusted member of the educational community are most likely to increase the participation of students of non-White racial/ethnic backgrounds. Idaho continues to work to improve the availability of accurate contact information. LEAs are encouraged to continue communication regarding the Post-School Outcomes survey at the exit and follow-up communication with the option to update contact information in the fall or early spring before the survey collection opens.

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

The State compared the representation by race/ethnicity, disability, and geographic location in the population to the representation in the respondents using a +/- 3% criteria to identify over-or under-representation.

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)**

The ISDE does not show evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for this indicator. Reduced response rates are attributed to fewer large LEAs participating in the opt-in data collection process.

The Secondary Transition Coordinator participates as part of the annual data training, Data Drill Down, by providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data and indicators. The ISDE Secondary Transition Coordinator also hosts monthly webinars on secondary transition topics for secondary transition staff.

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

Joint ISDE and IDVR administrator training have resulted in LEA/IDVR funding partnerships to provide dedicated school-to-work counselors who are full-time or shared between smaller LEAs. Those LEAs engaged in this shared resource have begun to show an increase in their students connecting to pre-employment activities offered by IDVR.

In the last year, the ISDE and IDVR conducted two Transition surveys to gain additional information about the differences between the services accessed and what educators and counselors list as being available. One survey was sent to parents and families to learn what secondary transition services they know of and are accessing. The second was issued to educators and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors to identify the type and availability of secondary transition services for students ages 15-21 with disabilities in Idaho. Idaho continues to analyze results to determine if there are



regions with lower access to secondary transition services or if improved messaging is needed to inform families of available services. The Secondary Transition Coordinator has partnered with other state agencies to provide training and information to parents and LEAs about the availability of local resources and benefits. Partnering agencies include the IDVR, Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL), and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW). Idaho is currently working on expanding apprenticeship opportunities in the state. To help improve access to apprenticeship in the state for individuals with disabilities, IDVR has added an Apprenticeship Coordinator position.

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

In November of 2021, the Transition Institute was provided in both face-to-face and virtual format to facilitate health and safety recommendations from the CDC. The Transition Institute hosted in the fall of 2022 returned to a face-to-face-only format which better encourages involvement in the institute. Lead state partner agencies included the IDVR, IDOL, ICDD, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ICBVI), and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL). The 2022 Transition Institute linked 54 LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. A total of 275 individuals participated in the institute representing staff from LEAs, IDVR, ICBVI, Career Technical Education (CTE), colleges and universities, and IPUL. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. As a result of activities initiated at the Transition Institute, 41 of the participating LEAs have developed annual District Action Plans to improve transition at the local level. District Action Plans were turned in to the ISDE for follow-up activities. Idaho intends to continue the Transition Institute and expects growth for students with disabilities in future Secondary Transition and Post School Outcomes data.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Idaho examined three criteria to determine nonresponse bias. The first criterion examined was the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias occurred. Idaho's response rate is nearly 50%, a very high survey response rate. Second, the ISDE examined the representativeness of the responses. As described in the analysis for representativeness, ISDE found no significant differences by disability category. Only one difference was found by race/ethnicity. Third, ISDE compared the responses of exiters who responded early to those who responded later in the process. This comparison focuses on the idea that individuals who did not immediately respond and need multiple prompts to respond are different in some meaningful way from those who respond immediately. These results showed no significant differences between exiters who responded earlier and exiters who responded later. The data illustrates the importance of Idaho conducting follow-up emails and phone calls with exiters as a majority, but not all exiters wish to communicate with LEA representatives.

In the review of supplementary data collected through the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education, the ISDE continues to show a percentage of youth participating in higher education that did not respond to the survey. In the prior year, the ISDE hypothesized that these exiters did not identify themselves as having been a student with disabilities. To ensure that survey language was not impacting the response of these individuals, the ISDE confirmed that survey questions did not directly reference participation in special education or related services. The ISDE continues to analyze this information to understand the lack of response. The ISDE is now reviewing supplementary materials such as cover letters and email notifications for language that may impact response from past students who received services but do not identify themselves as an individual with disabilities. The State compared the representation by race/ethnicity, disability, and geographic location in the population to the representation in the respondents using a +/- 3% criteria to identify over-or under-representation.

No differences were found by disability or geographic location based on using the +/- 3% methodology. Differences in response rate were found by race/ethnicity but not by the response. The SWD population consists of 69.00% of Whites, and the respondents consist of 73.14% of Whites. Therefore, there was a slightly higher percentage of white respondents in the respondent group than in the population.

All other racial/ethnic groups were within three percentage points of their population percentage.

Although white respondents were slightly over-represented, there were no differences in the actual responses by race/ethnicity. For example, there were no significant differences in Measurement C between White exiters and Hispanic exiters. Further, 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.

## 14 - OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2021 data represent slippage from the FFY 2020 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2021 targets for indicators 14-B and 14-C. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

In its description of strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, the State did not specifically address strategies to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, the State reported, "The SWD population consists of 69.00% of Whites, and the respondents consist of 73.14% of Whites. Therefore, there was a slightly higher percentage of white respondents in the respondent group than in the population." Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

## 14 - Required Actions

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Idaho's dispute resolution system, which includes various options for addressing disputes, was noted as an area of strength by stakeholders; Idaho's dispute resolution data and processes have been stable and have not shown substantial shifts over time. Since states are not required to establish baseline or targets when the number of resolution sessions is less than 10, stakeholders chose not to pursue target setting for Indicator 15.

Current, relevant dispute resolution information is provided to LEAs, parents, and educational partners, in a variety of formats and locations. This is in an effort to ensure that all are aware that any of the dispute resolution options offered by SDE may be initiated at any time and in any sequence, without prerequisite actions, and that more than one DR process (e.g., facilitation and complaint investigation) may be in effect at the same time. The DR office regularly includes information on trending issues as part of monthly webinars provided by the SDE'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 regular updates to our educational partners, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and parents in partnership with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), in addition to annual training provided at the New Superintendent Orientation and the IDEA and Federal Program Workshop, both sponsored by the State Department of Education.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A template draft was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	50.00%	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%	

**Targets**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	NA	NA	NA	N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions are less than 10. Idaho and its stakeholders stand ready to discuss baseline and establish targets as needed for future submission once minimum criteria are met to require targets.

The ISDE has implemented changes to tracking and processes necessary to ensure FFY 2020 data discrepancy in the number of resolution meetings and agreements does not reoccur. FFY 2020 dispute resolution data were updated and resubmitted through the EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey reopen period.

Several mechanisms are available through the Idaho State Department of Education’s (SDE) 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 complaints, due process hearings, and expedited due process hearings. Idaho’s DR office makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve disputes at the least adversarial and most local level appropriate.

The DR office contracts with more than a dozen third-party experts who provide facilitation, mediation, investigation, and due process hearing services under the supervision of the SDE’s DR office. Nearly 20% of these contractors are qualified to serve as due process hearing officers. Each DR contractor brings unique experience and talent to the SDE, but all have significant knowledge and expertise in both special education regulations and practices and conflict resolution. Contractors and hearing officers are assigned on a rotational and geographic basis and are required to participate in regular training and stay up to date on current issues related to special education. The DR office provides its contractors with national legal updates, current OSEP/OSER and state level guidance, annual in-person training hosted by the DR office staff, quarterly remote meetings that include DR updates and Q&A discussions, and regular opportunities to attend national and/or regional training such as LRP, PNWI, and TAESE training.

Current, relevant dispute resolution information is provided to LEAs, parents, and educational partners, in a variety of formats and locations. This is in an effort to ensure that all are aware that any of the dispute resolution options offered by SDE may be initiated at any time and in any sequence, without prerequisite actions, and that more than one DR process (e.g., facilitation and complaint investigation) may be in effect at the same time. The DR office regularly includes information on trending issues as part of monthly webinars provided by the SDE’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 regular updates to our educational partners, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and parents in partnership with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), in addition to annual training provided at the New Superintendent Orientation and the IDEA and Federal Program Workshop, both sponsored by the State Department of Education.

Idaho’s Special Education Dispute Resolution Office regularly provides information on “hot topics” or “trending issues” as part of monthly webinars to local special education directors and presents at the annual New Superintendents’ Orientation. The team has developed resources for local school principals related to discipline, IEP and evaluation processes, accommodations, etc.

New resources include but are not limited to:

Dispute Resolution Quick Guides – These convenient, easily-accessed, one-page guides provide current information about each dispute resolution process available through the DR office.

Parent’s Guide to Facilitation – This guide provides a brief overview of the role of the facilitator and offers parents several tips for preparing for a facilitated meeting.

The Dispute Resolution office offers regular updates to stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and works closely with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), and Idaho Special Education Support & Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) to develop resources and training for parents and school districts.

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

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

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	9
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	5

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

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

Idaho's dispute resolution system, which includes various options for addressing disputes, was noted as an area of strength by stakeholders. As Idaho's dispute resolution systems have been stable and have not shown substantial shifts over time, stakeholders elected to maintain previously established targets.

Idaho has implemented changes to communication and processes regarding data collection responsibilities. As a result of these changes in data collection methodology, Idaho reestablished the baseline, using FFY 2020 data, of 80%. In the spring of 2022, ISDE provided additional information regarding the finalized FFY 2020 SPP/APR and OSEP's response including the update of baseline and target for Indicator 16. Stakeholders confirmed approval of the new baseline and continued use of the 75%-85% target range.

Current, relevant dispute resolution information is provided to LEAs, parents, and educational partners, in a variety of formats and locations. This is in an effort to ensure that all are aware that any of the dispute resolution options offered by SDE may be initiated at any time and in any sequence, without prerequisite actions, and that more than one DR process (e.g., facilitation and complaint investigation) may be in effect at the same time. The DR office regularly includes information on trending issues as part of monthly webinars provided by the SDE'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 regular updates to our educational partners, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and parents in partnership with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), in addition to annual training provided at the New Superintendent Orientation and the IDEA and Federal Program Workshop, both sponsored by the State Department of Education.

Per stakeholder input, the ISDE is developing one to two-page informational sheets for each indicator. These information sheets will briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A draft of the template was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December of 2022. The ISDE is currently modifying the template based on stakeholder feedback.

## Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	80.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	78.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%
Data	77.78%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	80.00%

## Targets

FFY	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%

## FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target (low)	FFY 2021 Target (high)	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	5	9	80.00%	75.00%	85.00%	66.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

As shown in Idaho's IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey, the ISDE received a total of 12 mediation requests. Nine requested mediations were held, and three were withdrawn or not held. Of those nine mediations held, the five which were unrelated to due process complaints resulted in mediation agreements, and one of the four related to due process complaints resulted in a mediation agreement. Additional relevant information must be considered to assess the percentage of agreement accurately; cross-referencing Section B: Mediation Requests and Section C: Due Process Complaints discloses the context in which some mediation agreements did not occur. With this analysis, the data show that four mediations were held related to due process complaints, and just one resulted in a mediation agreement because the other three due process complaints were withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing). Instead of resulting in 66.66% agreement when considering only one of the information tables, the cross-referenced data shows 100% agreement. To view Idaho's current and historical dispute resolution data as submitted through Idaho's IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey, please access the following link: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-618-part-b-reports/2021-2022-Dispute-Resolution.xlsx>.

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of Indicator 16 data. Several mechanisms are available through the Idaho State Department of Education's (SDE) 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 complaints, due process hearings, and expedited due process hearings. Idaho's DR office makes a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes to resolve disputes at the least adversarial and most local level appropriate. The DR office contracts with more than a dozen third-party experts who provide facilitation, mediation, investigation, and due process hearing services under the supervision of the SDE's DR office. Nearly 20% of these contractors are qualified to serve as due process hearing officers. Each DR contractor brings unique experience and talent to the SDE, but all have significant knowledge and expertise in both special education regulations and practices, and conflict resolution. Contractors and hearing officers are assigned on a rotational and geographic basis and are required to participate in regular training and stay up to date on current issues related to special education. The DR office provides its contractors with national legal updates, current OSEP/OSER and state level guidance, annual in-person training hosted by the DR office staff, quarterly remote meetings that include DR updates and Q&A discussions, and regular opportunities to attend national and/or regional training such as LRP, PNWI, and TAESE trainings. Current, relevant dispute resolution information is provided to LEAs, parents, and educational partners, in a variety of formats and locations. This is in an effort to ensure that all are aware that any of the dispute resolution options offered by SDE may be initiated at any time and in any sequence, without prerequisite actions, and that more than one DR process (e.g., facilitation and complaint investigation) may be in effect at the same time. The DR office regularly includes information on trending issues as part of monthly webinars provided by the SDE'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 regular updates to our educational partners, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and parents in partnership with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), in addition to annual training provided at the New Superintendent Orientation and the IDEA and Federal Program Workshop, both sponsored by the State Department of Education. Idaho's Special Education Dispute Resolution Office regularly provides information on "hot topics" or "trending issues" as part of monthly webinars to local special education directors and presents at the annual New Superintendents' Orientation. The team has developed resources for local school principals related to discipline, IEP and evaluation processes, accommodations, etc. New resources include but are not limited to: Dispute Resolution Quick Guides – These convenient, easily-accessed, one-page guides provide current information about each dispute resolution process available through the DR office. Parent's Guide to Facilitation – This guide provides a brief overview of the role of the facilitator and offers parents several tips for preparing for a facilitated meeting.

The Dispute Resolution office offers regular updates to stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and the Directors Advisory Council (DAC), and works closely with Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), and Idaho Special Education Support & Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) to develop resources and training for parents and school districts.

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 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 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

###### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,



and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

**C. Stakeholder Engagement**

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

**17 - Indicator Data**

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

Increase the percent of fourth-grade students with disabilities in Idaho who will be proficient in literacy as measured on the state summative assessment, currently ISAT by Smarter Balanced.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

The subset of the population from the indicator are the LEAs participating in the SSIP professional development project, Cultivating Readers, during the 2021-22 school year. The LEAs included in the calculation are the following: Joint School District #2, Blackfoot, Boundary County, Filer, Future Public School, Inc., Gem Prep: Nampa, Gem Prep: Meridian, Gem Prep: Online, Gem Prep: Pocatello, Idaho Falls, Kuna, Lapwai, Minidoka County, Mullan, Notus, Preston, Project Impact STEM Academy, Ririe, Snake River, St. Maries, Sugar-Salem, Twin Falls, Wendell. These 23 LEAs represented 13% of the total number of LEAs in the state in FFY 2021 (23/172) and the number of students in this cohort made up 28% (789/2813) of the total target population of students. Idaho will measure the SiMR for this same cohort of LEAs from year to year. Idaho will calculate and report the SiMR data for 4th grade students in this same cohort of LEAs each year in the SPP/APR submission.

Staff from 24 unique LEAs participated in the SSIP/SPDG in the 2021-22 school year but only 23 are reported for the purposes of the SiMR. One LEA, Canyon Owyhee School Service Agency (COSSA), is a co-op that employs its own staff to provide services to students in LEAs that form the co-op. Notus school district students receive services from staff from the COSSA co-op and its students will be reported in the SiMR data. COSSA staff will participate in the SSIP activities but no students from COSSA are included in the SiMR data.

**Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/Idaho-State-Systematic-Improvement-Plan-Theory-of-Action.pdf>

**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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	14.20%	14.30%	14.40%	14.60%	14.80%

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Number of 4th grade students with disabilities proficient on the ISAT in ELA	Total number of 4th grade students with disabilities who participated in the ISAT in ELA	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
127	789	15.31%	14.20%	16.10%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

The data source for the FFY 2021 data is the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), by Smarter Balanced. The ISAT is Idaho's summative assessment in English/language arts (ELA).

The EDFacts file where the data are reported is the SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups – Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178). Idaho uses a subset of the data reported in the EDFacts file for calculating the SiMR.

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

ISDE Assessment and Accountability Department received the raw assessment data from Smarter Balanced. The Assessment and Accountability team cleaned the data and provided it to the SSIP internal evaluator for analysis. 4th grade students with disabilities who were enrolled in an LEA participating in the SSIP in the 2021-22 school year were included in the calculation of the SiMR. The SiMR was calculated by dividing the number of 4th grade students with disabilities in SSIP LEAs who scored proficient or advanced on the ISAT for ELA by the total number of 4th grade students with disabilities in SSIP LEAs who were administered the ISAT for ELA. Idaho aligned the SSIP baseline data year and targets through 2025 with those of SPP/APR Indicator 3B for 4th grade ELA since the SiMR data is a subset of the data for that indicator.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

The SSIP State Leadership Team monitored progress of student outcomes on a monthly basis using data from the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI). The IRI is an early reading screener and diagnostic assessment administered in the fall and spring to students in kindergarten through 3rd grade. The Special Education Department analyzed these data to assess LEA progress toward targets and provided LEAs with IRI reports with data from the 2020-2021 school year at the Fall 2021 Data Drill Down. These reports contained charts and tables disaggregated by student demographics including race/ethnicity, special education status, grade, and reading subskill. Additionally, LEAs were able to use the IRI as an informal progress monitoring tool at any time and the majority of SSIP LEAs used it as such. The SSIP internal evaluator obtained the informal, uncleaned progress monitoring data at the beginning of each month for the month prior, aggregated the data to the building, LEA, cohort and project levels, and used it for state-level program planning and estimating progress toward the SiMR. Although the ISAT measures a broader range of ELA content (reading, writing, listening and research), student data from the IRI is the only data the State Leadership Team has available for progress monitoring of student outcomes. Compared to the ISAT, the IRI is more useful in measuring student growth in reading specifically, which is the ELA area the SSIP focuses on improving. In FFY 2021, the State Leadership Team created school-level reports with the monthly progress monitoring data to help schools identify their needs mid-year for training and TA during the February 2022 In-District Visits. The State Leadership Team developed similar reports for building teams to use for program planning during the spring 2022 Spring Institute. These reports were disaggregated by student characteristics, such as grade and disability status, as well as by reading subskill areas. The teams were able to target specific student groups and reading skills that might benefit from staff receiving additional professional development in those specific areas.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

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:**

(1) Governance: To align the SSIP work with other state-level initiatives and expand the reach of reading support, an analysis was conducted on LEA reading outcomes. Based on the analysis, the State Leadership Team conducted targeted outreach to LEAs with reading scores below the state average to apply for participation in the SSIP. The activities of the SSIP aligned with the Governor's and Superintendent of Public Instruction's literacy priorities that all Idaho students are proficient readers by 3rd grade. Idaho is a local control state, and each LEA develops and submits an annual Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan to the Idaho State Board of Education. This literacy plan outlines the LEA's plans to improve English language arts and literacy instruction. The Idaho State Leadership Team collaborated with LEA leadership teams, other departments at the ISDE, and community partners to share resources and communicate activities and priorities to improve reading and literacy instruction. The three priorities for the SSIP in collaboration with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, other ISDE departments, and LEA leadership teams were to address the following:

(2) Finance: Idaho was awarded the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) October 1, 2020. Through the SPDG, SSIP LEAs were sub awarded funds for supporting their SSIP/SPDG implementation activities. The Special Education fiscal team and SPDG project director implemented a fiscal monitoring system to ensure appropriate use of SPDG funds. LEA personnel including business managers, special education directors, and principals were provided information during webinars, virtual meetings, and emails to ensure they understood their budgets, documentation they were required to submit with their reimbursement requests, and expected timelines for drawdowns and document submission.

(3) Personnel/Workforce: With the support of SPDG funding, Idaho was able to expand the State Leadership Team to include the state Special Education Director, Fiscal Coordinator, Fiscal Contract Specialist, and Data and Reporting Program Specialist. In FFY 2021, the team continued to implement the activities of the SSIP ISDE provides statewide professional development opportunities face-to-face and virtually (both synchronous and asynchronous), delivered by qualified professionals. A website was developed to house sustainable training materials and various project resources. Through the SSIP, participating LEAs have access to national literacy experts that guide them through evaluating their LEA's literacy programs, instructional practices, and coaching support through the utilization of a continuous improvement cycle to implement change..

(4) Data System: During the reporting period, Idaho implemented a robust data collection and analysis system. The team continued to collect both implementation and student outcomes data. The SPDG supported an expansion of the SSIP activities in FFY 2021 and those activities needed to be

evaluated. Therefore, Idaho continued implementing the data collection and analysis activities from previous years and added additional activities in FFY 2021. Idaho began using newly developed data collection instruments. One example of this was a partnership Idaho established with a vendor that developed and maintains a platform for virtual coaching. Additionally, the SSIP evaluator and SPDG external evaluator continued working together to improve and streamline surveys that were sent to project participants and collected training observation data to evaluate training quality using a high-quality PD checklist. Data elements that are collected, analyzed and used to make project improvements include the following bulleted list below. More information on results and changes made to project activities and timelines is provided in subsequent sections. Post-training surveys to evaluate participants' perceptions of the training they received and their gains in knowledge and skills

- Observations to evaluate training quality
- Fidelity of implementation of instructional staff and coaches
- School infrastructure for Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading (MTSS-R)
- Coaching frequency and quality
- Attendance and activities completion rates

The State Leadership Team also supports SSIP participants to improve their use of data and data literacy. During the Spring Institute training, school teams are provided data reports multiple times per year and participate in training to increase their understanding of the data and how to use them to improve their school reading systems and teachers' instruction.

The State Leadership Team supports a data system that collects both implementation data and student outcomes through various instruments and surveys. ISDE cultivates a culture of data use to drive continuous improvement. Participating SSIP LEAs receive training on data literacy at the annual fall data training delivered by ISDE staff, the Fall Institute training, and Spring Institute. The sections below describe the instruments and data collected in more detail.

(5) Professional Development: The SSIP continued to provide a robust system of statewide professional development, offered both face-to-face and virtually (both synchronous and asynchronous), and delivered by qualified professionals. A website was maintained and expanded to house sustainable training materials and various project resources. Through the SSIP, participating LEA and school staff had access to national literacy experts that guided them through evaluating their schools' reading programs, teachers' instructional practices, and coaching supports through the utilization of a continuous improvement cycle to implement change. Technical assistance (TA) was provided through a variety of sources. TA for LEAs participating in the SSIP included onsite visits to schools in the Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-up years (years 2, 3, and 4 of participation), and monthly virtual technical assistance and coaching calls for instructional staff, coaches, administrators and parents. Differentiated training and TA successfully supported schools to align instructional practices across all Tiers of instruction, helped teachers and coaches improve their practices, and improved schools' collaboration with parents and families.

(6) Accountability and Quality Improvement: ISDE conducted monitoring and accountability activities through the General Supervision File Review (GSFR), fiscal monitoring, and annual LEA Determinations. A team of ISDE Special Education staff improved the data calculation methodology of Idaho's LEA determinations to make a meaningful monitoring system to identify LEAs needing extra support and TA and provided them with those supports to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. LEAs that received a determination of "Needs Intervention" and were identified as low performing in ELA proficiency were approached to participate in the SSIP.

(7) Quality Standards: Idaho continued to facilitate the Idaho Professional Standards Commission, which makes recommendations and renders decisions that provide Idaho with competent, qualified, ethical educators dedicated to rigorous standards, pre-K-12 student achievement, and improved professional practice. All teacher candidates were expected to meet the Idaho Core Teacher Standards and the standards specific to their discipline area(s).

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

- (1) Governance:
  - a. Identified infrastructure improvement strategy
    - i. Increased the number of LEAs participating in the project and specifically targeted LEAs with relatively low student outcomes in reading.
  - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
    - i. Applications were open from January 1 through April 1, 2022, for participation in the 2022-23 school year. Staff at 7 LEAs with 7 total schools applied to participate. As previously reported, the State Leadership Team's goal was to recruit 10 LEAs and 20 schools. However, they were only able to recruit 7 LEAs with a total of 7 schools. The LEAs represent rural districts and small charter schools. The majority of the LEAs were recruited through a collaboration with the Federal Programs Department Idaho Principals Network.
    - c. Supports change: Adding additional LEAs allows Idaho to scale-up SSIP activities to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities.
    - d. Assess and communicate achievement: The application process resulted in 7 new LEAs applying and joining the SSIP activities. In May 2022 the State Leadership team met with the incoming LEAs to provide an overview of the 4-year commitment. Stakeholders were updated through presentations, emails, and special education directors' webinars on the addition of new LEAs throughout the year. The state assessed achievement by tracking the number of application submitted and LEAs participating.
- (2) Finance: Idaho was awarded the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) October 1, 2020. Idaho was able to begin sub-awarding SSIP LEAs to support their participation
  - a. Identified infrastructure improvement strategy
    - i. Set up system to award, monitor and reimburse SSIP LEAs for project-related expenditures. LEAs were required to submit reimbursement requests at least quarterly, provide detailed general ledgers of expenditures and submit quarterly expenditure monitoring forms to the State Leadership Team.
    - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
      - i. Awarded 24 SSIP LEAs subawards and monitored their expenditures. When LEAs requested reimbursements that were not allowable, the reimbursement requests were not approved. LEAs were able to pay their staff for off-contract work they completed for the SSIP or hire substitute teachers with funds.
      - c. Supports change: SPDG funds provide the necessary financial support to help LEAs sustain improvement strategies by supporting instructional staff and LEA-identified coaches in completing SSIP activities during off-contract time or by hiring substitute teachers.
      - d. Assess and communicate achievement: LEA subawards were set up and funds were withdrawn throughout the year. LEAs were reminded to drawdown funds through emails and administrative calls. Additionally, a webinar was held for LEA Business Managers on the type of fund, how to access funds, allowable expenditures, timelines and report submission requirements. The state assessed achievement by tracking expenditure types and percentage of funds that were drawn down quarterly, and through feedback from LEA personnel.
  - (3) Personnel/Workforce: During the current reporting period, the SSIP worked to create sustainable training materials for LEA personnel to provide PD and TA for new and returning staff.
    - a. Identified infrastructure improvement strategy

- i. Created sustainable materials to support new and returning LEA personnel to implement evidence-based practices.
- ii. Added additional members to the ISDE Leadership team including a percentage of time of the fiscal coordinator, contract specialist, special education director and a program specialist, to assist in the implementation of the project objectives. The team began implementing an improved system of fiscal support and accountability, including allocating funds to LEAs based on their needs and developing a process for fiscal monitoring of LEAs. SDE personnel supported LEAs with fiscal issues through technical assistance via webinars, emails and phone calls.
- b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
  - i. A series of online training courses were created by literacy and coaching experts on the foundational skills for reading, Science of Reading, comprehensive data systems, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The materials were linked on the SSIP website and promoted during training. Pageviews were tracked on the training materials to monitor how they were being accessed. The page views for the various training materials from August 2021 through July 31, 2022 are as follows: Foundational Skills resource page: 304 public views, an increase from 122 last year; Comprehensive Data Systems resource page: 436 public views, an increase from 148 last year; Vocabulary Instruction resource page: 96 public views, an increase from 54 last year; Reading Comprehension resource page: 228 public views, an increase from 78 last year; and the Science of Reading added during this reporting period had 440 public views.
  - ii. The State Leadership Team added an additional .75 FTE between the four new staff supporting the project. The team was able to implement a fiscal monitoring process as well as develop processes and materials that would not have been possible without the additional support.
- c. Supports change: Creating online training material helps to sustain the SSIP activities. Utilizing a designated website organizes the resources and makes accessing materials easy. The State Leadership has greatly increased their capacity with the additional personnel support. This will increase the sustainability and scaling up of the project in the future.
- d. Assess and communicate achievement: Sustainable material was developed and posted on the project website. The website has seen increased traffic, with all resources increasing page views over last year. The state assessed achievement by tracking the number of public views
- (4) Data System: During the reporting period, Idaho continued developing, implementing and improving a robust data collection system.
  - a. Identified infrastructure improvement strategy
    - i. Developed, implemented and improved a robust data collection system.
  - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
    - i. Through the SSIP's comprehensive data collection and analysis system, State Leadership Team members were able to make data-driven decisions around areas to focus on for improvement and the strategies to employ. Short-term and intermediate outcomes of these data were primarily focused on improvement of the supports offered through the SSIP and identifying specific areas of reading instruction where SSIP teachers might have needed more support to improve their ability to deliver high-quality instruction. Student outcomes and implementation fidelity data are detailed in other SSIP sections.
    - c. Supports change: Idaho will improve SSIP activities using the data collected through its robust data collection system. Improved SSIP supports will result in LEA and school staff improving their practices and, subsequently, gains in student reading outcomes.
    - d. Assess and communicate achievement: The State Leadership Team assessed achievement through response rates of surveys, timely and accurate data submissions and through conversations with SSIP participants during virtual meetings. To communicate achievement, the State Leadership Team included data to celebrate in monthly reminders emails to all SSIP participants, developed an incentive system for submitting timely and accurate data, and collected and shared success stories through qualitative data collection methods that were compiled into an end of year video and shared with SSIP participants.
- (5) Professional Development: Tool character limits did not allow for a complete description of Professional Development. For the complete description of all strategies, please go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-State-Performance-Plan/FFY-2021-State-Performance-Plan-Annual-Performance-Report-Indicator-17-SSIP.pdf>.

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

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.**

Data System: During the reporting period, Idaho added additional data collection tools and analysis and feedback processes.

- a. Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy
  - i. Idaho launched implementation of a virtual coaching platform for instructional staff and coaches. This tool allowed instructional staff and coaches to upload videos of themselves delivering instruction and/or coaching, self-reflect, and share the video with peers or their coach who then provided feedback. The system collected data on each user's activity. The SSIP evaluator accessed the data on a monthly basis to monitor the level of activity of individuals and schools. The State Leadership Team followed up with building principals if there were concerns with low usage from specific schools. They also used the usage data to celebrate the individuals and schools who were utilizing the system regularly.
  - ii. Idaho began collecting data using two new tools in FFY 2021: The High-Quality Professional Development Observation Checklist (HQPD Checklist) and Virtual Facilitation Checklist. Additionally, a new feedback process was put into place for communicating data collected through these tools with the training facilitators. The SSIP evaluator included these data in a trainer feedback report, met virtually with trainers within 3 weeks of delivering the training, reviewed the data and summarized suggestions for improving future trainings.
- b. Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
  - i. Idaho was able to monitor SSIP instructional staff's and coaches' activity in the virtual coaching platform. During the course of the school year, 235 videos of instruction were shared in the platform by 28 teachers.
  - ii. Third party observers collected training observation data to evaluate training quality using a high-quality PD checklist (see subsequent section for specific data obtained through using the HQPD Checklist) and a Virtual Facilitation Checklist. These data were utilized by the State Leadership Team to identify training strengths and weaknesses and to plan for improvements to future trainings.
- c. Support change: Idaho can improve SSIP activities through a robust data collection system which will help them meet their SIMR target. Additionally, sustainability of systems improvement efforts is supported with the coaching platform.

**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: Idaho's elected Superintendent will be inaugurated in January 2023. Superintendent of Public Instruction Critchfield might establish different priorities or reading initiatives. The SSIP will work to align with the new priorities. An analysis of students' reading proficiency in kindergarten through third grade will be completed. The State Leadership Team will continue with targeted outreach to LEAs whose reading scores were below the state average and encourage them to apply to the SSIP. Idaho plans to target ten new LEAs and 20 additional schools for the project. The application is open from January 9 through March 31, 2023. Selected LEAs will be notified by April 2023. The addition of new LEAs and buildings will continue to expand the project, increasing the reach of the training to improve the fidelity of evidence-based practices. In addition, the Idaho Legislature, during the 2022 session, passed funding for optional full-day kindergarten. The Idaho State Leadership Team will collaborate with participating LEAs to support this new opportunity for kindergarten students. The Idaho Legislature also passed new dyslexia legislation that requires training and professional development for all instructional staff from kindergarten-12th grade. The State Leadership Team will work to ensure the SSIP content and activities align with the legislation where appropriate.

- a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:

- i. Initiate recruitment campaign for 2023-24 participation in the SSIP
  - ii. Target low-performing LEAs to apply to participate in the SSIP for the 2023-24 school year.
  - iii. Work with the new Superintendent of Public Instruction and staff to align with or incorporate the Superintendent's priorities into the activities of the SSIP
  - iv. Align professional development activities with Idaho's Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together or SMART Project, Content Department initiative, and the SSIP. This will provide cohesion for LEAs that have instructional staff in both projects.
  - v. Align the SSIP training and PD opportunities with the new dyslexia legislation where appropriate.
  - b. Anticipated Outcomes:
    - i. Add new LEAs that would benefit from participation in the project and increase reading proficiency for students with disabilities.
    - ii. Scale up the project through recruitment of 10 new LEAs
    - iii. Improve instructional staff's delivery of explicit instruction when teaching reading
    - iv. Build the capacity of LEAs to provide coaching for instructional staff
    - v. Improve schools' implementation of MTSS-R
    - vi. Improve LEA and school leaders' abilities to lead an implementation team effectively.
  2. Personnel/Workforce: The SSIP creates sustainable coaching material to provide PD and TA for new and returning district-identified instructional coaches. SPDG funds have made it possible to develop a scope of work for an external evaluator to help provide additional analysis of project activities.
    - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
      - i. We have created sustainable materials to support new and returning LEA coaches to support instructional staff implementing evidence-based practices.
      - ii. Add an external evaluator to support the ISDE Leadership team in data collection, analysis, and reporting.
    - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
      - i. Create coaching support material to assist LEA-identified coaches in supporting instructional staff in teaching foundational skills for reading, the Science of Reading, comprehensive data systems, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The materials were linked on the SSIP website and promoted during training and monthly instructional/coaching calls.
  3. Accountability/monitoring: The SSIP is a four-year project. LEAs during the 4th year of the project will be assisted in completing an Idaho SPDG Sustainability Assessment to determine if additional supports are needed to help with the sustainability of the evidence-based practices utilized throughout the project. The Sustainability Checklist has seven sections: Cost/benefit, funding stability, partnerships, organizational capacity, program evaluation, communication, and strategic planning. Additionally, surveys are sent out after all TA and PD activities, and the Leadership team wants to establish focus groups to gather participants' input on the effectiveness of project activities.
    - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
      - i. Create procedures on how to complete the Sustainability Checklist.
      - ii. Reach out to different roles in the project to recruit focus group members representing instructional staff, coaches, administrators, and parents.
      - iii. Develop standardized focus group questions that are open-ended to gather input.
    - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
      - i. Providing additional support identified through the Sustainability Checklist increases the LEA's ability to sustain evidence-based practices.
      - ii. Through focus groups, the Idaho Leadership team will be able to better address the needs of the participants based on their role in the project.
  4. Professional development: The ISDE Content and Curriculum Department launched its K-3 reading project Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART), in conjunction with the first annual K-3 Reading Summit. SMART is a multiyear cohort project that provides training and coaching to K-3 educators across Idaho. The SSIP State Leadership team, in collaboration with the SMART Director, developed a plan for supporting SSIP schools whose teachers were interested in participating in the SMART project. The partnership will provide instructional staff with additional options to improve student reading outcomes. Additionally, Idaho utilizes a coaching platform to support the implementation of explicit instruction with fidelity. The LEAs do not currently utilize coaching platforms so the State Leadership Team will develop and provide robust training on the effective use of the platform.
    - a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy:
      - i. Develop a coordinated plan for LEA staff participating in the SSIP and SMART projects.
      - ii. Develop and be prepared to deliver a more robust coaching platform training.
      - iii. Work with individuals LEAs when necessary to understand and utilize the coaching platform to support coaching activities.
    - b. Identified short-term or intermediate outcomes:
      - i. Aligning the SMART and SSIP will positively impact students' ability to read. Instructional staff will not have to choose one project over another to learn and implement evidence-based practices for teaching reading.
      - ii. A more robust coaching platform training will help increase the number of videos submitted, rated, and providing meaningful feedback to instructional staff.
- Tool character limits did not allow for a complete description of the summary of the next steps for the Technical Assistance and Data infrastructure improvement strategies and the anticipated outcomes. Idaho has included a general description of these areas. For the complete summary of all strategies, please go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-State-Performance-Plan/FFY-2021-State-Performance-Plan-Annual-Performance-Report-Indicator-17-SSIP.pdf>
5. Technical Assistance: LEAs are supported with technical assistance (TA) specific to their individual needs and the number of years that they have been in the project. Additionally, TA support is designed to address the various roles within the projects.
  6. Data: The State Leadership Team supports a data system that collects implementation data and student outcomes through various instruments and surveys. ISDE cultivates a culture of data use to drive continuous improvement.

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

ISDE supported the implementation of five evidence-based practices:

1. Implementation Science Framework,
2. Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA),
3. IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide,
4. Instructional Coaching, and
5. Explicit Instruction.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

(1) Implementation Science Framework: Implementation science refers to the "methods or techniques used to enhance the adoption, implementation, and sustainability" of a program or practice (Eccles & Mittman, 2006). The Implementation 161 Part B Science Framework provides methods and strategies to facilitate quality implementation and use of evidence-based practices. The SSIP utilizes the resources created by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) housed at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

(2) Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up (Cohorts in years 1, 2, 3, and 4) LEAs utilize the EBPs within implementation science to focus on improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle is the EBP the Project has identified as a vehicle for change within the LEA system.

(3) IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide: The Institute of Education Sciences Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade provides four recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills. The practice guide was developed utilizing rigorous research to provide specific recommendations for teaching reading. The evidence-based recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills include: Recommendation 1 – Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge; Recommendation 2 – Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3 – Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; and Recommendation 4 – Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

(4) Instructional Coaching: LEA-identified staff receive training in coaching practices to support instructional staff with professional development and implementation of explicit instruction. Instructional coaches offer classroom modeling, supportive feedback, and observations of specific teaching practices.

(5) Explicit Instruction: SSIP instructional staff are trained and supported to utilize explicit instruction strategies to deliver effective reading instruction to students with disabilities. Dr. Anita Archer and Dr. Charles Hughes define explicit instruction as “a systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented” form of instruction. The SSIP provides training to participating teachers and coaches on the effective implementation of explicit instruction as a part of the Fall Institute. Coaches are provided additional training on explicit instruction components within the Comprehensive Decoding RESET Rubric to support teachers with effective implementation of the EBP and evaluate the fidelity of implementation. Instructional staff implement and measure progress on each component throughout the year and receive coaching support on identified weaknesses in instructional delivery. Instructional staff receive expert TA from SSIP staff and contracted coaches during the Fall Institute, twice a year during In-District Visits, and during monthly calls with literacy experts to further their understanding and implementation of the explicit instruction practices.

**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: Implementation science refers to the “methods or techniques used to enhance the adoption, implementation, and sustainability” of a program or practice (Eccles & Mittman, 2006). The Implementation 161 Part B Science Framework provides methods and strategies to facilitate quality implementation and use of evidence-based practices. The SSIP utilizes the resources created by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) housed at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The State Leadership Team strengthens state-level infrastructure and LEAs implement EBPs using an implementation science framework. At the LEA level, implementation teams are formed, training on the Framework is provided by SSIP staff.

•Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Administrator Calls

•Tools Used: NIRN Initiative Inventory, Communication Plan Template, Implementation Drivers, Action Plan, Implementation Stages, and Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA)

•Data collected: Attendance, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials

•Impact on the SiMR: Through the use of Implementation Science, LEAs review the health of their reading programs and make necessary changes in instructional practices and district policies to improve reading outcomes for students.

(2) LEAs utilize the EBPs within implementation science to focus on improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle is the EBP the SSIP has identified as a vehicle for change within the LEA system.

Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up (Cohorts in years 2, 3, and 4) LEAs utilize the EBPs within implementation science with a focus on improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle is the EBP the project has identified as a vehicle for change within the LEA and building systems. Building teams complete the PDSA cycle at least annually upon completion of their MTSS-R review. SSIP staff provide TA during monthly administrator calls and In-District Visits to support their understanding of the process and promote effective implementation of the practices.

•Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Administrator Calls

•Tools Used: Action Plan worksheet

•Data collected: Attendance, completed and submitted Action Plan, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials

•Impact on the SiMR: Through the use of a continuous improvement cycle, LEA and building leadership teams can track their progress in the implementation of evidence-based practices, use of student data to make decisions, improve the delivery of explicit instruction, align instruction across all tiers, and other LEA-identified priorities. All of these activities improve outcomes for students.

(3) IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide: The Institute of Education Sciences Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade provides four recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills. The practice guide was developed utilizing rigorous research to provide specific recommendations for teaching reading. The evidence-based recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills include: Recommendation 1 – Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language and vocabulary knowledge; Recommendation 2 – Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters; Recommendation 3 – Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words; and Recommendation 4 – Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide. SSIP instructional staff and coaches are trained on the EBPs outlined in the IES Foundational Skills Guide. This training is provided every year for schools in the Readiness year during the Fall Institute, as well as through an online course designed to support instructional staff to implement early reading EBPs in the classroom. All instructional staff and coaches complete twenty modules in two parts over the span of the school year during the Readiness year. Completion, knowledge gain, and satisfaction are measured for each module to ensure the SSIP provides training that supports improved implementation of EBPs in reading. A hybrid version of the module course is available for teachers and coaches entering the project after the initial Readiness year. This accommodates staff turnover, allowing new staff to gain the knowledge of the EBPs and participate fully in the project, since the original course is completed only during the Readiness year. Each subsequent year during the Fall Institute, instructional and coaching staff receive PD specific to the recommendations outlined in the IES Practice Guide.

•Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, Collaborative Calls for instructional staff and coaches, online PD

•Tools Used: Contracted reading specialists, synchronous and asynchronous trainings, website to house resources, Fall Institute

•Data collected: Attendance, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials, HQPD Observation Checklist

•Impact on the SiMR: Providing quality professional development and resources to support instructional staff's knowledge, skills, and abilities to deliver explicit instruction specific to the foundations of reading has a positive impact on student outcomes.

(4) Instructional Coaching: LEAs/schools implement instructional coaching practices to support growth at the classroom level for students with disabilities. Instructional coaches participate in training to improve their knowledge and skills in both explicit instruction and instructional coaching. To improve their knowledge and skills around explicit instruction in reading, LEA-identified coaches attend training during the Fall Institute specific to their year in the project. During the Readiness Year coaches focus on the foundational skills of reading; Implementation Year focuses on data decision making; Sustainability Year focuses on vocabulary instruction; and the Scale-Up Year addresses reading comprehension. They also participate in training on the RESET Comprehensive Decoding Rubric, a tool the SSIP uses to assess instructional staff's fidelity of implementation of explicit instruction. This training helps coaches understand what high-quality explicit instruction practices look like and helps guide their action planning and coaching with teachers. Training focused on improving coaching practices is delivered in a three-year cycle each December. Each year the SSIP has a specific coaching focus on Jim Knight's coaching practices.

•Activities/Strategies: Fall and Spring Institute, Coaching PD (years 2, 3, and 4), In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Administrator Calls, online PD,

•Tools Used: Contracted consultants, synchronous and asynchronous training, website to house resources 163 Part B  
•Data collected: Attendance, survey data, meeting minutes, training materials, observations of coaches, RESET Rubric ratings, coaching platform data  
Impact on the SiMR: Providing quality professional development and resources to develop and support instructional coaches' knowledge, skills, and abilities helps teachers improve their delivery of reading instruction. This, in turn, improves student outcomes.

(5) Explicit Instruction: Tool character limits did not allow for a description of how the Explicit Instruction evidence-based practice is intended to impact the SiMR. For the full summary, go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-State-Performance-Plan/FFY-2021-State-Performance-Plan-Annual-Performance-Report-Indicator-17-SSIP.pdf>

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

Idaho monitors fidelity of implementation on multiple levels; at the state, building and classroom levels. Below is a description of the instruments and processes used to monitor fidelity and a summary of the data collected in FFY 2021.

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

As a SPDG grantee, Idaho is required to complete the SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components worksheet annually to submit with the annual performance report (APR) in May. The SPDG State Leadership Team completed the worksheet from January through April 2022. The worksheet includes 16 components of high-quality professional development including personnel selection, quality of trainings, coaching, data systems and systemic leadership supports. The State Leadership Team developed an action plan for improving gaps in implementation and will continue assessing and updating the action plan.

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

The MTSS-R Checklist and Action Planning Tool was developed by the National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL). It is an evaluation, prioritization and planning tool that is utilized by building leadership teams to assess their school infrastructure to support high-quality reading instruction for all students. Annually, building leadership teams complete the Checklist and prioritization process and develop an improvement plan. Teams use the data from the Checklist and action plan monthly during leadership team meetings along with a Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycle to update their action plans to continuously improve their implementation. The State Leadership Team uses the data to monitor building, cohort and project-level systems improvements. FFY 2021 was the second year that Idaho used the MTSS-R Checklist. The Checklist is divided into 5 elements. NCIL updated the Checklist during the previous year, adding an additional element and modifying some of the existing indicators. The elements are as follows: Element 1: Core Reading Instruction and Intervention, Element 2: Data Use, Element 3: Professional Development and Coaching, Element 4: MTSS-R School Leadership, Element 5: Mutual Support Involving Families and the School. Each element is further broken down into sections and individual indicators. Building leadership teams completed the Checklist and Action Planning Tool at the Fall Institute in August 2021. The average percentage of items implemented is reported below for each element.

Element 1: Core Reading Instruction and Intervention; 60%

Element 2: Data Use; 41%

Element 3: Professional Development and Coaching; 33%

Element 4: MTSS-R School Leadership; 49%

Element 5: Mutual Support Involving Families and the School; 42%

Classroom-level fidelity of explicit instruction assessment using the Recognizing Effective Special Education Teachers (RESET) Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (RESET Rubric) and surveys

The RESET Rubric was developed under a grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education Institute for Education Sciences (IES). The Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (CDR) evaluates the teacher's implementation of a comprehensive decoding lesson taught using explicit, systematic instruction. In a comprehensive decoding lesson, the focus is on the instruction and practice of accurate sound-symbol correspondence, word reading, encoding and reading connected text. The RESET Rubric consists of 7 components made up of 18 individual practices. In the SSIP project, instructional staff are required to record videos of their classroom instruction, review the video and self-reflect using the RESET Rubric. They then submit the video to their LEA instructional coach in a virtual coaching platform, newly implemented in FFY 2021. The coach views the video and completes a RESET Rubric to assess implementation fidelity and sends the ratings back to the instructional staff in the virtual coaching platform. The coach and instructional staff develop an action plan collaboratively that they review and update monthly. A full RESET Rubric is completed twice per year, in the fall and spring, to assess improvement in implementation fidelity. The State Leadership Team collects the RESET Rubric data from LEA coaches and summarizes the data to identify areas where participants might benefit from targeted training and to monitor improvement in implementation fidelity at the building, LEA, cohort and project levels.

In FFY 2021, collecting high-quality and complete RESET Rubric data proved challenging. With the support of the SPDG funds, the State Leadership Team was able to partner with a vendor to provide a virtual coaching platform to facilitate the video recording and coaching process and to automate RESET Rubric data collection. Implementation of the virtual platform was launched in fall 2021. The State Leadership Team provided training and technical assistance in the Fall Institute and throughout the year. As with any new technology or intervention, uptake of the platform was slow during the 2021-22 school year and no coaches sent RESET Rubric ratings in the system to their instructional staff. Therefore, the internal evaluator did not receive any RESET Rubric ratings from instructional coaches. However, The State Leadership Team partnered with the Lee Pesky Learning Center (LPLC) to conduct external observations of teachers' videos using the RESET Rubric. LPLC is a non-profit educational consultancy company that partnered with Boise State University in developing the RESET Rubric. The State Leadership Team asked instructional staff to submit videos to LPLC for the external observation and rubric rating. In spring 2022, 5 instructional staff submitted videos that met all the criteria to be able to be scored. RESET Rubric targets were 40% implemented for those in Implementation cohort and 80% implemented for those in Sustainability cohort. Four out of five instructional staff met the target that corresponded with the cohort they were in. In FFY 2022, the State Leadership Team provided more training and technical assistance, developed resources, and improved processes to ensure better quality data submission in the future.

The State Leadership Team also collected data on participants perceptions of their growth in knowledge and skills related to explicit delivery of foundational skills reading instruction. In the End of Year Survey sent to participants in May 2022, instructional staff were asked to rate their skill level at the beginning and end of the year on the following objectives: (1) delivering instruction on the Foundational Reading Skills, and (2) using explicit instruction strategies when teaching reading. 24 teachers responded to the questions and response percentages were as follows:

(1) delivering instruction on the Foundational Reading Skills

Beginning of the year – 8% Novice, 25% Advanced Beginner, 46% Competent, 21% Proficient, 0% Expert (21% proficient or above)

End of the year – 4% Novice, 13% Advanced Beginner, 29% Competent, 50% Proficient, 4% Expert (54% proficient or above)

(2) using explicit instruction strategies when teaching reading

Beginning of the year – 8% Novice, 29% Advanced Beginner, 46% Competent, 17% Proficient, 0% Expert (17% proficient or above)

End of the year – 0% Novice, 17% Advanced Beginner, 29% Competent, 50% Proficient, 4% Expert (54% proficient or above)

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

Tool character limits did not allow for a complete description of data collected to monitor the fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

For the complete list of measurements used and data collected, go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-State-Performance-Plan/FFY-2021-State-Performance-Plan-Annual-Performance-Report-Indicator-17-SSIP.pdf>

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

The State Leadership Team collects various data for progress monitoring and continuous improvement of the SSIP evidence-based practices. The results of the progress monitoring support the state's decision to continue the ongoing use of the previously identified evidence-based practices. The data collection instruments, processes and data summaries are described below.

#### Student progress monitoring Idaho Reading Indicator

The SSIP State Leadership Team monitored progress of student outcomes on a monthly basis using data from the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI). The IRI is an early reading screener and diagnostic assessment administered in the fall and spring to students in kindergarten through 3rd grade. The Special Education Department analyzed these data to assess LEA progress toward targets and provided LEAs with IRI reports with data from the 2020-2021 school year at the Fall 2021 Data Drill Down. These reports contained charts and tables disaggregated by student demographics including race/ethnicity, special education status, grade, and reading subskill. Additionally, LEAs were able to use the IRI as an informal progress monitoring tool at any time and the majority of SSIP LEAs used it as such. The SSIP internal evaluator obtained the informal, uncleaned progress monitoring data at the beginning of each month for the month prior, aggregated the data to the building, LEA, cohort and project levels, and used it for state-level program planning and estimating progress toward the SiMR. For example, when State Leadership Team members identified that the Text Fluency subskill of the IRI was an area where students were underperforming, they met with the SSIP literacy consultants and developed material and training to address the issue during the Spring Institute. The consultants also used the school-level IRI reports to target specific reading subskills during their In-District visits with schools in February 2022. The consultants provided specific technical assistance and coaching to help teachers improve their reading instruction delivery in the subskill areas where their students were underperforming.

#### SSIP participant progress monitoring

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

An important part of the SSIP training for instructional staff and coaches is the ECRI online training modules. The purpose of these modules is for participants to increase their knowledge and ability to deliver effective instruction to students when teaching reading. The State Leadership Team collects progress monitoring data on participants' completion and learning. Participants complete a short survey after finishing each module. The survey asks questions related to the quality of the training and participant satisfaction, as well as their perceptions around how they've increased their understanding of the course content and ability to implement it. The State Leadership Team tracks the completion progress of participants as they work their way through the modules and analyzes the survey data to better understand how participants perceive their improvements. The State Leadership Team reviewed the survey data for each module with the consultants who created the modules. The qualitative responses were especially helpful in determining what the issues were with the modules. When issues were reported in the survey, the training developers took action to fix them. 45 SSIP participants completed at least the first 10 online training modules (Part I) and 27 of those completed the whole 20 module series during FFY 2021. 84% (n=898) of Part I survey respondents reported satisfaction with the training modules. 26% (n=279) of respondents said that they understood how to teach the big idea or strategy of the module before the training (proficient or expert on a 5-point scale of novice, beginner, competent, proficient, expert), which increased to 57% (603) after the training. In regards to their ability to utilize the big idea or strategy from the module in their instruction, 27% (288) said they were able to utilize the big idea or strategy before the training compared to 56% (n=594) after the training. Regarding Part II, 91% (n=461) of survey respondents reported satisfaction with the training modules. 25% (n=127) of respondents said that they understood how to teach the big idea or strategy of the module before the training (proficient or expert on a 5-point scale of novice, beginner, competent, proficient, expert), which increased to 54% (273) after the training. In regards to their ability to utilize the big idea or strategy from the module in their instruction, 25% (127) said they were able to utilize the big idea or strategy before the training compared to 56% (n=283) after the training.

#### Post-training surveys

##### Fall Institute Post-Training Survey

The Fall Institute is the SSIP training kick off in which LEA and school SSIP participants learn the evidence-based practices associated with their role and year in the project. The training is delivered over multiple days and using both in-person and virtual formats. Teams come together to complete the MTSS-R Checklist for the school year and then participate in various other trainings on evidence-based practices according to their role. After the training, the State Leadership Team sends the participants a post-training survey which asks questions about their satisfaction with the training and improvements in knowledge and abilities around the evidence-based practices. The survey responses are used to better understand in which areas the trainings need improvement and to develop an improvement plan. Below are survey response data on participants' satisfaction and self-perceived learning acquired as a result of the Fall Institute trainings.

Percent satisfied with each Fall Institute session:

- MTSS-R: 104/125, 82%
- Reading Content sessions: Foundational Skills (28/29, 97%), Data Based Decision Making (18/18, 100%), Vocabulary (6/6, 100%)
- RESET sessions: Foundational Skills (5/6, 83%), Data Based Decision Making (13/14, 93%), Vocabulary (no responses)
- Leading by Convening: (12/14, 86%)
- Serving on Groups (17/17, 100%)

Percent that increased skills as a result of the training (LT=learning target):

- MTSS-R (LT1 103/125, 90%; LT2 118/125, 94%; LT3 112/124, 90%; LT4 112/124, 90%; LT5 111/124, 88%)
- Reading Content sessions: Foundational Skills (LT1 28/29, 97%; LT2 28/29, 97%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 18/18, 100%), Vocabulary (LT1 6/6, 100%)
- RESET sessions: Foundational Skills (LT1 6/6, 100%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 13/14, 93%; LT2 14/14, 100%), Vocabulary (no responses)
- Leading by Convening (LT1 12/14, 86%; LT2 12/14, 86%; LT3 11/14, 79%)
- Serving on Groups (LT1 13/17, 76%; LT2 14/17, 82%; LT3 17/17, 100%; LT4 14/17, 82%; LT5 15/17, 88%)

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 trainings were reviewed and modified.

Tool character limits did not allow for a complete description of additional data. For the complete description, including data from the Coaching Training Survey, Spring Institute Post-Training Survey, In-District Visit Surveys, Librarian Training Survey, and End of Year Survey go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-State-Performance-Plan/FFY-2021-State-Performance-Plan-Annual-Performance-Report-Indicator-17-SSIP.pdf>.

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

1 Implementation Science Framework: The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support building leadership teams in implementing evidence-based practices, reviewing and revising their MTSS-R process, and supporting instructional staff to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.

2 Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA) The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support building leadership teams to identify areas of need through the MTSS-R process and create and implement a continuous improvement cycle to support instructional staff to close the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.

a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:

i. Addition of a mid-year call with schools and the National Center for Improving Literacy to monitor 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. Create a padlet for each year of the project to post the monthly resources presented at monthly instructional/coaching calls, including recordings of the calls for staff that are unable to attend live.
    - ii. Continuously evaluate and improve the trainings and TA provided by the SSIP
  - b. Anticipated Outcomes:
    - i. Utilizing a designated website organizes the resources and makes accessing materials easy.
- 4 Instructional Coaching:
- a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:
    - i. Develop and be prepared to deliver a more robust coaching platform training.
    - ii. Work with individual LEAs/schools when necessary to understand and utilize the coaching platform to support coaching activities.
  - b. Anticipated Outcomes
    - i. Addition of robust training on the use of the virtual coaching platform instructional staff will receive synchronous and asynchronous coaching to improve reading outcomes for students.
- 5 Explicit Instruction:
- a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR
    - i. Support LEAs that have teachers in the SMART Project and align to SSIP activities.
    - ii. Incorporate the new Idaho Dyslexia Legislation training and professional development into SSIP activities.
  - b. Anticipated Outcomes
    - i. Better coherence between the ISDE's two PD initiatives that focus on early reading
    - ii. Ensure that teachers meet Dyslexia Legislation requirements through participation in the SSIP. This will decrease teachers' frustration with having to participate in multiple trainings with very similar content.

**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.**

Additional activities and strategies are mentioned in previous sections. During FFY 2021 we continuously modified SSIP activities, strategies, and timelines based on quantitative and qualitative data we collected through our comprehensive data collection and analysis system. Information collected through our comprehensive data collection and analysis system resulted in making small adjustments to best meet the needs of LEAs and stakeholders. The stakeholders who provided information and data are listed in the next section.

Some of the changes to activities, strategies and timelines are listed below.

**Timeline Changes**

1. Changed dates of Fall Institute to not conflict with the Idaho Superintendents' Conference
2. Visited first-year elementary school principals in the spring before starting implementation in August

**Justification for Timeline Changes**

1. In the previous year, the SSIP Fall Institute conflicted with the Idaho Superintendents' Conference resulting in administrators and special education directors not attending the MTSS-R training with the LEA/school team. The SSIP State Leadership Team swapped the Instructional PD days to the first week in August and moved the MTSS-R training to the second week. Adjusting the calendar of events resulted in complete teams attending the Fall Institute together.
2. In the previous submission, the newly identified LEAs were visited virtually by one of the contracted state coaches. Members of the SSIP State Leadership Team met with each new elementary school principal and special education director in the spring before starting in August. Meeting in person allowed the State Leadership Team to share the expectations of the project, answer questions, and individualize the supports that would be necessary to ensure success.

**Activity Changes**

1. Planned for alignment of the SMART/Cultivating Readers pilot LEAs
2. Built in coaching platform check-ins during collaboration calls
3. All participants signed an agreement to complete all required SSIP activities.
4. Began using new data collection instruments (e.g., Virtual Facilitation Checklist, Coaching Fidelity of Implementation Tool (C-LIFT))

**Justification for change**

1. To coordinate across ISDE Content Department and Special Education Department initiatives, the SSIP Leadership team aligned project activities with the new Content Department SMART initiative. It provided teachers who were participating in both initiatives to minimize duplicative work.
2. To ensure coaches and instructional staff understood how to utilize the coaching platform, specific TA was built into each of the instructional collaboration calls.
3. In an effort to improve completion of SSIP activities, fidelity of implementation, and data submission, all SSIP participants were asked to sign an agreement to continue receiving fiscal support for their participation.
4. The new tools were used to evaluate aspects of the project that were not formerly evaluated. By collecting evaluation data on these activities, the State Leadership Team was able to target areas for improvement.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

**Description of Stakeholder Input**

- 1) Special Education Advisory Groups
  - a) Directors Advisory Council (DAC)
  - b) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- 2) SSIP participants
  - a) Special education director meetings
  - b) Parent group meetings
  - c) District Leadership meetings
  - d) Individual SSIP participants
- 3) SSIP partners
  - 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
- 4) ISDE collaboration
- a) Coordination with Idaho SMART project
- b) STAT team

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

Idaho engaged diverse stakeholders representing a wide range of perspectives. Stakeholders were engaged on various levels, depending on their background and depth of knowledge of the SSIP work. Stakeholders informed and provided input to the SSIP State Leadership Team on how to overcome challenges, improve implementation of evidence-based practices, improve the evaluation and address gaps in the SSIP project through the SPDG application. The State Leadership Team co-created content and project activities with the stakeholders who had more in-depth understanding and experience with the project on a transforming level of engagement. Below are details of the specific strategies the State Leadership Team used to engage each set of stakeholders. The levels on which the State Leadership Team engaged each group of stakeholders has been included next to each set.

1) Special Education Advisory Groups - (Networking)

- a) DAC
- b) SEAP

The State Leadership Team met with the special education advisory groups on a quarterly basis during half or full day meetings scheduled through the special education department and used various strategies for engagement. Some of the strategies included presenting information or project data to inform on the current status of the work, presenting barriers or challenges and asking for input on how to overcome them, and sharing evaluation data collected from SSIP participants and eliciting ideas for continuous improvement.

2) SSIP participants – (Collaborating and Transforming):

- a) Special education director meetings
- b) Parent group meetings
- c) District Leadership meetings
- d) Individual SSIP participants

On a monthly basis, the State Leadership Team or SSIP partners met with SSIP participants to review project data, discuss progress on building leadership team goals (e.g., Special education directors meeting address implementation of MTSS-R goals and action plans), asked specific questions to pinpoint areas of success and challenges, worked through a continuous improvement cycle, and evaluated fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices. SSIP Participants received PD and TA throughout the year. Upon completion of each PD or TA visit a survey was sent out to gather input on how to improve the activities implemented through the SSIP. The State Leadership Team and SSIP partners reviewed survey data and developed an action plan to improve support.

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

SSIP partners are government agencies, universities, non-profits and private companies who work with the State Leadership Team to develop and improve the SSIP supports. The State Leadership Team met one-on-one on at least a quarterly basis with each of the partners listed above. Engagement activities included jointly developing a scope of work for the partner to carry out during the course of the year, debriefing trainings that took place by reviewing participant data collected via surveys and training observation data to come up with an action plan for improvement, discussing feedback the partners had collected from SSIP participants during any events they facilitated and coming to consensus on how to address the feedback, and reviewing project implementation or outcome data to collaborate and plan for next steps.

4) ISDE collaboration (Informing to Transforming)

- a) Coordination with Idaho SMART project
- b) State Technical Assistance Team (STAT Team)

The State Leadership Team worked interdepartmentally to be informed of other ISDE professional development initiatives and to build cohesion among them. The ISDE Content and Curriculum Department launched its K-3 reading project Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART) in conjunction with the first annual K-3 Reading Summit. SMART is a multiyear cohort project that provides training and coaching to K-3 educators across Idaho. The SSIP State Leadership team in collaboration with the SMART Director developed a plan for supporting SSIP schools whose teachers were interested in participating in the SMART project. The collaboration will provide instructional staff with additional options to improve reading outcomes for students. Additionally, the SSIP evaluator participated as a member of the STAT Team, an advisory group led by the Federal Programs Department to improve implementation of the school improvement efforts required under ESEA. The SSIP evaluator represented the activities and needs of the SSIP in STAT meetings.

**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 stakeholders' concerns through surveys, during meetings, in-district visits, and other forms of communication. The State Leadership Team looked at challenges and concerns through the lens of "technical" or "adaptive" challenges. Technical challenges were addressed through problem-solving and sharing experience from other members of the SSIP project. Adaptive challenges required meeting with the specific group and looking for ways to come to a consensus on an acceptable solution. Staff turnover continued to be the biggest challenge. The State Leadership Team worked with each partner differently to address staff turnover. Some school teams were able to utilize SSIP-developed sustainable resources to train new staff. Other school teams chose not to advance to the next year of the project because they viewed the scope of the challenge as insurmountable.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SIMR.**

All activities are addressed in previous sections.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

See previous sections.

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

Idaho has not identified any new barriers that have not been addressed in prior sections. The ISDE Leadership Team will monitor all activities, implementation, and data collection to determine if additional supports are needed.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

The current theory of action. <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/Idaho-StateSystematic-Improvement-Plan-Theory-of-Action.pdf>

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report tool character limits did not allow for a complete description of multiple sections of Idaho's Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan. For a complete description without impact from character limits, see the accessible PDF copy of Idaho's FFY 2021 Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan initial submission at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/files/2021-2022-State-Performance-Plan/FFY-2021-State-Performance-Plan-Annual-Performance-Report-Indicator-17-SSIP.pdf>.

## **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **17 - OSEP Response**

## **17 - 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:**

Julie A Mead

#### **Title:**

Interim Director of Special Education

#### **Email:**

jmead@sde.idaho.gov

#### **Phone:**

2083326806

#### **Submitted on:**

04/27/23 11:47:47 AM