ID
Part B

FFY2014
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report (Submitted February 2016)

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

158

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

Introduction

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

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

1. The SDE has in place general supervision policies, procedures and practices which provided leadership and guidance to LEAs through technical assistance and relationship building for the purpose of helping LEAs achieve high-quality implementation of educational programs to increase student achievement and functional outcomes for children with disabilities while balancing those results with the compliance requirements of IDEA.

2. If the performance of a LEA did not meet the State targets, the SDE provided technical assistance and support to LEAs from SDE central office staff, special education regional coordinators and contractors and addressed the identified deficiencies.

3. When issues of noncompliance were identified as "findings," the SDE tracked the process of correcting those "findings" via the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). The SDE ensured that issues of LEA noncompliance were corrected as soon as possible, but in no case, later than 365 days after the receipt of the State's notice of identification of "findings." The SDE implemented OSEP's 09-02 memo when verifying correction of noncompliance by applying two tests - prongs 1 and 2:

Prong 1 – the LEA 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.

Prong 2 – the LEA corrects each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the

jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

B. The Idaho State Department of Education's Dispute Resolution Program:

Program Description: Several mechanisms were available through the State Department of Education (SDE) to assist in resolving IDEA disputes. These processes were: facilitation, informal conflict resolution, mediation, state complaints, due process hearings, and expedited due process hearings. The Dispute Resolution office had a team of 18 contractors and three hearing officers to manage the caseload for Idaho. Idaho made a concerted effort to promote early dispute resolution processes in an effort to resolve disputes at the least adversarial level appropriate. Contractors and hearing officers were assigned on a rotational basis and were trained by the SDE Dispute Resolution office.

Facilitations accounted for the majority (78%) of the caseload in dispute resolution. Idaho had 168 facilitation requests in 2014-15 with 127 facilitations held (increase of 20% over 2013-2014) at 91% agreement rate. This compares to 21 mediations requested with 14 held, and 27 state complaints filed with 18 investigated in 2014-2015.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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.

Technical Assistance System: The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs;

A. Technical Assistance Provided by the Idaho SDE to LEAs:

Instructional webinars were made available at the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website on a variety of special education topics including Alternate Assessments, Accessible Instructional Materials, Assistive Technology, Charter Schools, Early Childhood, Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind, English Language Learners, IDEA Dispute Resolution, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, School-based Medicaid, Secondary Transitions, Specific Learning Disability and Idaho's Continuous Improvement Monitoring System. In addition, on the SDE's website informative and instructive documents and forms were posted, which also included the Idaho State Special Education Manual. Special Education Division personnel in the SDE office and in regional field offices provided technical assistance on a case-by-case basis to answer queries from LEAs, parents, and other individuals via phone, and email. The SDE develops technical assistance trainings for statewide initiatives, Corrective Action Plans, and LEA program requests.

B. Technical Assistance provided by Idaho SDE – Special Education Division for special educators throughout the State of Idaho in the following areas:

1. **New Teaching Trainings –** Regional trainings were held for new special education teachers each year. These trainings provided participants with: resources and supports, a review and discussion of IDEA compliance requirements, examples of compliance for practice, and an opportunity for networking, questions, and reflection.

2. **Secondary Transition Training –** Regional trainings were held for special education teachers working with Secondary Students transitioning from school to higher education or to vocational training. These trainings provided participants with skills and knowledge required for writing high quality transition IEPs that are compliant with the requirements of Indicator 13. Resources were provided including occupational interest scales and other tools to help students and IEP teams develop Individual Transition Plans (ITPs) that ensure a student's prospect for quality post school outcomes.

3. **Early Childhood Training –** Regional trainings were held for special education teachers working with children in early childhood programs and children transitioning into elementary LEAs. These trainings provided participants with: a review of federal reporting and compliance requirements, essential knowledge to build high quality and compliant early childhood IEPs, increased skills and accuracy for integrating the ECO process into the IEP process, sample documents and resources, and an opportunity for practice and reflection.

4. **Aligning IEPs to the Common Core Training** – Regional trainings were held for special education teachers on how to Align IEP goals to the Common Core. These trainings provided participants with information and resources for: incorporating appropriate supports and accommodations in the IEP to meet student needs and enable access to the general education curriculum, aligning goals with grade-level academic standards to facilitate student attainment of grade-level academic standards, delivering high-quality, evidence-based, individualized instruction, providing lessons with a Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and assistive technology (along with accessible instructional materials) to ensure access (if needed).

5. **Technical Assistance is provided to the following Stakeholder's Boards, Commissions, Councils, Divisions, and Committees -** The Idaho State Department of Education – Special Education Division provided technical assistance, and collaboration with stakeholders which is not limited to but includes: The Special Education Director's Advisory Council, The Special Education Advisory Panel, Idaho Parents Unlimited, The Vocational Rehabilitation Agency, The Idaho Professional Technical Division, The Idaho Council for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, The Idaho Council for the Blind and Visually Impaired, The Idaho Education Services for the Deaf and Blind, The Education Translators Certification Board, Community Center Boards, Disability Rights of Idaho, The Disability Coordinators for Institutions of Higher Learning, The Idaho Department of Labor, The Idaho Council for Developmental Disabilities (Employment First Initiative), The Specific Learning Disability Executive Leadership Committee, The Charter School Commission, The Charter School Network, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare – Medicaid Division, and The Early Childhood Council.

. C. Technical Assistance is also provided by the Idaho SDE – Special Education Division through Focus Visits in Collaboration with the School Improvement and Support Division:

1. The Idaho State Department of Education – Special Education Division, in collaboration with the School

Improvement and Support Division, strategically partnered with district and school leaders to create an aligned, coherent, and coordinated education system focused on common goals around improving learning and achievement outcomes for all children.

2. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) requires every state to have "a statewide system of intensive and sustained support and improvement for LEAs" that ensures the necessary supports are in place at every level of the educational system so students are getting the help they need to reach their full potential. Idaho's School Improvement and Support focused on the instructional core; teachers and students in the presence of content. While the focus is ultimately on the instructional core, research on school and district improvement emphasizes the importance and complexity of the many influences upon LEAs. As such, it is critical that our School Improvment and Support provides assistance in all of these components of the LEA's system including special education.

   Joining together with the School Improvement and Support Division, to provide onsite focus visits for systemic improvement, provided a range of services that touch upon the many layers within the system, such as the Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) Project, parent and community involvement, implementation of Response to Intervention (RTI), Superintendents Network of Support, and LEA Special Education Programs.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

Professional Development 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;

A. **Professional Development Opportunities were made available through the Center of Disabilities and Human Development, University of Idaho, 875 Perimeter Drive MS 4061, Moscow, ID 83844-4061, Phone: (208) 885-6132, Fax: (208) 885-6145, (funded through special education grants through the Idaho State Department of Education – Special Education Division):**

The Center of Disabilities and Human Developement supported the following:

1. **Autism Supports:**

   Autism Suports is designed to improve educational services to children with Autism by building the capacity of school personnel and teams to assess, set goals, determine placement, and implement instructional strategies and supports across a variety of environments within the school.

2. **The Idaho Assistive Technology Project:**

   The Idaho Assistive Technology Project (IATP) is a federally funded program administered by the Center on Disabilities and Human Development at the University of Idaho. The goal of the IATP is to increase the availability of assistive technology devices and services for older persons and Idahoans with disabilities.

3. **Idaho AT4All:**

The website lists a variety of used equipment available for sale, give-away or loan, including wheelchairs & scooters, walkers, personal care items, items for vision and hearing impairments, hospital beds, computers, adapted vehicles, and more!

4. **Idaho Training Clearinghouse:**

   The Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC), a website listing all current special education related trainings across the state, is sponsored by the Idaho State Department of Education to link special educators and parents of students with disabilities with training opportunities across multiple agencies and parent groups. There are numerous archived webinars covering a large variety of special education subjects available for use in professional development.

B. Professional Development Opportunities available through the Idaho Results Center, Boise State University, Ron and Linda Yanke Family Research Park 220 E. Parkcenter Blvd., Boise, ID 83706-3940 (funded through special education grants through the Idaho State Department of Education – Special Education Division) .

The Idaho Results Center supported the following statewide initiatives through training

and technical assistance:

§ Special Education Support & Technical Assistance (SESTA)

§ Special Education New Teacher Orientation and Training

§ Advanced Tiered Academic Trainings

The Idaho Results Center also:

§ Standardizes training delivery, content, etc. across Idaho.

§ Delivers technical assistance via a "Train the Trainer" model for special education personnel.

§ Provides technical assistance for statewide initiatives.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: ☑ apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

For this February 2016 submission of Idaho's SPP/APR, input was solicited from a variety of stakeholders. The Idaho Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3) (combined with parents of preschoolers), the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) (including community partners), individuals with disabilities, higher education, the Idaho Parent Information Center, and the Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC) all took an active role in the development of this SPP/APR, and provided the SDE with quality input on improving performance in a number of the indicator areas.

Planning sessions were held with the Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) personnel including the Special Education Director and all Special Education Coordinators. Indicators and required measurement methods were discussed and indicators assigned to individual coordinators and specialists as related to areas of expertise and assignment within the Division of Special Education. This internal team comprised of staff with data analysis expertise and content area expertise in each area discussed criteria for measurable and rigorous targets and improvement activities. This team drafted the

SPP/APR using this information. The draft, along with the raw data, was presented to stakeholder groups for input on all content targets and improvement activities.

In addition, collaborative discussions across all SDE Divisions ensured that the SDE Strategic Plan and all Leadership Team activities were incorporated into the SPP as appropriate. The Assessment and Accountability Division, Content Division, Elementary & Secondary Education Act Division, School Improvement and Support Division, Student Engagement & Postsecondary Readiness Division, and Information Technology Division joined the Special Education Division in conducting data and infrastructure analysis.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Idaho reported annually (in February) to the public on the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the SPP and the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP. Idaho's Annual Performance Report (APR) was posted on the State website at: http://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/.

In February, reports on the performance of each district against the state targets were posted at: http://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/. Notification of the posting was disseminated through the SDE Quality Assurance & Reporting Coordinator's monthly email. In addition, a formal, annual report was made available to the Idaho State Board of Education, LEA superintendents, special education directors, school boards, the Special Education Advisory Panel, the Idaho Interagency Secondary Council, and at conferences and meetings that occured throughout the year.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥				10.50%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data		15.30%	72.30%	72.40%	86.50%	88.80%	89.20%	87.30%	74.30%	73.77%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,159	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	1,957	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	59.22%	Calculate

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
1,159	1,957	73.77%	90.00%	59.22%

Explanation of Slippage

The 2013-14 school year marks the first year Idaho used the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b). A four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is defined as:

- The number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who entered high school four years earlier, while adjusting for transfer students, those students who emigrated or are deceased.

Under the previous graduation rate calculations, Idaho had a graduation rate target of 90%. Idaho's ESEA Waiver was approved in 2015 and Idaho was given an extension on the ESEA Waiver to develop new graduation targets.

The new four-year adjusted cohort has negatively impacted our special education graduation rate since it now requires students to complete their high school education and receive their diploma in four years. Students receiving special education services have the opportunity to attend high school until the semester of their 21st birthday. Consequently, students in the 18-21 year old program appear not to have graduated, resulting in a lower number of graduates reported. With the passing of ESSA, Idaho will be setting long-term goals which will include graduation rate under the four-year adjusted cohort calculations. Idaho's implementation of the new accountability system, with new targets, will take place after the 2017 spring tests used in the 2017-2018 school ratings.

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

The conditions that Idaho youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma (for students who enter high school at the 9th grade level in Fall 2009 or later) include 29 credits for core instruction, 17 credits for electives, a Post Secondary Readiness Plan completed at the end of 8th grade, and a score of proficient or advanced in reading, math, and language usage on the Idaho State Achievement Test. In addition, Idaho allows for an alternate mechanism, to be used for all students, if they do not achieve a score of proficient or advanced in reading, math, and language usage, however, they must follow an appeal procedure in their local school district. The alternate mechanism or alternate pathway must meet IDAPA Rules Governing Thoroughness 08.02.03 in which 90% of the criteria of the measure(s) must be based on academic proficiency and performance, the measure(s) must be aligned to a minimum of 10th grade content standards and aligned to subject matter, and the measure(s) must be valid and reliable. For students with disabilities on IEPs, in order to meet their individual needs to demonstrate achievement, if accommodations or adaptations are made to the District and State's regular graduation requirement, including the Idaho State Achievement Test, the IEP team shall document them in the IEP.

College Entrance Exam:

All students must take one (1) of the following college entrance examinations before the end of the student's eleventh-grade year: COMPASS, ACT or SAT.

Senior Project:

All students must complete a senior project by the end of grade twelve (12).

Condition to graduate on an IEP route to graduate:

certificate is granted to students without disabilities. Graduation criteria established by the IEP team is only available for a student with an IEP. Students who will meet graduation requirements through an individualized plan for graduation developed by the IEP team will include the plan in the student's IEP. The IEP team specifically addresses completion of the student's secondary program by adapting the course content, course objectives, instructional strategies, grading, and assessments, and/or identifying alternate methods for demonstrating competence. The student's plan for graduation must include at least one evaluation measure in the core academic area(s.) The plan must also include a description of the student's participation in statewide assessments. The plan may also use other indicators to support the identified method of evaluation when determining the graduation requirements for individual students receiving special education services. Students who graduate on this plan will receive a regular diploma per Idaho code, however, they will be reported as a non-graduate for accountability purposes.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤				2.40%	2.40%	2.20%	2.20%	2.10%	2.10%	5.08%
Data		0.54%	2.97%	2.60%	2.30%	1.40%	1.20%	1.50%	3.60%	5.08%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.58%	4.08%	3.58%	3.08%	2.58%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Dropout rates are reported annually to school districts. In their monitoring self-assessment process, Districts must explore the root cause of dropout rates that fail to meet the state goal and write an improvement plan to address the underlying issues. These plans may be revised annually, as needed, based on new data.

Input was gathered from a variety of stakeholders. The Special Education Advisory Panel, including a wide array of stakeholders, received a presentation and report on all indicators in the Fall meeting. Discussion and input followed. Dropout rates and technical assistance brainstorming also was accomplished during the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition meeting Spring 2014. Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) includes representatives from: Department of Labor, Assistive Technology Project, Idaho Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired, District High School Transition Teacher, District Special Education Director, Disability Services from state universities, and community colleges, Professional Technological Education, Department of Corrections, Juvenile Corrections, Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind, Disability Rights Idaho, Vocational Rehabilitation, Health and Welfare, Idaho Council on Disabilities, Idaho Parents Unlimited, Special Education Higher Education Faculty, and the State Department of Education. A Special Education Workgroup met twice to consider data for the indicators and provided input and recommendations. Data was presented at the following conferences, Idaho Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Special Education Directors Conference, Idaho Association of School Administrators (IASA) Annual Conference, with broad stakeholder input solicited. Recommendations were taken into consideration as improvement planning occurred.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Custom numerator header.	Custom denominator header.	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

Custom numerator header.	Custom denominator header.	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
431	6,720	5.08%	4.58%	6.41%

☑ **Use a different calculation methodology**

☑ Change numerator description in data table

☑ Change denominator description in data table

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

Per OSEP Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement table, Idaho chose the option to report indicator 2 "using the same data source and measurement that the State used for its FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012 ESEA dropout event rate: [(number of (special education) students enrolled in grades 9-12 who dropped out) divided by the (total number of (special education) students enrolled in grades 9-12) times 100] .

Explanation of Slippage

At 6.41%, Idaho's dropout rate increased by 1.33% over the previous year's data of 5.08%. The rigorous target of less than 4.58% was not met. Due to a stringent verification process to identify students that dropout, more students were captured in the data element than identified previously.

The 2013-14 school year marks the first year Idaho used the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, in accordance with 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b). A four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is defined as:

- The number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who entered high school four years earlier, while adjusting for transfer students, those students who emigrated or are deceased.

Due to the new four-year cohort graduation rate, many special education students aged 18 to 21 are now identified as dropouts because they are not graduating within the four years. Previously, this category was not as well-defined leading to incorrect coding of these 18 to 21 year old students, in an effort by LEAs not to code these students as drop-outs.

Idaho is working with their longitudinal data team to find an appropriate way for LEAs to code students attending an 18-21 year old program, as to not show them as drop-outs.

The SDE continued to provide technical assistance to districts through webinars and collaboration between the secondary special education coordinator, district special education directors, School Improvement, and Gear Up programs.

Additionally, the SDE established a new coordinator position to address student engagement and post-secondary readiness. This coordinator is working with ESEA and SPED divisions to target technical assistance for districts with the greatest needs.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

No longer required due to passage of ESSA.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Grade 3	2006	Target ≥				99.00%	99.10%	99.20%	99.30%	99.20%	99.20%	95.00%
			Data			98.00%	99.62%	99.15%	99.80%	99.20%	91.90%	96.32%	97.91%
	B Grade 4	2006	Target ≥				98.50%	98.60%	98.70%	98.80%	98.70%	98.70%	95.00%
			Data			98.50%	99.78%	99.14%	99.70%	98.70%	93.20%	96.31%	95.87%
	C Grade 5	2006	Target ≥				99.30%	99.40%	99.50%	99.60%	99.50%	99.50%	95.00%
			Data			99.20%	99.80%	99.21%	99.50%	99.10%	94.10%	96.53%	96.79%
	D Grade 6	2006	Target ≥				98.20%	98.30%	98.40%	98.50%	98.40%	98.40%	95.00%
			Data			99.10%	99.58%	98.05%	98.30%	97.60%	94.90%	96.97%	96.19%
	E Grade 7	2006	Target ≥				98.00%	98.10%	98.20%	98.30%	98.20%	98.20%	95.00%
			Data			98.50%	98.88%	98.06%	98.30%	97.70%	94.40%	96.99%	93.29%
	F Grade 8	2006	Target ≥				97.40%	97.50%	97.60%	97.70%	97.60%	97.60%	95.00%
			Data			98.20%	98.34%	98.18%	98.90%	97.30%	95.30%	96.54%	93.09%
	G HS	2006	Target ≥				95.60%	95.70%	95.80%	95.90%	95.80%	95.80%	95.00%
			Data			99.50%	96.42%	96.55%	96.20%	92.10%	88.30%	91.40%	84.95%
Math	A Grade 3	2013	Target ≥										95.00%
			Data									99.60%	97.13%
	B Grade 4	2013	Target ≥										95.00%
			Data									99.90%	96.29%
	C Grade 5	2013	Target ≥										95.00%
			Data									99.60%	96.93%
	D Grade 6	2013	Target ≥										95.00%
			Data									99.60%	95.10%
	E Grade 7	2013	Target ≥										95.00%
			Data									99.50%	92.43%
	F Grade 8	2013	Target ≥										95.00%
			Data									99.70%	93.58%
	G HS	2013	Target ≥										95.00%
			Data									98.90%	84.03%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	G ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

The stakeholder groups determined that Idaho can not set baseline until the 2014/2015 school year reported upon completion of the first year's proficiency scores reported for the new ISAT test. No students participated in this test due to Idaho electing for statewide field testing of the new SBAC. The stateholders recommended that Idaho maintain a 95% participation rate during the 2014/2015 school year.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	2,219	2,217	97.91%	95.00%	99.91%

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B Grade 4	2,256	2,212	95.87%	95.00%	98.05%
C Grade 5	2,156	2,097	96.79%	95.00%	97.26%
D Grade 6	1,997	1,945	96.19%	95.00%	97.40%
E Grade 7	1,902	1,860	93.29%	95.00%	97.79%
F Grade 8	1,922	1,853	93.09%	95.00%	96.41%
G H	1,432	1,266	84.95%	95.00%	88.41%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	2,272	2,228	97.13%	95.00%	98.06%
B Grade 4	2,259	2,218	96.29%	95.00%	98.19%
C Grade 5	2,160	2,108	96.93%	95.00%	97.59%
D Grade 6	1,999	1,949	95.10%	95.00%	97.50%
E Grade 7	1,905	1,860	92.43%	95.00%	97.64%
F Grade 8	1,922	1,859	93.58%	95.00%	96.72%
G HS	1,432	1,259	84.03%	95.00%	87.92%

Public Reporting Information

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

http://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/
http://apps.sde.idaho.gov/ReportCard

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Grade 3	2014	Target ≥			53.09%	56.30%	59.60%	62.81%	66.40%	66.40%	86.00%	76.00%
			Data		50.40%	41.70%	44.90%	51.30%	49.50%	50.70%	77.20%	51.50%	66.90%
	B Grade 4	2014	Target ≥			53.09%	56.30%	59.60%	62.81%	66.40%	66.40%	86.00%	76.00%
			Data		50.40%	41.70%	44.90%	51.30%	49.50%	50.70%	77.20%	51.50%	71.11%
	C Grade 5	2014	Target ≥			53.09%	56.30%	59.60%	62.81%	66.40%	66.40%	86.00%	76.00%
			Data		50.40%	41.70%	44.90%	51.30%	49.50%	50.70%	77.20%	51.50%	63.28%
	D Grade 6	2014	Target ≥			53.09%	56.30%	59.60%	62.81%	66.40%	66.40%	86.00%	76.00%
			Data		50.40%	41.70%	44.90%	51.30%	49.50%	50.70%	77.20%	51.50%	72.93%
	E Grade 7	2014	Target ≥			53.09%	56.30%	59.60%	62.81%	66.40%	66.40%	86.00%	76.00%
			Data		50.40%	41.70%	44.90%	51.30%	49.50%	50.70%	77.20%	51.50%	65.79%
	F Grade 8	2014	Target ≥			53.09%	56.30%	59.60%	62.81%	66.40%	66.40%	86.00%	76.00%
			Data		50.40%	41.70%	44.90%	51.30%	49.50%	50.70%	77.20%	51.50%	69.61%
	G HS	2014	Target ≥			53.09%	56.30%	59.60%	62.81%	66.40%	66.40%	86.00%	76.00%
			Data		50.40%	41.70%	44.90%	51.30%	49.50%	50.70%	77.20%	51.50%	29.54%
Math	A Grade 3	2014	Target ≥			48.18%	49.80%	53.30%	56.68%	61.28%	61.28%	84.00%	74.00%
			Data		54.70%	41.20%	40.60%	42.10%	41.70%	40.40%	66.80%	39.70%	59.06%
	B Grade 4	2014	Target ≥			48.18%	49.80%	53.30%	56.68%	61.28%	61.28%	84.00%	74.00%
			Data		54.70%	41.20%	40.60%	42.10%	41.70%	40.40%	66.80%	39.70%	65.19%
	C Grade 5	2014	Target ≥			48.18%	49.80%	53.30%	56.68%	61.28%	61.28%	84.00%	74.00%
			Data		54.70%	41.20%	40.60%	42.10%	41.70%	40.40%	66.80%	39.70%	70.23%
	D Grade 6	2014	Target ≥			48.18%	49.80%	53.30%	56.68%	61.28%	61.28%	84.00%	74.00%
			Data		54.70%	41.20%	40.60%	42.10%	41.70%	40.40%	66.80%	39.70%	66.67%
	E Grade 7	2014	Target ≥			48.18%	49.80%	53.30%	56.68%	61.28%	61.28%	84.00%	74.00%
			Data		54.70%	41.20%	40.60%	42.10%	41.70%	40.40%	66.80%	39.70%	59.84%
	F Grade 8	2014	Target ≥			48.18%	49.80%	53.30%	56.68%	61.28%	61.28%	84.00%	74.00%
			Data		54.70%	41.20%	40.60%	42.10%	41.70%	40.40%	66.80%	39.70%	66.67%
	G HS	2014	Target ≥			48.18%	49.80%	53.30%	56.68%	61.28%	61.28%	84.00%	74.00%
			Data		54.70%	41.20%	40.60%	42.10%	41.70%	40.40%	66.80%	39.70%	14.39%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	**A** ≥ Grade 3	16.00%	19.00%	22.00%	25.00%	28.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	12.00%	19.00%	22.00%	25.00%	28.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	13.00%	15.00%	22.00%	25.00%	28.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	10.00%	16.00%	18.00%	25.00%	28.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	8.00%	13.00%	19.00%	21.00%	28.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	8.00%	11.00%	16.00%	22.00%	24.00%
	G ≥ HS	11.00%	11.00%	14.00%	19.00%	25.00%
Math	**A** ≥ Grade 3	18.00%	21.00%	24.00%	27.00%	30.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	13.00%	21.00%	24.00%	27.00%	30.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	10.00%	16.00%	24.00%	27.00%	30.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	7.00%	13.00%	19.00%	27.00%	30.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	6.00%	10.00%	16.00%	22.00%	30.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	4.00%	9.00%	13.00%	19.00%	25.00%
	G ≥ HS	3.00%	7.00%	12.00%	16.00%	22.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Idaho's targets for 3C are based on the actual performance of students with disabilities rather than the using the states' AMO targets set for the general population of students, as our AMO reflects a state average. We feel our targets are more comprehensive of the student population we serve. In addition, Idaho will officially reset their proficiency targets in the 2016-2017 school year as part of the approved ESEA waiver.

Targets have historically been applied at a rate of 3% increase per year in each grade. As Idaho is in the process of implementing a new accountability model, with an emphasis on student growth, we have taken a new approach in determining targets that mirrors this effort. You will notice we have applied a 3% increase not at each grade level annually, but atthe cohort level, annually. In some cases, this approach results in a 18% increase in a specific grade level through 2018 – but an 11% increase in a student grade level cohort in the same time frame.

Applying the increase at the cohort level allows us to most appropriately track student improvement over time. It also allows us the opportunity to evaluate the implementation of our new standards at each grade level, while at the same time, evaluating the vertical alignment of our state standards, as students' progress through the years. Finally, Idaho's State Strategic Improvement Plan considers growth for students from grade 3 to 4, so we expect to see the result of the use of evidence based instructional strategies for students with disabilities to be reflected in our reported growth over time.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

As explained in Indicator 3A, Idaho was given approval to allow our students to participate in the Smarter Balanced regular assessment or National Center and State Collaborative alternate assessment field tests in ELA and mathematics. For this reason, Idaho is unable to report on performance. Idaho will be able to report performance in December 2015.

Stakeholders have been informed that the baseline is being reset to FFY 2014 based on the assessment results from the SY 2014-2015. The SY 2014-2015 is the first year with student level results on our new ISAT by Smarter Balance. Once the baseline was changed, the stakeholder group suggested an annual increase of 3% each year for each grade level.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	2,219	446	66.90%	16.00%	20.10%
B Grade 4	2,212	350	71.11%	12.00%	15.82%
C Grade 5	2,097	355	63.28%	13.00%	16.93%
D Grade 6	1,945	250	72.93%	10.00%	12.85%
E Grade 7	1,860	249	65.79%	8.00%	13.39%
F Grade 8	1,853	220	69.61%	8.00%	11.87%
G H	1,266	170	29.54%	11.00%	13.43%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	2,228	493	59.06%	18.00%	22.13%
B Grade 4	2,218	385	65.19%	13.00%	17.36%
C Grade 5	2,108	293	70.23%	10.00%	13.90%
D Grade 6	1,949	214	66.67%	7.00%	10.98%
E Grade 7	1,860	220	59.84%	6.00%	11.83%
F Grade 8	1,859	174	66.67%	4.00%	9.36%
G H	1,259	76	14.39%	3.00%	6.04%

Public Reporting Information

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

http://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/
http://apps.sde.idaho.gov/ReportCard

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0.87%	2.40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

The State Department of Education collected 618 discipline data from each district on the number of suspensions and expulsions. These data were reviewed for significant discrepancies according to the definition included on the next page FFY14 under State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology, and based on the number of students enrolled with IEPs in each district. Results were shared with stakeholders and the Special Education Advisory Panel for comments and input.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

Number of districts in the State

Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	147	0%	0%	0%

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

- (selected) 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
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The SDE redefined and recalculated significant discrepancy in April 2012 as a result of the Office of Special Education APR clarification process. The e-formula was replaced with a state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities to set the suspension/ expulsion-rate bar measure. The state bar is the state level suspension / expulsion rate plus one percentage point.

In Idaho, "Significant discrepancy" is defined as 1% or more above the current year's state average by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

That is, the total number of students with disabilities who were suspended/expelled divided by the total number of students with disabilities in the state. The formula is:

$$\text{State level suspension/expulsion rate} = \frac{\text{\# of SWDs suspended/expelled} > 10 \text{ days}}{\text{Total \# of SWDs in the state}} \times 100$$

Application of data:

$$\text{State level suspension/expulsion rate} = \frac{1}{27592} \times 100 = 0.00$$

The state bar is 0.00% + 1.00 = 1.00%.

A district will have significant discrepancy if its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from any racial/ethnic group is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.00% for FFY 2014 data.

For Indicator 4a, Idaho has established a minimum "n" size of at least 10 children with IEPs enrolled in the school district. Based on the application of this minimum "n," 11 of 158 districts in Idaho were excluded (158 - 11 = 147) from the calculation for this indicator in FFY 2014.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

For FFY 2014, no districts were found to have significant discrepancy. In FFY 2011, six (6) districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy. Based on the examination of 2010-11 data, the Idaho State Department of Education reviewed the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

This review was conducted by the Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator (QARC) during focused visits with the districts. The monitoring included reviewing the district's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The QARC also conducted a review and analysis of 1) the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) current at the time of the discipline actions; 2) discipline records and reports specific to the suspension and/or expulsion of the student; 3) functional behavior assessments; 4) manifestation determinations; and 5) the district's discipline policy. No findings of noncompliance were made based on these reviews. If noncompliance had been identified during the review of policies, procedures and practices, the SDE would have required the district 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 compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). Idaho verifies correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

- [x] The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- [ ] The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
  - [ ] The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

    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.
  - [x] The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

Number of districts in the State

Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	147	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The SDE redefined and recalculated a significant discrepancy in April 2012 as a result of the Office of Special Education APR clarification process. The e-formula was replaced with a state-level suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities to set the suspension/ expulsion-rate bar measure. The state bar is the state level suspension/expulsion rate plus one percentage point.

In Idaho, "Significant discrepancy" is defined as 1% or more above the current year's state average by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs within the

State.

That is, the total number of students with disabilities who were suspended/expelled divided by the total number of students with disabilities in the state. The formula is:

$$\text{State level suspension/expulsion rate} = \frac{\text{\# of SWDs suspended/expelled > 10 days}}{\text{Total \# of SWDs in the state}} \times 100$$

Application of data:

$$\text{State level suspension/expulsion rate} = \frac{0}{27592} \times 100 = 0.00$$

The state bar is 0.00% + 1.00 = 1.00%.

A district will have significant discrepancy if its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from any racial/ethnic group is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.00% for FFY 2014 data.

For Indicator 4a, Idaho has established a minimum “n” size of at least 10 children with IEPs enrolled in the school district. Based on the application of this minimum “n,” 11 of 158 districts in Idaho were excluded (158 - 11 = 147) from the calculation for this indicator in FFY 2014.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

FFY 2014, no districts were found to have significant discrepancy. In FFY 2011, six (6) districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy. Based on the examination of 2010-11 data, the Idaho State Department of Education reviewed the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

This review was conducted by the Quality Assurance and Reporting coordinator (QARC) during focused visits with the districts. The monitoring included reviewing the district’s policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; ensuring that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA regulations, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The

procedures and practices, the SDE would have required the district 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 compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). Idaho verifies correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	64.00%	65.00%
		Data		63.80%	61.80%	62.50%	63.30%	62.81%	62.30%	60.70%	60.40%	60.12%
B	2005	Target ≤			8.60%	8.40%	8.20%	8.00%	7.90%	7.90%	7.90%	7.90%
		Data		8.00%	8.70%	9.40%	9.30%	9.40%	10.80%	11.30%	11.40%	10.83%
C	2005	Target ≤			1.60%	3.70%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
		Data		1.60%	1.80%	2.00%	1.60%	1.40%	1.70%	1.30%	1.20%	1.21%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%
Target B ≤	7.42%	6.94%	6.46%	5.98%	5.50%
Target C ≤	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	25,210	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C002; Data group 74)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,340	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,547	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	233	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	38	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	27	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,340	25,210	60.12%	66.00%	60.85%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,547	25,210	10.83%	7.42%	10.10%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	298	25,210	1.21%	1.50%	1.18%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									31.40%	32.40%
		Data								30.40%	41.70%	30.28%
B	2011	Target ≤									49.80%	49.30%
		Data								50.30%	52.70%	52.91%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	33.40%	34.40%	35.40%	36.40%	37.40%
Target B ≤	48.30%	47.30%	46.30%	45.30%	44.30%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Targets were set based on data analysis and stakeholder input. In setting targets and addressing the needs of students 3-5 years of age, Idaho utilized three (3) specific stakeholder groups: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3), and Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC). Each of three stakeholder groups represent different stakeholder members. SEAP represents: higher education, parents, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendent, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Parents Unlimited, charter schools, and Start Department of Education staff. ECS represents: the medical community, state legislatures, higher education, Idaho Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind, Community Council of Idaho, IDEA Part C, parents, state child care, child welfare, judicial system, State Department of Insurance, infant/child mental health, mental health, Head Start, public health, early intervention providers, regional EC3 representative, Developmental Disabilities Council, and Medicaid. DAC consists of several special education directors in Idaho from large/small and rural/urban districts to reflect the wide range of demographics across the state.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	3,267	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	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	966	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,448	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	241	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	966	3,267	30.28%	33.40%	29.57%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,690	3,267	52.91%	48.30%	51.73%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State of Idaho does not offer state-funded regular early childhood programs. LEAs utilize different federally funded programs, e.g. Head Start, Title 1, to provide student's receiving early intervention typical peer interaction. Due to the rural nature of the state, not every district has access to Head Start. LEAs are encouraged to have students receiving special education or related services in a regular kindergarten program, whenever possible.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2013	Target ≥						93.00%	93.50%	93.50%	93.50%	84.70%
		Data					92.80%	92.50%	92.80%	90.80%	89.40%	84.70%
A2	2013	Target ≥						56.50%	57.00%	57.00%	57.00%	53.88%
		Data					55.60%	56.30%	58.10%	58.00%	59.40%	53.88%
B1	2013	Target ≥						92.70%	93.20%	93.20%	90.80%	78.05%
		Data					92.20%	91.40%	91.90%	90.90%	90.00%	78.05%
B2	2013	Target ≥						51.00%	51.50%	52.30%	50.50%	27.37%
		Data					50.20%	52.30%	53.30%	53.40%	50.50%	27.37%
C1	2013	Target ≥						90.70%	91.20%	91.20%	91.20%	83.31%
		Data					90.20%	91.10%	91.50%	91.10%	88.40%	83.31%
C2	2013	Target ≥						66.20%	67.00%	67.80%	68.40%	65.41%
		Data					65.70%	67.80%	68.80%	69.40%	68.40%	65.41%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	85.20%	84.70%	84.20%	85.70%	85.20%
Target A2 ≥	54.38%	54.88%	55.38%	55.88%	56.38%
Target B1 ≥	78.55%	79.05%	79.55%	80.05%	80.55%
Target B2 ≥	27.87%	28.37%	28.87%	29.37%	29.87%
Target C1 ≥	83.81%	84.31%	84.81%	85.31%	85.81%
Target C2 ≥	65.91%	66.41%	66.91%	67.41%	67.91%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Targets were set based on analysis of the data and stakeholders input. In setting targets and addressing the needs of students 3-5 years of age, Idaho utilized three (3) specific stakeholder groups, Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3), and Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC). Each of three stakeholder groups represents different stakeholder members. SEAP represents: higher education, parents, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendent, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Vocational Rehabilitation,

Blind, Community Council of Idaho, IDEA Part C, parents, state child care, child welfare, judicial system, State Department of Insurance, infant/child mental health, mental health, Head Start, public health, early intervention providers, regional EC3 representative, Developmental Disabilities Council, and Medicaid. DAC consists of special education directors in Idaho from large/small and rural/urban districts to reflect the demographics across the state.

FFY 2013 baseline was collected from the 781 students receiving special education services who received services for at least six months from 147 school districts. Idaho believes that the quality of data will improve due to the new ECO/IEP and the technical assistance afforded the districts and a better understanding of early childhood outcomes.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	781.00

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	4.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	129.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	229.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	250.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	169.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	479.00	612.00	84.70%	85.20%	78.27%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	419.00	781.00	53.88%	54.38%	53.65%

Explanation of A1 Slippage

Idaho embedded all of the elements of the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF-R), reflecting the Early Childhood Outcome Process, into the Early Childhood Individual Education Plan (ECO/IEP), June 2013. Statewide training was conducted in 7 location around the state to educate early childhood special education teachers, special education directors, and related service providers on the new process. School districts were given 18 month, the 2013/2014 and part of the 2014/2015 school year to complete the transition from the old process of collecting ECO data to the new ECO/IEP. The 18 months was negotiated to assure that school districts had adequate time to educate all of their staff and make changes when each student's annual IEP can due. The SDE did not want to place an undue burden on the LEAs to amend IEPs tobe in compliance with the new ECO collection process.

Prior to embedding the ECOs into an early childhood IEP exit data was gathered in a variety of ways. The new ECO/IEP ensure that entrance and exit rating are completed by an IEP team and through periodic file reviews, there is now potential for inter-rater reliability on all ECO ratings. It was anticipated that as the ECO process became part of the IEP that our

statewide data would drop. Early childhood special education teachers and related service providers can access resource materials on-line, as well as training materials for new staff. The slippage is a result of Idaho's change in data collection and ECO process.

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	2.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	212.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	388.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	167.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	12.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	555.00	769.00	78.05%	78.55%	72.17%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	179.00	781.00	27.37%	27.87%	22.92%

Explanation of B1 Slippage

Idaho embedded all of the elements of the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF-R), reflecting the Early Childhood Outcome Process, into the Early Childhood Individual Education Plan (ECO/IEP), June 2013. Statewide training was conducted in 7 location around the state to educate early childhood special education teachers, special education directors, and related service providers on the new process. School districts were given 18 month, the 2013/2014 and part of the 2014/2015 school year to complete the transition from the old process of collecting ECO data to the new ECO/IEP. The 18 months was negotiated to assure that school districts had adequate time to educate all of their staff and make changes when each student's annual IEP can due. The SDE did not want to place an undue burden on the LEAs to amend IEPs to be in compliance with the new ECO collection process.

Prior to embedding the ECOs into an early childhood IEP exit data was gathered in a variety of ways. The new ECO/IEP ensure that entrance and exit rating are completed by an IEP team and through periodic file reviews, there is now potential for inter-rater reliability on all ECO ratings. It was anticipated that as the ECO process became part of the IEP that our statewide data would drop. Early childhood special education teachers and related service providers can access resource materials on-line, as well as training materials for new staff. The slippage is a result of Idaho's change in data collection and ECO process.

Explanation of B2 Slippage

Idaho embedded all of the elements of the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF-R), reflecting the Early Childhood Outcome Process, into the Early Childhood Individual Education Plan (ECO/IEP), June 2013. Statewide training was conducted in 7 location around the state to educate early childhood special education teachers, special education directors, and related service providers on the new process. School districts were given 18 month, the 2013/2014 and part of the 2014/2015 school year to complete the transition from the old process of collecting ECO data to the new ECO/IEP. The 18 months was negotiated to assure that school districts had adequate time to educate all of their staff and make changes when each student's annual IEP can due. The SDE did not want to place an undue burden on the LEAs to amend IEPs to

be in compliance with the new ECO collection process.

Prior to embedding the ECOs into an early childhood IEP exit data was gathered in a variety of ways. The new ECO/IEP ensure that entrance and exit rating are completed by an IEP team and through periodic file reviews, there is now potential for inter-rater reliability on all ECO ratings. It was anticipated that as the ECO process became part of the IEP that our statewide data would drop. Early childhood special education teachers and related service providers can access resource materials on-line, as well as training materials for new staff. The slippage is a result of Idaho's change in data collection and ECO process.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	4.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	132.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	165.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	269.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	211.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	434.00	570.00	83.31%	83.81%	76.14%
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. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	480.00	781.00	65.41%	65.91%	61.46%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

Idaho embedded all of the elements of the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF-R), reflecting the Early Childhood Outcome Process, into the Early Childhood Individual Education Plan (ECO/IEP), June 2013. Statewide training was conducted in 7 location around the state to educate early childhood special education teachers, special education directors, and related service providers on the new process. School districts were given 18 month, the 2013/2014 and part of the 2014/2015 school year to complete the transition from the old process of collecting ECO data to the new ECO/IEP. The 18 months was negotiated to assure that school districts had adequate time to educate all of their staff and make changes when each student's annual IEP can due. The SDE did not want to place an undue burden on the LEAs to amend IEPs to be in compliance with the new ECO collection process.

Prior to embedding the ECOs into an early childhood IEP exit data was gathered in a variety of ways. The new ECO/IEP ensure that entrance and exit rating are completed by an IEP team and through periodic file reviews, there is now potential for inter-rater reliability on all ECO ratings. It was anticipated that as the ECO process became part of the IEP that our statewide data would drop. Early childhood special education teachers and related service providers can access resource materials on-line, as well as training materials for new staff. The slippage is a result of Idaho's change in data collection and ECO process.

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Idaho embedded all of the elements of the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF-R), reflecting the Early Childhood Outcome Process, into the Early Childhood Individual Education Plan (ECO/IEP), June 2013. Statewide training was

conducted in 7 location around the state to educate early childhood special education teachers, special education directors, and related service providers on the new process. School districts were given 18 month, the 2013/2014 and part of the 2014/2015 school year to complete the transition from the old process of collecting ECO data to the new ECO/IEP. The 18 months was negotiated to assure that school districts had adequate time to educate all of their staff and make changes when each student's annual IEP can due. The SDE did not want to place an undue burden on the LEAs to amend IEPs to be in compliance with the new ECO collection process.

Prior to embedding the ECOs into an early childhood IEP exit data was gathered in a variety of ways. The new ECO/IEP ensure that entrance and exit rating are completed by an IEP team and through periodic file reviews, there is now potential for inter-rater reliability on all ECO ratings. It was anticipated that as the ECO process became part of the IEP that our statewide data would drop. Early childhood special education teachers and related service providers can access resource materials on-line, as well as training materials for new staff. The slippage is a result of Idaho's change in data collection and ECO process.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Idaho embedded all of the elements of the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF-R) into the Early Childhood Individual Education Plan (ECO/IEP). Additionally, Idaho utilizes the "Decision Tree for Summary Rating Discussions" developed by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (5/09) to make same-age peer comparisons. "Comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 utilizing the Decision Tree.

It was determined that the ECO process done during the individualized evaluation of the child's needs would assure the use of multiple sources of data, parent input, and a team process. Evaluation procedures may include, but are not limited to, observations, interviews, behavior checklists, structured interactions, play assessment, adaptive and developmental scales, criterion-referenced and norm referenced instruments, clinical judgment, and tests of basic concepts or other techniques and procedures as deemed appropriate by the professional(s) conducting the evaluations. Data used to determine the ECO rating is determined using a state-approved anchor assessment, parent interview, and evaluation data.

Idaho began using the new ECO/IEP during the 2014/2015 school year. During discussions with stakeholder groups, during the development and implementation of the new ECO/IEP, it was decided to reset our baselines for this indicator to reflect the new process. All Districts with students enrolled in preschool programs for at least six months prior to exiting were required to report ECO data. The number of students reported for FFY 2014 (781) decreased by 147 students from FFY 2013 (928).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? Yes

Will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			26.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	31.00%	32.00%		55.00%
Data		26.00%	26.00%	25.00%	35.00%	33.00%	34.00%	36.00%	51.30%	60.41%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	59.60%	64.20%	68.80%	73.40%	78.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

On November 9, 2015, the SDE reported out findings from the Indicator 8 Parent Involvement Survey to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). Information compared results from the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 collections.

58% of Idaho's LEAs have 100 or fewer students in special education. Survey results show that smaller LEAs frequently do not have sufficient survey responses to inform their processes. To make data more meaningful for LEAs, SEAP recommended that the SDE proceed with adding ten reports to the 2015-2016 Indicator 8 survey contract. The ten reports will include one report for each of the six regions and four reports separating LEAs by the students with disabilities population. Annually, Indicator 8 survey results are provided in a report to each LEA including their individual data and statewide data for comparison. Based on SEAP's recommendation data collected from the 2015-2016 collection period will also be provided to LEAs based on their region and student population.

SEAP has listed updating targets for Indicator 8 as an item for further discussion in the 2015-2016 school year. Current targets were determined through SEAP recommendations in February of 2014 but were based on data collected using a different set of survey questions, sampling plan, and vendor.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

means of improving services and results for children with disabilities				
405.92	663.71	60.41%	59.60%	61.16%

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.

A stratified, representative sample of preK-12 students was chosen within each surveyed district. Results were weighted according to population size of the district to ensure the overall state parent involvement percentage was an accurate reflection of the experience of parents of students with disabilities ages 3 to 21. Parents of students at all grade levels responded to the survey.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The representativeness of the survey was assessed by comparing the demographic characteristics of the students whose parents responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all special education students. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the grade level of the child; and (3) by the primary disability of the child. For example, 14% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a child with a speech/language impairment and 13% of special education students in the entire sample have a speech/language impairment learning disability. Parents of white students were slightly more likely to respond than parents of non-white students: 84% of the parents who returned a survey are parents of a white student whereas 77% of the special education students in the sample are white. Results were weighted by district to ensure that the parent survey results reflected the population of parents.

Was sampling used? Yes
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? No
Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Results are reliable and valid because a stratified, representative group of parents is selected to complete the survey. First, as outlined in the sampling plan submitted and approved in FFY2013, each year a representative group of districts is selected to participate in the Indicator 8 data collection. Secondly, a sample of parents is randomly selected from each of the selected districts. The number of parents chosen is dependent on the number of total students with disabilities enrolled in a given district. The sample sizes selected ensured roughly similar margins of error across the different district sizes. For those districts that have more than 100 students, and thus for which a sample is chosen, the population is stratified by grade, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender to ensure representativeness of the resulting sample. When calculating the state-level results, responses are weighted by the student population size.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		16.10%	5.60%	2.30%	1.50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	109	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

In October and November 2014, stakeholder groups including: the State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3), and Director Advisory Committee (DAC) were asked for input to change the formula for determination of disproportionality from the "E-Formula" to an Alternate Risk Ratio formula for indicators 9 and 10. Additionally, the threshold of 3.0 was recommended along with a minimum cell size of 25 students with disabilities enrolled in the district based on the Child Count submitted in April 2014. Recommendations were based on the Data Accountability Center's *Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guild (Revised)* (October 2011) and Using the Risk Ratio to Assess Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education at the School-District Level (Bollmer, Bethel, Garrison-Mogren, & Brauen, 2007, *Journal of Special Education, 41*, 186-198).

In May and September 2015, stakeholder groups including the State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and Director Advisory Committee (DAC) were again asked for input on using the Alternative Risk Ratio formula to calculate disproportionality. Both SEAP and DAC reaffirmed that this was the best way to calculate disproportionality in Idaho.

The recommendations of the stakeholders were adopted.

Data Source:

Data collected under IDEA section 618 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, As Amended) and the State's analysis to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.Alternate Risk Ratio

When applied to overall special education eligibility within a district, the alternate risk ratio answers the question, "How many times greater is a specific racial/ethnic group's risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services in comparison with all other racial/ethnic groups in the state?" When applied to eligibility by disability category within a district, the alternate risk ratio answers the question, "How many times greater is a specific racial/ethnic group's risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services for a particular disability category in comparison with all other racial/ethnic groups in the state?"

ARR = DLR/SLR

Where:

ARR = Alternate Risk Ratio

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

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

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

Minimum Cell Size: Idaho has established 25 students with disabilities in a district as a minimum 'n' size for calculation.

By applying the Alternate Risk Ratio-Formula to district data, SDE identifies districts with ARR equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, as having disproportionate representation. Each of those districts must complete a Performance Response that includes an explanation of policies, practices, and procedures used to refer, evaluate, and identify students for special education. The SDE also selects student eligibility files to review. District responses and eligibility documentation are examined and evaluated by the SDE to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected, based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments are not appropriate, the SDE looks for a preponderance of evidence based on functional data collected to support eligibility for special education. The SDE also checks to see if the exclusionary factors have been adequately addressed. From this information, the SDE determines whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification, and if it is, makes a finding of noncompliance in regards to the appropriateness of the District's identification policies, practices, and procedures.
The number of districts analyzed was 109 having 25 or more students with disabilities enrolled. No districts were found to have over-representation for FFY 2014 (using data form SY 2014-2015).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		16.10%	5.60%	2.30%	2.26%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	109	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

In October and November 2014, stakeholder groups including: the State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) Early Childhood Coordinating Council (EC3), and Director Advisory Committee (DAC) were asked for input to change the formula for determination of disproportionality from the "E-Formula" to an Alternate Risk Ratio formula for indicators 9 and 10. Additionally, the threshold of 3.0 was recommended along with a minimum cell size of 25 students with disabilities enrolled in the district based on the Child Count submitted in April 2014. Recommendations were based on the Data Accountability Center's *Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guild (Revised)* (October 2011) and Using the Risk Ratio to Assess Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education at the School-District Level (Bollmer, Bethel, Garrison-Mogren, & Brauen, 2007, *Journal of Special Education*, *41*, 186-198).

In May and September 2015, stakeholder groups including the State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and Director Advisory Committee (DAC) were again asked for input on using the Alternative Risk Ratio formula to calculate disproportionality. Both SEAP and DAC reaffirmed that this was the best way to calculate disproportionality in Idaho.

The recommendations of the stakeholders were adopted.

Determination of Inappropriate Identification:

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

The number of districts analyzed was 109 having 25 or more students with disabilities enrolled. No districts were found to have over-representation for FFY 2014 (using data form SY 2014-2015).

Alternate Risk Ratio
When applied to overall special education eligibility within a district, the alternate risk ratio answers the question, "How many times greater is a specific racial/ethnic group's risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services in comparison with all other racial/ethnic groups in the state?" When applied to eligibility by disability category within a district, the alternate risk ratio answers the question, "How many times greater is a specific racial/ethnic group's risk of being identified as eligible for special education and related services for a particular disability category in comparison with all other racial/ethnic groups in the state?"

ARR = DLR/SLR

Where:

ARR = Alternate Risk Ratio

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

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

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

Minimum Cell Size: Idaho has established 25 students with disabilities in a district as a minimum 'n' size for calculation.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		91.40%	92.70%	95.00%	98.00%	98.00%	95.00%	95.00%	99.40%	97.85%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4,277	4,214	97.85%	100%	98.53%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	63

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.

Idaho sent out 23 letters of non-compliance. The range of the number of days late varied from one day late to 365 days late due to a variety of reasons including, scheduling difficulties, staffing issues, requests for additional assessments, and student moved into a district with written extension request.

Prong 1:

In order to ensure that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, SEA reviewed subsequent 60-day timeline data collected through the Compliance Tracking Tool and verified that 100% of these subsequent files were completed within the timeline, consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(c). The twenty-three (23)issues of noncompliance were notified in writing that noncompliance had been corrected.

Prong 2:

SEA verified the correction of this noncompliance by reviewing the data and by verifying that all the eligible and ineligible students had their evaluations completed, although late. Each of the files for these students identified as noncompliant in FFY2013 were investigated through the Compliance Tracking Tool and verified that all eligible students had an IEP developed.

Because Idaho passed the two verification tests, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the SEA considered that

Idaho has verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for Indicator 11 and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c).

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- (●) **The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.**
- ( ) **The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.**

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

- ( ) **State monitoring**
- (●) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

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

Data is collected through the state's database. Districts are required to submit all 60-day timeline data. The data is then reviewed by the state compliance monitor.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Prong 1:

In order to ensure that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, Idaho SDE reviewed subsequent 60-day timeline data collected through the Compliance Tracking Tool for the 37 schools where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2013. As a result of this review, the Idaho SDE verified that 100% of these subsequent files were completed within the timeline, consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(c).

Because the Idaho passed the two verification tests, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the SEA considered that Idaho had verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for Indicator 11 and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c).

Prong 2:

The Idaho SDE verified the correction of this noncompliance by reviewing the data and by verifying that all the eligible and ineligible students had their evaluations completed. Each of the files for these students identified as noncompliant in FFY2013 were investigated through the Compliance Tracking Tool and the Idaho SDE verified that all eligible students had an IEP developed, although late.

Because Idaho passed the two verification tests, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the SEA considered that Idaho had verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for Indicator 11 and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c).

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

Prong 2:

The Idaho SDE verified the correction of this noncompliance by reviewing the data and by verifying that all the eligible and ineligible students had their evaluations completed. Each of the files for these students identified as noncompliant in FFY2013 were investigated through the Compliance Tracking Tool and the Idaho SDE verified that all eligible students had an IEP developed, although late.

Because Idaho passed the two verification tests, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the SEA considered that Idaho had verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for Indicator 11 and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c).

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		59.00%	83.00%	90.30%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	99.20%	100%	99.23%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	741
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	103
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	356
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.	265
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	6

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
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. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	356	367	99.23%	100%	97.00%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	11

Explanation of Slippage

Data slipped to 97.00% in FFY 2014 from 99.23% in FFY 2013 for Early Childhood transitions between Part C to Part B.

There were four students who were found eligible, who did not have an IEP in place by the student's 3rd birthday. There were four students listed as eligible but both the determination of eligibility and the IEP were late. There were three students who did not qualify but the determination was not timely.

Idaho does not have one continuous data collection system between Part C and Part B. A notification process has been put in place where the State Department of Education receives notification of potentially eligible students that is identical to the notification each of the individual LEA receives. During the last year, it was identified that the Part C program didnot always have correct boundaries for all of the LEAs, resulting in the wrong LEA receiving the notification. This resulted in several of the IEP's not being developed in a timely manner. Part B worked with the staff at Part C to assure that all ofLEA boundaries were corrected.

2 - District and the parent required additional testing prior to eligibility resulting in a delay.

1 - Parent and district scheduling issues

2 - No reason noted

1 - Notification reflected an error in student's birthday

5 - Wrong boundary issues

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

4 students were listed as eligible with timely determination of eligibility but late IEP.

4 students were listed as eligible with late determination of eligibility and late IEP.

3 students did not qualify but the determination was not timely.

Boundary issues have been resolved and additional TA was provided to districts addressing other reason for delays.

2 - District and the parent required additional testing prior to eligibility resulting in a delay.

1 - Parent and district scheduling issues

2 - No reason noted

1 - Notification reflected an error in student's birthday

5 - Wrong boundary issues

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

- ○ **State monitoring**
- ◉ **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.

Prong 1

In order to ensure that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, SEA reviewed subsequent early childhood transition data (ISEEs Early Childhood Transition Report as well as individual student records) for the identified districts collected through the ISEEs data system and verified that all districts were implementing all regulatory

Prong 2

SEA verified the correction/resolution of each individual instance of noncompliance by a review of individual records in the Compliance Tracking Tool. SEA verified that all students where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2013 had an IEP and were receiving special education and related services.

Because the Idaho passed the two (2) verification test, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the SEA considered that Idaho has corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for Indicator 12 and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR Section 300.124(b).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						63.00%	36.00%	32.00%	22.60%	55.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
159	236	55.00%	100%	67.37%

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

- (●) State monitoring
- ( ) 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.

For the 2015 General Supervision File Review process, all districts provided secondary files for review. In a departure from previous years, SDE staff and contractors reviewed the files. No district conducted a "self-evaluation" as in previous years. The SDE requested 576 files in total, 236 (40.9% of all files reviewed) of which were secondary files.

The Secondary File Review was completed on students who were part of a student list from the Idaho State Department of Education and available on the SDE Secure Server in November. This list was developed through a random sample that was stratified. The data gathered during the file reviews are entered into the Compliance Tracking Tool student-by-student and a percentage is calculated on each item for the district to enable them to analyze systems level issues. All districts receive written notification of noncompliance.

contracts went to each district and reviewed copies of the IEPs and Eligibility Reports. A regional or central office staff works with the LEA staff to review the files to ensure consistency in the file review. The files are reviewed and entered into a database called the Compliance Tracking Tool.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
63	63	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Districts submitted data (subsequent to the notification of noncompliance) to demonstrate correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. The data submitted was reviewed by SEA using the Compliance Tracking Tool. SEA verified that subsequent data showed 100% compliance, indicating districts are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

There were 63 findings of noncompliance under Indicator 13 pertaining to the following regulatory requirements during FFY 2013.

§300.320(a)(7)(b) Transition services. Beginning not later than the first IEP to be in effect when the child turns 16, or younger if determined appropriate by the IEP Team, and updated annually, thereafter, the IEP must include--

(1) Appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment, and, where appropriate, independent living skills; and

(2) The transition services (including courses of study) needed to assist the child in reaching those goals.

§300.321(b) Transition services participants.

(1) In accordance with paragraph (a)(7) of this section, the public agency must invite a child with a disability to attend the child's IEP Team meeting if a purpose of the meeting will be the consideration of the postsecondary goals for the child and the transition services needed to assist the child in reaching those goals under Sec. 300.320(b).

(3) To the extent appropriate, with the consent of the parents or a child who has reached the age of majority, in implementing the requirements of paragraph (b)(1) of this section, the public agency must invite a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services.

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

Prong 1

Prong 2

SEA verified the correction/resolution of each individual instance of noncompliance by a review of individual records in the Compliance Tracking Tool. SEA verified that all students where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2013 had identified noncompliance corrected.

Because the Idaho passed the two (2) verification test, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the SEA considered that Idaho has corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for Indicator 13 and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							18.00%	18.30%		20.00%
		Data						17.00%	22.00%	19.00%		18.22%
B	2009	Target ≥							31.00%	37.00%	33.00%	33.00%
		Data						31.00%	41.00%	32.00%	44.50%	41.30%
C	2009	Target ≥							73.00%	71.10%	77.00%	77.00%
		Data						71.00%	78.00%	75.00%	68.10%	61.94%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	22.50%	23.00%	23.50%	24.00%	24.50%
Target B ≥	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%
Target C ≥	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	79.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

☑ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

their processes. To make data more meaningful for LEAs, SEAP recommended that the SDE proceed with adding ten reports to the 2015-2016 Indicator 14 survey contract. The ten reports will include one report for each of the six regions and four reports separating LEAs by the students with disabilities population. Annually, reports on Indicator 14 survey results are provided to each LEA including their individual data and statewide data for comparison. Based on SEAP's recommendation data collected from the 2015-2016 collection period will also be provided to LEAs based on region and student population.

SEAP has listed updating targets for Indicator 14 as an item for further discussion for the 2015-2016 school year. Current targets were determined through SEAP and Director's Advisory Council (DAC) recommendations in 2014 but were based primarily on data collected using a different vendor and survey protocol.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	270.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	37.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	74.00
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)	20.00
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).	17.00

	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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	37.00	270.00	18.22%	22.50%	13.70%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	111.00	270.00	41.30%	45.00%	41.11%
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)	148.00	270.00	61.94%	77.50%	54.81%

Explanation of A Slippage

The percentage of exiters enrolled in higher education is currently at 13.7% representing a decrease by 4.5 percentage points from the prior year. The survey collection conducted in the summer of 2015 for exiters from school year 2013-2014 had a substantial increase in the response rate of students identified as drop out. The response rate changed from 6.88% of all respondents the prior year to just over 11%. No students identified as dropouts provided responses which calculated into Measurement A: Enrolled in post-secondary education.

Explanation of C Slippage

The percentage of exiters enrolled in higher education, competitively employed or engaged in other post-secondary education and employment opportunities is at its lowest level; the FFY 2014 rate is 54.8%; this represents a decrease of 7.1 percentage points from the prior year. The target of 77.5% was not met. The SDE is working with Professional Technical Education to help increase the rate students with disabilities engaging in other post-secondary education.

Survey responses indicate low performance on connecting students with a job, college, and or community agencies. In response to the reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation created a Transition Coordinator position. The SDE plans to coordinate and leverage resources to improve the transition of students from secondary education programs.

The Special Education Advisory Panel has listed target setting for Indicator 14 for future discussion. Targets were primarily based on survey results from a prior survey protocol and vendor.

Was sampling used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The response rates were analyzed by gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, and type of exiter to determine if one group was more likely to respond than another group. No significant differences existed in response rates by gender, race/ethnicity, primary disability, or exit type.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥				80.00%		100%	100%	100%		
Data		100%	87.80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. Data reported on the APR matches the November 2015 EMaps data upload.

3. Total number of due process complaints filed = 9

3.1 Resolution meetings = 8

3.1.a Written settlement agreements reached = 0

3.2 Hearings fully adjudicated = 4

3.4 Hearings withdrawn or dismissed = 5

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA PartB Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA PartB Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	8	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Complaints				

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	8	0%		0%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 16: Mediation

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥							100%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data			100%	100%	66.66%	100%	88.89%	91.30%	81.25%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014			2015			2016			2017			2018		
Target	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%	75.00%	-	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	13	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	14	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

complaints	complaints				
1	13	14	100%	75.00% - 85.00%	100%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		8.00%
Data	7.00%	11.03%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	9.00%	10.00%	11.00%	12.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

Idaho's SiMR is:

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 Balance.

The SiMR Workgroup expressed concern of Idaho having no baseline data on the ISAT by Smarter Balance, a component of the statewide student assessment system. This lack of data was due to full state field test participation on the ISAT in 2013-2014. The limitations of NAEP were discussed, as well, including the ability to pull state-wide results from NAEP data, but not district-, school- or classroom-specific results.

To assist states in setting their achievement levels, the National Assessment Governing Board, the oversight body for NAEP compared NAEP achievement levels with the new Smarter Balanced test. Smarter Balanced projections for student achievement closely aligned with how students have performed historically on NAEP. The achievement levels also generally align with the results of a comprehensive research study on college preparedness conducted by the National Assessment Governing Board (see http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Smarter-Balanced-Achievement-Levels-QA.pdf and https://www.nagb.org/what-we-do/preparedness-research.html for more information).

The SiMR Workgroup reviewed the correlation between NAEP data and ISAT by Smarter Balance data, and explored data given to support the validity and accuracy of the two separate data sets correlating with each other.

After establishing the validity of data comparison between the two data sources, the ISDE SSIP Core Team examined Idaho's NAEP fourth grade proficiency in literacy for the last three testing years. The proficiency level for the State's SWD had a mean of 7%. Then the ISDE examined the national average for nine year old (fourth grade) SWD which indicated an annual improvement of 1%.

The ISDE 2013 baseline for 4th grade literacy is 7%. Our targets were set at 1% annually and this was based on the national growth average on the NAEP scores.

The ISDE believes that the targets are rigorous in that the gap between Idaho students with disabilities literacy

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Component 1: Data Analysis

Overview

The Idaho State Department of Education's (ISDE) Special Education Team (including all ISDE Special Education and auxiliary staff) conducted data-analysis for the purpose of developing Phase 1 of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). A process of data collection and analysis activities was conducted to identify a focus area and root-causes contributing to low performance of students with disabilities in order to align Idaho's improvement efforts accordingly. After an initial false start, the Special Education Team conducted data collection and analysis efforts through the development of a four-step action plan. The first step included a broad analysis of data sources, both quantitative and qualitative, to narrow possible focus areas from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) indicators. The second step involved the Special Education Team applying the conclusions from step one to further narrow the indicators toward a goal of identifying a State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). The third step involved increased stake-holder input, data collection activities, and in-depth data analysis of the developing SiMR. Finally, the fourth step involved summarizing data and identifying a root-cause.

State Profile

Idaho is comprised of both moderately sized population centers and sparsely populated areas with very small towns. Idaho boasts some of the largest wilderness areas in the United States. The land area is 83,557 square miles with a total student enrollment of 291,009 as of November 1, 2014. Idaho has 3.48 students per square mile with the smallest Local Educational Agency (LEA) (Prairie) having a total enrollment of six students and the largest LEA (West Ada) having a total enrollment of 36,513 students. Statewide Child Count numbers of students with disabilities is 28,482 as of March 20,2015.

Idaho's education system is locally-controlled with Idaho Code outlining minimum requirements and administrative rule allowing variances in the design and implementation of effective procedures, practices, and programs for state LEAs. The ISDE's most recent vision statement, implemented effective January 1, 2015, by the new ISDE administration, was developed to highlight this local-control: "Supporting schools and students to achieve." While Idaho's LEAs are epitomized as local-control, they partner with the ISDE to identify areas of improvement and what actions need to be taken to achieve results.

The Special Education Division of the ISDE has experienced considerable change since the inception of OSEPs RDA initiative. In October 2013, the Special Education Division was comprised of a State Special Education Director, six Coordinators, three Administrative Assistants, and had seven Regional Coordinators (RCs) statewide to provide local technical assistance. A brief summary of the structural changes between December 2013 and January 2015 include: effective June 2014 all RCs were dismissed; in July 2014 the Special Populations Coordinator resigned; in August 2014 the State Special Education Director resigned; in September 2014 an Interim Special Education Director was hired for a five-month term; in December 2014 the Funding and Accountability Coordinator retired and the Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator resigned; in January 2015 a new ISDE Superintendent of Public Instruction took office, a new State Special Education Director was named, and a new Funding and Accountability Coordinator was hired; in February 2015 a new Data and Reporting Coordinator was hired, three Administrative Assistant positions were upgraded to Program Specialists (Data and Reporting, Contracts and Fiscal, and Dispute Resolution Program Specialists), and a new Administrative Assistant was hired. Positions open as of March 2015 include all RCs and a newly approved Results-Driven Accountability Coordinator position.

Initial Efforts (October 2013 to July 2014)

With OSEP's initial implementation of Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) and Indicator 17, the then ISDE Special Education Director accepted the task of defining goals for improving educational and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

In October 2013 most of the ISDE Special Education Team and RCs attended the annual Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC) conference in Eugene, Oregon. The Idaho contingency met outside of the conference to discuss Phase I of the new SSIP. The ISDE Special Education Director described the process that Idaho would follow to complete the SSIP and to identify the SiMR. This process included a stakeholder meeting in December 2013, following the State Special Education Director's led educational presentations to state stakeholders in the following months.

In December 2013 the ISDE Special Education Director invited a group of stakeholders that included the ISDE Special Education Team, RCs, and representatives from the three institutions of higher education who receive IDEA Part B funding through sub-awards from the ISDE (University of Idaho, Boise State University, and Idaho State University). Small workgroups discussed the different indicators, analyzed potential impacts on student outcomes, and completed a broad analysis of indicator data as presented by the ISDE Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator and the ISDE Special Education Director. Upon conclusion of this meeting, the ISDE Special Education Director identified the six OSEP indicators selected to become the focus of Idaho's SSIP: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 14.

In January 2014 the former ISDE Special Education Director met with the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). As required, a majority of SEAP members are individuals with disabilities, or parents of children with disabilities (birth through 26). Other SEAP members represent a variety of agencies and education professionals. The ISDE Special Education Director presented Phase 1 of the SSIP to the SEAP Panel, and a discussion of the Special Education Director's proposed Theory of Action as it was developing, indicating the plan aligned with Indicators 3 and 4 (academic achievement), Indicator 5 (LRE) and Indicator 14 Post secondary/Transition.

In February 2014 the developing Theory of Action was presented by the State Special Education Director to the rest of the ISDE Special Education Team. Between February 2014 and continuing through May 2014, the ISDE Special Education Director and the Quality Assurance and Reporting Coordinator engaged in a series of information-sharing meetings aimed to educate stakeholders on Phase 1 of the SSIP. These included:

- meetings in each of the state's six educational regions for superintendents, principals, and special education directors (by invitation only);

- a presentation at the Idaho Association for Special Education Administrators Conference (IASEA) held on February 25-26, 2014 which brings together special education administrators from around the state;

- a presentation at the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) meeting in April 2014. The council's purpose is to improve and facilitate interagency collaboration regards to helping students successfully transition into post school services. This council is made up of: Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Labor, Developmental Disabilities Council, Health and Welfare, Department of Corrections, Juvenile Correction, Idaho Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind (IESDB), Disabilities offices at institutions of higher education, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), Assistive Technology (AT) project, Transcend, LEAs, and ISDE; and

- statewide webinars for Special Education Directors in March, April and May 2014.

Feedback from these various meetings resulted in informal and written feedback from directors, professional organizations, and others across the state to the ISDE Administration, and informally to members of the ISDE Special Education Team. Concerns over the breath of the indicators chosen, capacity for implementation, fiscal impact, lack of technical assistance support, and lack of specificity in the plan were identified. The major themes were the number of indicators identified inthe SSIP and lack of clarity on how they would be measured. Additionally feedback addressed the lack of regional support (given the dismissal of all RCs effective June 2014), time and staff hours to implement on local level, and a lack of a clear vision of what the SSIP means in day-to-day practice.

Starting Over (August 2014 to October 2014)

The ISDE Director of Special Education resigned abruptly the first week of August 2014. At that point the remaining ISDE Special Education Team sought guidance from OSEP and the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC) to review the current direction of Idaho's SSIP. This assistance eventually resulted in the ISDE refocusing efforts to re-develop the SSIP with Phase 1 beginning again in August 2014.

The SSIP Core Team was formed and comprised of the ISDE Special Education Team, two re-hired RCs housed at the University of Idaho, and representation from the Boise State University Idaho Results Center. With guidance from the OSEP team and WRRC, the SSIP was reframed as needing to be aligned to student performance measures in the SPP/APR. The SSIP Core Team determined the process needed to be started over at the infrastructure analysis step.

In August 2014 the ISDE Special Education Team met with ISDE staff divisions within the ISDE (specifically: Information Technology; Title 1 and ESEA; Statewide System of Support; Content; and Assessment and Accountability). The goal was to clarify existing data collection processes and to determine data quality and scope. Additionally in August 2014 the feedback from previous statewide meetings were combined with questions and responses from the Directors' webinars in order to assess the general perceptions of the process to-date across the state.

The SSIP Core Team met early in August 2014 to discuss initial findings. After analyzing all the data available, the SSIP Core Team came to the conclusion the previous data analysis would need to be expanded.

Gathering Input and Data (September - October 2014)

The ISDE Special Education Team developed and distributed two surveys to narrow the scope of the SSIP. One survey, entitled The Education Stakeholder's Survey, was sent to all staff at the ISDE, the University of Idaho Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHD), the Boise State University Idaho Results Center, as well as statewide to special education directors, principals, and superintendents. The second survey, The Agency/Parent Stakeholder's Survey, was sent to the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition, Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Higher Education Consortium, and various parent groups.

In late September 2014 the results of the Educator Stakeholder and Agency/Parent Stakeholder surveys were analyzed. The Educator Stakeholder survey asked respondents their opinion on what academic area students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs) need the most instruction to be successful on statewide assessments. Based on survey responses by stakeholders, reading was the area most needed by students with IEPs. When asked what should be given priority the response was Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments. One question asked what skills are missing for students with disabilities who graduate but are not deemed college and career ready. Academic Content (Indicator 3) was in the top three for respondents. Agency/Parent Stakeholder survey recipients were asked if there were concerns about Idaho's student with disabilities growth or performance on statewide testing, 68.1% of the respondents said "Yes". Seventy (70%) of the respondents answered "reading" when asked what area students with disabilities need to be most proficient in to be successful. At each new point of analysis the ISDE Special Education Team collaborated to discuss the findings and receive input from stakeholders.

Student Achievement data was requested from the ISDE Information Technology (IT) group for analysis. As the SSIP Core Team reviewed the data provided by IT which is submitted monthly by LEAs, concerns with the reliability of data submissions into Idaho's State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) became apparent. The ISDE relies on the LEA to submit accurate data in the SLDS but there are times when the accuracy comes into questions. The ISDE has a validation and verification processes in place to assist the LEAs in identifying possible data issues and the ISDE works with LEAs to make sure they understand the importance of accurate data. The validation and verification process provides feedback to

the LEAs before they complete their submissions in an effort to obtain accurate data at the time of submission. The ISDE provides annual training on how to submit accurate data and they Regional Data Coordinators are assigned to LEAs for technical assistance. LEAs are required to submit multiple fields of data monthly. Another area of concern is the many very small schools and LEAs in Idaho. The small size of our "n" count forces use of raw data in order to have representation of *all* schools and LEAs which can increases the margin for error.

Compliance data was a consideration as the ISDE examined other data used in the broad analysis. The General Supervision File Review (GSFR) process provided insights into potential strategies and opportunities for improvement on a state, region, LEA, and school bases. The ISDE Compliance Tracking Tool helped identify improvement activities that were found during GSFR and monitoring visits. The ISDE Compliance Tracking Tool is a database used to record, track, and monitor noncompliance findings to support LEAs, as well as Idaho, in successfully tracking improvement and correction.

Narrowing the SSIP (September to October 2014)

During September 2014, several guidance calls with OSEP were conducted and input from Idaho's Technical Assistance Center was received producing the following indicators for consideration for Idaho SSIP focus: Indicator 1: Graduation Rate; Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments; and Indicator 7: Preschool Children with Improvement Outcomes.

The below chart summaries the analysis by the SSIP Core Team of each proposed indicator and how these were narrowed to three possible options:

Indicator	Recommendation	Rationale
Indicator 1: Graduation Rates	Potential Option	
Indicator 2: Dropout Rates	Not a viable option	This indicator cannot stand alone, per OSEP guidance in the SSIP – Questions and Answers document, and in an effort to reduce the burden of the LEA to report on more than one indicator, this was not identified as a focal
Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments	Potential Option	
Indicator 5: Participation/Time in General Education Settings (LRE)	Not a viable option	This indicator can be used as a possible strategy and for improvement activities to increase outcomes, per OSEP guidance in the SSIP – Questions and Answers document, but was not identified as a focal point.
Indicator 6: Preschool Children in General	Not a viable option	This indicator can be used as a possible

Education Settings (Pre-School LRE)		strategy and for improvement activities to increase outcomes, per OSEP guidance in the SSIP – Questions and Answers document, but was not identified as a focal point.
Indicator 7: Preschool Children with Improved Outcomes	Potential option	Issue: No state-funded preschool in the state of Idaho

On September 22-23, 2014, the ISDE Special Education Team hosted a Data Analysis Workgroup Meeting. Two OSEP representatives met with the ISDE Special Education Team, their newly appointed Interim Special Education Director, the ISDE Directors of Content, Assessment and Accountability, Statewide System of Support, and Title 1/ESEA, as well as the ISDE School Choice Coordinator, members from Idaho Parent's Unlimited, and a representative from WRRC.

Indicator 1 – Graduation Rates: The graduation rate was disaggregated to include students with disabilities (SWD) and students without disabilities (SWOD) and compared the results over a four-year period. Both the national graduation rate and the Idaho graduation rate for those students were examined. Idaho's SWD graduation rate gap was increasing and Idaho's SWD percentage was almost half of the national average for students that graduated.

Graduation Rates for SWD and non-disabled students

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
SWD	89.20%	87.30%	87.10%	79.60%
SWOD	92.40%	92.90%	89.00%	83.60%

National graduation rate of students with disabilities compared to state graduation rates of students with disabilities.

	2008-2009	**2009-2010**	**2010-2011**
Graduation National	35.70%	62.60%	63.60%
Graduation Idaho	23.40%	48.10%	34.60%

Since Idaho only has one certificate available for graduation, this eliminated using Indicator 1 as the SiMR. Any comparison to national data was not possible due to the disconnect between graduation diploma requirements for students eligible forspecial education in Idaho and other states, which comprise national data.

Indicator 2 – Dropout Rates: Data was disaggregated by number of dropouts, number of SWD in Grades 9 – 12 and a dropout percentage rate. The previous five years of dropout rate information revealed the dropout rate has increased by 2.4%. Consideration was given a focus on dropout rates, however OSEP instructed that this indicator could not stand alone, and was not combined with the final determination of Indicator 3.

FFY	**Number of Dropouts**	**Number of SWD in Grades 9-12**	**Dropout Rate**
2007	184	7,059	2.6%

2008	152	6,710	2.3%
2009	94	6,870	1.4%
2010	83	6,866	1.2%
2011	96	6,507	1.5%
2012	234	6524	3.6%

Indicator 3 – Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments: Given the concerns with previous data, instruction from OSEP, and stakeholder input, Indicator 3 was selected as the focus for the SiMR.

The Data Analysis Workgroup reviewed statewide, LEA, and student level data, considered statewide initiatives and the existing infrastructure analysis, and information from the statewide surveys. The Data Analysis Workgroup considered a focus on graduation rates, but narrowed the SiMR to Indicator 3, with an expectation to further focus on either literacy or mathematics in the future.

In feedback from OSEP about their visit September 22-23, 2014, several challenges facing the ISDE Special Education Team were identified with respect to the development of the SSIP. First, the reorganization at OSEP and WRRC requires working with new liaisons in addition to working with new Technical Assistance centers unfamiliar with the state. Second, the work on the SSIP must take place utilizing existing ISDE resources and personnel, currently understaffed with changing leadership, who are still responsible for the continued daily activities of compliance, fiscal oversight, professional development and timely submission of federal reports. While the ISDE Special Education Team faced many challenges, they resolved to create a plan of action to complete a quality SSIP and SiMR within established deadlines.

Narrowed to Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessment

Using Indicator 3 – Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments, analysis was conducted on achievement gaps disaggregating SWD and non-disabled peers for reading and math.

The ISDE examined the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data which confirmed the hypothesis that the State's reading/literacy gap was growing at a higher rate than Math.

Reading

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

*Only 7% of SWD are proficient in reading/literacy. There is a 25% gap between SWD performances in comparison with all students.

Math

NAEP 2012-2014 -- Grade 4 Math			
All Students		Students with Disabilities	
Advanced: 6%	39%	Advanced: 3%	14%
Proficient: 33%		Proficient: 11%	
Basic: 43%	60%	Basic: 33%	86%
Below Basic: 17%		Below Basic: 53%	

*Only 14% of SWD are proficient in math. There is a 25% gap between SWD and all students but the proficient level was higher.

After establishing through data analysis that the Idaho's reading gap was growing at a higher rate, the data was drilled down further to identify possible reasons for the achievement gaps. Next proficiency rates disaggregated by placement information for school year 2012-2013 were examined. It was noted that the proficiency rate for math was lower than

reading when looking at the placement data.

Reading Proficiency Rate by Placement (2012-2013)

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

Math Proficiency Rate by Placement (2012-2013)

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

Development of the SiMR

In November 2014 the SSIP Core Team met separately with the Directors Advisory Council (DAC) and in January 2015 they met with SEAP. Both groups were instrumental in narrowing the SiMR to focus on Literacy. DAC directed the ISDE Special Education Team to explore narrowing the SiMR to only assessing students on one, two or three grades. However, they wanted all disabilities categories included in the measurement. Their recommendation was to measure at fourth, sixth, and eighth grade, within every LEA. It was determined that the ISDE only has the capacity to track one grade-level due to the rural nature of Idaho. The group came to the conclusion to select fourth grade since fourth grade has indicative measurable data on both reading fluency (measured in grade 3) and comprehension. This stakeholder group also recommended that measurement should be based on student growth not on proficiency categories. SEAP concurred with the recommendations from DAC. Results from the DAC meeting was shared with the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition and Early Childhood Coordinating Council in November 2014 for comments, suggestions, and consensus on the selection of Literacy. Both groups agreed that Literacy should be the focus of the SiMR.

The ISDE SSIP Core Team called together a SiMR Workgroup in December 2014. The SiMR Workgroup consisted of: LEA Special Education Directors, reading specialists, general and special education teachers, parents, special education staff, ISDE: Content, English Language Arts Coordinator, School-wide improvement Director, Title 1 Director, English Language Learner Director, Special Education Assessment Coordinator, Dispute Resolution Coordinator, Special Education Secondary Transition Coordinator, Special Populations Coordinator, Early Childhood Coordinator, University Technical Assistance provider, and Western Regional Resource Center Technical Assistance provider. With local decision making and buy-in so critical for the ISDE efforts, the ISDE invited all stakeholders to reaffirm the selection of literacy through an in-depth review of all pertinent literacy data.

Idaho has six educational regions, however, due to the size of LEAs in educational region three the team decided to utilize the Department of Health and Welfare (DHW) regions. The map on the left shows the education regions and the map on the right shows the DHW regions. Educational region three was split into three and four to coincide with the DHW regional alignment. It should be recognized that if region three and four were left together as one region, that region would represent approximately one-third, if not more, of all the students in Idaho.

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

The SSIP Core Team identified a need to consider data from both large and small sized LEAs, Charters (virtual and traditional), and location in regard to distance to resources. Some LEAs are closer to resources than others. The sample size consisted of 43 LEAs to include in the data analysis. This sampling closely represented the challenges that are faced by LEAs within the State.

Assessment data was disaggregated by the type of assessment; regular, regular with accommodations or alternate assessment based on Alternate Achievement Standards by Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). The ISDE analyzed type of assessment by placement. Findings showed that students in placement other than general education had a lower percentage of proficiency rates.

Percentage of Students Taking Type of Assessment (Reading) by Placement

Placement (LRE)	Type of Assessment	Percentage of Students

<40%	Alternate	64.05%
	Regular with Accommodations	0.11%
	Regular Without Accommodations	35.85%
40-80%	Alternate	8.95%
	Regular with Accommodations	0.41%
	Regular Without Accommodations	90.71%
80%+	Alternate	1.35%
	Regular with Accommodations	0.60%
	Regular Without Accommodations	98.05%

This information provided the detail needed to eliminate any correlation between student placement and the type of assessment the student took.

The SiMR Workgroup analyzed the data provided by the SSIP Core Team, and were charged with developing a hypothesis, exploring possible root causes, and identifying Idaho's SiMR. The SiMR Workgroup also analyzed the data surrounding ethnicity, LRE, gender, and disabilities category to determine initial root causes.

Even though the discussion has been about reading, it was determined during the SiMR Workgroup that the more appropriate term should be literacy. Literacy is traditionally understood as the ability to read and write which is the intent of increasing the proficiency rate. Idaho previously had standards for reading and language. These areas were assessed and reported separately. Idaho's current standards and assessment are for English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy, combining Idaho's previous stand-alone content area. Additionally, Idaho's new summative assessment will assess and report one score for the content area of ELA/Literacy.

This SiMR Workgroup analyzed the correlation between fluency and comprehension. The Idaho Reading Initiative (IRI) data, which is the statewide K-3 reading screener, provided a look at the fluency data over 10 years. The third-grade benchmark scores for SWD were marginally better than the second grade scores. Both kindergarten and first grade scored higher than second and third grade.

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

Looking at the percent of all students statewide scoring at Intensive (1) on the IRI, third graders were at 11%. The third grade students with disabilities had a little over 50% in the Intensive category.

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

As the ISDE continued to narrow the focus, the ISDE data analysis examined the Idaho Standard Achievement Test (ISAT) gaps between third and fourth grade students, since this is where fluency and comprehension intersect. Data showed that ISAT reading scores overall had increased year over year with the third and fourth grades showing approximately 90%. The same was not true of third and fourth grade students with disabilities. In 2013 third graders did better than fourth graders byapproximately 2%.

The ISAT reading data was starting to indicate that we needed to look at fourth grade literacy. To verify that this was an area to explore, ISDE pulled the ISAT reading cohort results for all students. The graph below shows that third and fourth grade reading for all students has been comparable for the last six years.

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

However, examination of the ISAT reading cohort results for SWD showed a totally different result. For the last six-years the fourth-grade SWD have been consistently lower than their third grade counterparts. This provided insight into a

specific, data-driven focus of the SiMR.

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

After examining the ISAT reading cohort data to the ISDE examined the NAEP data for fourth grade students. As illustrated by the graph below, Idaho students had been above the national average for many years but by 2013 students were right at the national average. With the continual decline in all fourth grade student literacy scores from 2007 to 2013, it is projected that Idaho SWD would decline as well.

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

Since the ISDE has no data for the 2013-2014 school year due to full-state field test participation on the ISAT by Smarter Balance, the ISDE is comparing results to the NAEP testing. To assist states in setting their achievement levels, the National Assessment Governing Board, the oversight body for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) did research comparing NAEP achievement levels with the new Smarter Balanced test. Smarter Balanced projections for student achievement closely aligned with how students have performed historically on NAEP. The achievement levels also generally align with the results of a comprehensive research study on college preparedness conducted by the National Assessment Governing Board (see http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Smarter-Balanced-Achievement-Levels-QA.pdf and https://www.nagb.org/what-we-do/preparedness-research.html for more information).

Comparison of Grade 4 ELA ISAT by Smarter Balance to NAEP 2013

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

After establishing the validity of data comparison between the two data sources, the ISDE SSIP Core Team examined Idaho's NAEP fourth grade proficiency in literacy for the last three testing years. The proficiency level for the State's SWD had a mean of 7%. Then the ISDE examined the national average for nine year old (fourth grade) SWD which indicated an annual improvement of 1%.

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

Determination of the SiMR

Once the data trend to fourth grade literacy was clearly established, the ISDE SSIP Core Team examined data for Idaho's six regions. The analysis focused on the percentage of SWD that were not proficient in literacy. As illustrated in graph below, all of Idaho's regions were 40% or greater when looking at the percentage of SWD that were not proficient on the ISAT.

Graphic did not upload, see Component #1 attachment.

The SSIP Core Team determined there was enough data-driven information to ascertain that fourth grade literacy in SWD was an area of concern. The SSIP Core Team drilled down into demographic information looking for any correlation to race/ethnicity, exceptionality category, or environment. No obvious gaps, regarding those demographics were found in the data.

With input from both DAC and SEAP in February 2015 the stakeholders supported a SiMR selecting 4th grade literacy because both reading fluency and comprehension positively impacts graduation rates and career and college readiness.

In addition to the data supporting the focus of fourth grade literacy, the ISDE Special Education Team completed a three-prong Infrastructure Analysis which examined Idaho's ability to support improvement and build capacity at the local level in relation to the ISDE's SiMR.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Component 2: Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

Description of Infrastructure Analysis Process

The ISDE Special Education Team completed a three-prong systematic process to complete an analysis of infrastructure involving: 1) the dissemination and collection of the Infrastructure Analysis Template; 2) the organization and facilitation of Collaborate Divisional Meetings, and 3) the application of the SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat) Analysis tool.

Infrastructure Analysis Template and Initial SWOT Analysis

In August 2014 the ISDE Special Education Team explored various tools to determine which would be most appropriate to employ in an effort to gather information from the other ISDE divisions. The Special Education Team chose the Infrastructure Analysis Template to share with the ISDE Divisions for both the breadth and depth of information requested and for its flexibility in use. The goal was to then take the information gathered and integrate it into a SWOT Template for analysis. The Special Education Team individually modified the Infrastructure Analysis Tool to best assess each division.

The following ten ISDE divisions received the Infrastructure Analysis Tool: Special Education, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), State-wide System of Support (SSOS), Content, Assessment and Accountability, Public School Finance, Information Technology (IT), Student Engagement and Post-Secondary Readiness, Idaho Results Center (a sub-award project housed at Boise State University focusing on tiered intervention), and ISDE Chief of Staff. Included with the template was an example of how to complete the template, guidelines for completion of the tool, and an invitation for ongoing dialog regarding the completion of the tool. The Special Education Team designated a specific team member to serve as a liaison for each division for clarification and to conduct brainstorming sessions for accuracy and thoroughness in completion of the infrastructure tool. Division directors worked with their liaisons and other cross-divisional staff in an effort to obtain insight on the collaborate purpose of the tool.

The Special Education Team collected the ISDE divisions' Infrastructure Analysis Templates in September 2014, and then merged the feedback into data tables for analysis. Each ISDE division director's responses were sorted into the seven sections of infrastructure within the tool: Governance, Fiscal, Quality Standards, Professional Development, Data, Technical Assistance and Accountability and Monitoring. The Special Education Team employed a thematic analysis of the data to identify emergent themes, and then applied the SWOT Analysis. The information gained from the Infrastructure Analysis Templates, while informative, proved insufficient for a thorough SWOT Analysis. The Special Education Team determined more data collection was warranted.

Collaborative Divisional Meetings

The Special Education Team organized and facilitated Collaborative Divisional Meetings with each of the six identified ISDE divisions in October 2014. These face-to-face meetings with each division discussed challenges and areas of possible collaboration. The goal of these meetings was to identify current initiatives and potential opportunities to scale up, better support and build capacity. Additionally, the purpose was to identify weaknesses and threats within the ISDE infrastructure to consider when determining the focus for the ISDE SiMR.

Given that the Infrastructure Analysis Templates were completed primarily by the ISDE division managers, the Special Education Team determined a more inclusive analysis of the ISDE was needed. The goal was to gather additional input from *all* relevant members of critical ISDE divisions in order to have a thorough, more detailed analysis of the various strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) existing in current ISDE infrastructure. Toward that end, the Special Education Team held Collaborative Divisional Meetings with six ISDE divisions: Content; Assessment and Accountability; Teacher Certification; Student Engagement and Post-secondary Readiness (SE&PsR); Statewide System of Support (SSOS); and Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

	GOVERN-ANCE		FISCAL		QUAL. STAND		PROF. DEV.		DATA		TECH. ASSIST.		ACCT & MON.	
	S/O	W/T	S/O	W/T	S/O	W/T	S/O	W/T	S/O	W/T	S/O	W/T	S/O	W/T
Assessment	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X			X	X
Certification	X	X			X		X				X		X	X
Content	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	
ESEA	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
SSOS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SE&PsR	X	X	X		X	X			X					
SPED	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Each Collaborative Divisional Meeting occurred during a division's regularly scheduled weekly or monthly meeting and lasted 45-70 minutes. The content of these Collaborative Divisional Meetings included a brief educational overview of Results Driven Accountability (RDA), including the statewide performance plan/annual performance report and the creation of a state systemic improvement plan (SSIP). A Special Education Team member facilitated the discussion to address seven categories of the Infrastructure Analysis Template: Governance, Fiscal, Quality Standards, Professional Development, Data, Technical Assistance and Accountability and Monitoring, with a SWOT analysis applied to each category. The individual divisions were allowed to elaborate on those areas most relevant to them, thus not all divisions had each element of the SWOT explored in depth. The graphic below illustrates the multi-category sorting later included in the Infrastructure Analysis:

Divisions were encouraged to take the handouts of the SWOT discussion form with them and to contact a member of the Special Education Team with ideas that may arise after their individual meetings. The Special Education Team was given a plethora of materials in the form of reports, websites, and access to existing data over the course of the following weeks.

SWOT Analysis of Combined Infrastructure Information

The results from each Collaborative Divisional Meeting were cross-referenced with the results of that same division's previously completed Infrastructure Analysis Tool, allowing for further elaboration on specifics of existing and currently-funded initiatives, programs, concerns, and areas for potential collaboration with the Special Education Team regarding literacy improvement efforts.

Description of State's System Infrastructure

The ISDE's systematic, three-prong Infrastructure Analysis process provided thorough information on the State's infrastructure. This information was consistently sorted within seven categories: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. Summary of the system infrastructure, re

Governance	· The **Governor of Idaho** appoints members to **the State Board of**

	Education (SBOE) which is the policy-making body for all public education in Idaho. · **Superintendent of Public Instruction** is elected for a four-year term and serves on the Governor's cabinet (first term started January 2015). · **LEAs** (commonly referred to as "districts") have local control per Idaho state law. The ISDE provides guidance, technical assistance and ensures compliance per state and federal law. · **The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act -** charges each state with the implementation of the rules and regulations governing education of students with disabilities. Idaho has aligned state statue to address IDEA and charge the ISDE Special Education Division to execute all state and federal obligations. LEAs are required by the ISDE to adopt and comply with the State special education policies found in the **State Special Education Manual**. · **Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan -** Literacy initiatives and programs are supported and approved (governed) by Idaho state legislation through the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Act. This plan incorporates three major initiatives into Idaho Code to increase Literacy: 1) assessment, 2) student intervention, and 3) teacher preparation. · The **Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) -** Part of the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan, governed by the legislature, administered by the ISDE to K-3 students. The ISDE Assessment Division oversees implementation. · **National Assessment Education Progress (NAEP) -** Funded and administered by the U.S. Dept. of Education. Through governance by Idaho administrative law, 4th – 8th grade students enrolled in public schools are required to participate in NAEP. The ISDE Assessment Division has oversight. · **Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA) -** Required through Federal and State code, is administered to K-12 in a Limited English Language program. · **Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) -** Required by Federal and State statute, 3rd to 10th grade students are assessed on ELA-Literacy and Math in alignment with Idaho Core Standards. The ISDE Assessment Division has oversight.
Fiscal	· **State Board of Education (SBOE) Regulations** – Each LEA is required by Law and SBOE regulations to maintain a reporting system for financial records. · **Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) Project--** Idaho legislature determined the need for increased support and technical assistance to Idaho LEAs specifically for school improvement, corrective action and restructure. Federal grant funds were obtained to meet this need thought the IBC Project. The ISDE Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Division oversees this project and allocation of funding, as governed through Idaho legislature. · **Common Core Coaches -** Funding is determined yearly by the Joint Finance Appropriations Committee (JFAC) and dedicated annually by the Idaho legislature. Coaches are throughout the state and accessible to all schools under the direction of ISDE Content Division's ELA

	Coordinator. · **Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) –**Idaho legislature has dedicated ongoing funding for the IRI as part of Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan (and Act).
Quality Standards	· **ISDE Professional Standards Commission (PSC) –** Provides leadership for accountability in Idaho schools through making recommendation to the SBOE and decision-making regarding educators in Idaho. · **Idaho Common Core State Standards –** Idaho has rigorous content standards established. Common Core State Standards in ELA/Literacy and Math were incorporated into alignment of curricular materials and instructional design in 2013-14. · **Survey System for Training Feedback -** The ISDE has a survey system to evaluate trainings and obtain feedback on the trainings in LEAs. This survey system allows for quality assurance to support and build capacity of LEAs through effective training related to areas of technical assistance and professional development. · **Special Education Division's General Supervision and Monitoring** – District level monitoring (conducted by the ISDE Special Education Division) and data collection of compliance and performance (in the State Performance Plan) has established standards in place. · **SEAP (Special Education Advisory Panel) –** Assists in addressing findings in federal monitoring reports and implementation of policy relating to students with disabilities. · **DAC (Directors Advisory Committee) –** Under direction of the ISDE Director of Special Education, the mission is to be a "collaborative, trusted voice for special education, providing guidance, critical insight and practical statewide input from the field to the SDE Special Education Division to aid in making sound decisions benefitting students with disabilities in Idaho."
Professional Development	· **Common Core Coaches –** Core Coaches, focused on ELA and Literacy, provide PD throughout Idaho to support Idaho Common Core State Standards. · **Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) Learning Community**– Through sub-award overseen by the ISDE Director of Special Education, the ITC posts training webinars online, and designs and hosts summer institutes, conferences and trainings. · **The Hub –**The ISDE has a collaborative and comprehensive professional development training housing system and interactive training calendar. The Hub houses information on all ISDE professional development resources and is accessible to all LEAs. · **ISDE Special Education Division Trainings** – Training visits are provided based on need or LEA/school request and include Early Childhood, Secondary Transition, SLD, and IEP –writing (Goals and Present Level of Performance [PLOP]) as well as dispute resolution strategies including facilitation and mediation. · **ISDE Webinar System for Professional Development Trainings**- The ISDE Special Education Division and other ISDE divisions provide

	technical assistance and professional development trainings to all LEAs. The ISDE webinar system addresses the challenge of reaching all LEAs in Idaho to provide PD and TA.	
Data	· **Idaho System for Education Excellence (ISEE)** – A K-12 longitudinal data system that supports budgeting processes, data submissions, and delivers information to stakeholders in regards to data-driven decision making. Includes student-level data management including demographics, program participation, testing exemption, course completion status, as well as graduation and drop-out data. · **ISDE Assessment Division Collection of Statewide testing data** – ISAT, NAEP, IRI, and IELA assessment data collection is overseen and accessible through ISDE Assessment Division. · **Early Childhood Outcome (ECOS) District data collection** – Requested by the ISDE of all LEAs, ECO data is reviewed for compliance and applied in design of effective EC trainings · **ISDE Special Education Division Data Reporting Coordinator** –Reviews data submitted by LEAs annually for quality and accuracy and compiles data for federal requirements.	
Technical Assistance	· **ISDE Special Education Division's Assistance** – Visits are provided based on need or LEA/school request and include Early Childhood, Secondary Transition, SLD, IEP writing (Goals and PLOP) as well as Dispute Resolution strategies including facilitation and mediation. · **Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC) Learning Community**– Through a sub-award overseen by the ISDE Director of Special Education, the ITC posts training webinars online, and designs and hosts summer institutes, conferences and trainings. · **ESEA's Assistance** – ISDE ESEA Division provides technical assistance on: writing effective and compliant application for funds, webinar series for each Title program, technical assistance onsite visits to LEAs with new programs, New Federal Program Director training, and Migrant Education Program identification and service training. · **SSOS Division School Improvement**– SSOS travels the state to provide technical assistance on School Improvement Plan writing. SSOS also supports Response to Intervention (RTI)/Multi-tiered system of support (MTSS). · **ISDE Webinar System for TA to LEAs**- A webinar system to provide technical assistance and professional development trainings to all LEAs is in place and supported through broadband internet accessibility. The ISDE webinar system addresses this challenge of reaching all LEAs for the purpose of providing professional development trainings and technical assistance.	
Accountability & Monitoring	· **Star-Rating System -** Idaho's school-level accountability system (1-5 star scale), monitored by the ISDE, determines each school's improvement status based on: 1. performance, 2. academic growth to standard, 3. growth for equity groups, and 4. post-secondary readiness. · **Idaho Building Capacity Project** – Overseen by the ISDE SSOS division, this project supports schools determined to need improvement (based on star-rating). Capacity Builders (ISDE contractors) provide	**Description of Strengths, System Coordination and Areas of**

	LEAs scaffold-support to build capacity and increase LEA accountability. · **Idaho Reading Initiative: B-12 (birth to grade 12) Literacy Plan –** Includes provisions for monitoring standards-based Common Core literacy approach in classrooms of all environments. · **SEAP (Special Education Advisory Panel) –** Assists in addressing findings in federal monitoring reports and implementation of policy relating to students with disabilities. · **DAC (Directors Advisory Committee) –** Under direction of the ISDE Director of Special Education, the mission is to be a "collaborative, trusted voice for special education, providing guidance, critical insight and practical statewide input from the field to the SDE special education department to aid in making sound decisions benefitting students with disabilities in Idaho." · **Special Education Division's General Supervision and Monitoring** – District level monitoring (conducted by the ISDE) and data collection of compliance and performance in the State Performance Plan.	**Improvement** Through the ISDE's three-prong analysis of each category within theISDE Infrastructure, strengths and areas of improvement were identified through application of SWOT analysis, identifying the extent to which ISDE systems are coordinated to address the SiMR.

The following is a summary of the strengths and improvement opportunities at the ISDE as determined by the Special Education Team's infrastructure analysis activities:

Strengths

- The State has a Comprehensive Literacy Plan in which Literacy initiatives and programs are supported and approved by state legislation through the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Act. This plan, enacted in 1999, incorporates three major initiatives into Idaho code to address assessment, student intervention and teacher preparation to increase Literacy. The Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan is well-established (having been in existence for 16 years) and encompasses all educational divisions in the ISDE.

- The ISDE has a recently developed, collaborative and comprehensive professional development training housing system and interactive training calendar (the Hub). The Hub was established in 2014 as the designated location for housing information on all ISDE technical assistance and professional development resources for LEAs. The Hub is accessible to all LEAs and stakeholders and allows for LEAs to make the most of training participation encompassing the focus of the SiMR.

- A webinar system to provide technical assistance and professional development trainings to all LEAs is in place and supported through broadband internet accessibility. Idaho has a unique challenge in providing hands-on training to LEAs spread throughout 83,574 square miles; some LEAs more than 450 miles away from each other. The ISDE webinar system addresses this challenge for the purpose of providing trainings and support to LEAs to address SiMR improvement practices.

- The ISDE has a functioning accurate survey system to evaluate trainings and obtain feedback on the trainings in LEAs. This survey system allows for quality assurance to support and build capacity of LEAs through effective training related to areas of technical assistance and professional development.

- ISDE staff is housed within close proximity to each other (all ISDE educational staff offices are in the same building). This was identified as a strength in allowing for frequency of face-to-face communication for collaboration of resources related to supporting the focus of the SiMR in LEAs.

- In March 2015 the ISDE named a Deputy Superintendent to oversee federal programs. This individual has a goal of increasing collaboration between divisions.

Improvement Opportunities

- Lack of resources was the first weakness identified by all ISDE divisions through the infrastructure analysis process. Divisions are spread thin with lack of personnel, lack of funds and subsequently, high turnover. To address this system-wide threat, all divisions determined the need to increase collaboration for effective implementation of SiMR

improvement strategies. There is a strongly established need and high support for cross-divisional ISDE communication. Additional Collaborative Divisional Meetings, ambassadors, minute sharing, monthly all-staff meetings with divisional presentations, and internal newsletters were suggested as methods for increasing inter-division collaboration. The ISDE identified the need for the ISDE Superintendent to formalize methods for increasing system-wide collaboration.

- While the ISDE does have a webinar system in place, the large geographic size of the state makes necessary in-person, hands-on training and scheduling difficult. The ISDE identified the opportunity to expand on the current webinar system, through collaboration with ISDE Information Technology (IT) Division, to make webinars more similar to hand-on trainings. In order to provide effective training regarding evidenced-based practice to increase literacy, advances in webinar technology will be important as will working regularly with IT. The SPED team addressed the opportunity to invite a member of IT to weekly meetings.

- Small population, rural LEAs have difficulty finding quality staff and securing substitutes to enable teachers to attend trainings. To address this concern, the ISDE will need to use the Hub to coordinate scheduling of local regional trainings with other ISDE divisions to make the most of the LEA's staff's time. To support LEAs and build their capacity of highly qualified teachers, it was determined that ISDE will need to continue to make best effort to increase attendance for professional development trainings in these small and rural districts.

- ESEA, SSOS (MTSS) and SPED Divisions conduct school visits and scheduled school monitoring, but currently do so without collaboration with each other. These three ISDE divisions have vast opportunities to collaborate school visits and monitoring for increased effectiveness.

Description of State-Level Improvement Plans and Initiatives

Throughout the three-prong process on the ISDE Infrastructure Analysis, the ISDE Special Education Team analyzed relevant state-level improvement plans and initiatives in relation to the SiMR and examined the extent to which they are aligned, or could be integrated, with the SSIP. The ISDE examined special education improvement plans and general education improvement plans (and initiatives related to each plan) to determine which initiatives could be sustained and or expanded to impact LEAs and schools to increase literacy.

The ISDE, as well as the State of Idaho, has many current initiatives centered on Literacy development in which the ISDE SiMR is closely aligned:

Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Act

In March of 1999, the Idaho legislature signed Idaho's Child Literacy Act into law. The act consists of three parts, Idaho Reading Initiative, Student Intervention, and Teacher Preparation.

Idaho Reading Initiative

All K-3 students are assessed twice each year, once in the fall, and once in late winter, to screen students in the areas of phonological awareness, fluency, and comprehension. Assessment results are used to determine appropriate intervention strategies.

Student Intervention

School districts must establish intervention programs, which are a minimum of 40 additional instructional hours, for K-3 students who are below grade-level in reading. All intervention programs must be approved by local school boards and ISDE. Each district is required to validate the effectiveness of their intervention program.

Teacher Preparation:

All K-8 teachers involved in reading instruction and administrators who supervise teachers of reading must complete

Idaho's Comprehensive Literacy Course. The course standards consist of having knowledge, strategies, and beliefs about language structures and literacy instruction that are based on current research and best practices in order to maximize students' reading success.

Idaho K-3 Comprehensive Literacy Plan

Through the plan, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) has identified six areas that will support the ongoing development and implementation of the State literacy components:

· Leadership and Sustainability: Establish effective leadership, essential for successful implantation and maintenance of a sustainable comprehensive literacy program.

· Common Core English Language Arts/Literacy Standards: Implementing the newly adopted Common Core English Language Arts Standards in all content areas serve as the anchor for academic literacy instruction.

· Comprehensive Assessment System: Identifying and using valid and reliable measures to screen progress, monitor, and diagnose literacy needs to target instruction.

· Instruction: Implementing evidence based instruction, promoting active student engagement, and establishing systems of support. Special attention in the area is given to students with special needs using the RTI model.

· Technology Integration: Infusing all aspects of the B-12 Literacy development with appropriate technologies. Three main types of technologies will be emphasized: assistive technologies, new literacies, and digital tools for traditional literacies.

· Professional Development and Resources: Developing learning opportunities, web resources, and coordinated support services that enhance literacy development.

For more information on this plan, see: http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/strivingReaders/docs/Idaho%20State%20B-12%20Literacy%20Plan%20September%202012.pdf.

Governor's Task Force for Improving Education

In September 2013 the Governor's Task Force for Improving Education released their final list of recommendations for improving K-12 education in Idaho. The Idaho Literacy Committee was formed to evaluate and make recommendations regarding the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan and the Idaho Reading Initiative. Key recommendations from the Idaho Literacy Committee align to the ISDE SiMR. For example, ISDE shall provide screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic tools to LEAs; LEAs shall continue to screen and monitor progress of students beyond third grade until students who are not meeting grade-level proficiency have mastered grade-level expectations; IRI intervention funds shall be allocated to provide evidence-based literacy interventions to students identified as at risk; ISDE shall provide professional development in the administration and analysis of assessment data, to include the Smarter Balanced Assessment; ISDE shall provide professional development in the delivery of effective, evidence-based literacy instruction and intervention.

For more information on this plan, see: http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/literacyTech/docs/nov/Revised%20ID%20Literacy%20Task%20Force%20Report%2011-7-14.pdf)

ELA-Literacy Division's Common Core Coaches

Common Core Coaches train teacher-leaders from all districts throughout the state to replicate trainings back at the local district level. The existing training provided by the ELA coaches could be enhanced to incorporate information on special education accommodations and adaptations.

Additionally, collaboration with ELA-Literacy could develop additional documents to enhance the ability to relate the vertical alignment of standards to all students in special education.

Boise State University's Writing Project

The Boise State University Writing Project provides workshops for teachers throughout Idaho. These workshops adhere to the National Writing Project tenets of improving instruction in schools, supporting teachers as professionals, and fostering collaboration across the curriculum.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Division's School Monitoring

The ISDE ESEA Division and the Special Education Division have begun the process of developing a collaborative school monitoring model. Continued collaborative efforts of streamlining and refining the monitoring requirements between divisions (ESEA and Special Education) would result in better utilization of resources, expertise and support to LEAs and school in their efforts to improve literacy for students with disabilities.

Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) Project

Statewide System of Support (SSOS) division identified potential for collaboration with their cornerstone, Idaho Building Capacity project, specifically in the training of Capacity Builders and the development of the capacity builder's "tool kit." In 2007, the Idaho determined a need for increased support and technical assistance to Idaho schools and districts, especially in relation to those in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The IBC Project provides scaffold support designed to assist LEAs in building their own internal leadership capacity to implement and sustain school and district improvement efforts. A rigorous school and district selection process has been developed, with a goal to select schools and districts most in need of support, those that serve a high proportion of at-risk students, and those that have limited local resources to meet those needs. The project is sponsored and directed by the ISDE but designed and delivered in partnership with regional school improvement centers at Boise State University, Idaho State University, and the University of Idaho.

Capacity Builders (CBs)

A key component of the IBC Project is the utilization of highly distinguished educators who are trained by the state to assist school and district leaders as they facilitate the work of improvement in Idaho's schools and districts. CBs are assigned to all participating schools and districts within the IBC network. CBs are provided with a tool kit of school improvement resources, and, in partnership with school and district leaders, help create and implement a customized school improvement plan**.** The ISDE Special Education Division can align with this initiative by participating in trainings of CBs to incorporate effective special education tools into their "tool kits." Additionally, face-to-face collaboration with the CBs during their trainings could result in techniques incorporated into the trainings specific to special education students as well as general education students. The ISDE Divisions of SSOS and Special Education have the ability to create joint teams for school improvement school visits.

21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC)

The 21st CCLC program is designed to provide academic enrichment opportunities, art, music, recreation, sports, drug and violence prevention and youth development activities to students during non-school hours. The program also offers families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for educational development. Utilizing these centers established throughout Idaho present an opportunity for engaging family and community in the process of increasing child-level Literacy through continued support outside of the classroom. Educating family and community members on evidenced-based practices for supporting Literacy in the home and environment closely align with the SiMR.

Representatives Involved in Phase I and Committed to Support Phase II

Several representatives were involved in the development of Phase I of the SSIP and are committed to supporting implementation of Phase II. The chart below identifies the representatives and their roles concerning the SSIP.

Name of Group or Organization Positions and Stakeholders within the Group	Participated in Phase I of the SSIP	Committed to Phase II Implementation

ISDE Special Education Team: Special Education Director, Coordinators, Program Specialists, Administrative Assistant, Regional Coordinators (RCs), Idaho Results Center (IRC), Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC), and Center on Disabilities and Human Development. Meetings: Ongoing	X	X
Core Stakeholders Workgroup: Special Education Coordinators, Program Specialist, and two University of Idaho TA providers. Meetings: Ongoing.	X	
Data Analysis Workgroup: ISDE Directors: Content, Assessment and Accountability, SSOS, and ESEA, Charter School; Idaho Parent's Unlimited (IPUL), the ISDE Special Education Team, WRRC technical assistance provider, OSEP provider, and Federal ESEA provider. Meeting: September 22-23, 2014.	X	
DAC: This council is made up of thirteen regional special education directors who represent the six educational regions of the state, as well as charter schools. They represent both rural and urban school districts from each of the six regions. Meetings: November 11, 2014 and February 18, 2015.	X	X
SiMR Workgroup (Phase I Workgroup): Reading Specialist, general and special education teachers, parents, ISDE Special Education Team, WRRC technical assistance provider and ISDE staff including: Content Director, ELA Coordinator, School-wide Improvement Director, Title 1 Director, ELL Director, and Special Education Assessment Coordinator. Meeting: in December 9-12, 2014	X	
SSIP Implementation Workgroup (Phase II workgroup): ISDE Special Education Team, LEA Special Education Directors, special and general education teachers, Literacy Specialists, parents of students with disabilities, ISDE representatives from Assessment and Accountability and Content Divisions. Meeting: Ongoing		X
SEAP: higher education representation, Idaho Educational Services for the Deaf and Blind administrator, parents, Health and Welfare, Idaho Department of Corrections, ISDE Special Education Director and Coordinators. Meets Quarterly: January 26, 2015	X	X
ISDE Assessment and Accountability Division	X	X
ISDE ESEA (Elementary Secondary Education Act) Division	X	X
ISDE Content Division	X	X
ISDE Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Division	X	X
ISDE Student Engagement & Post-Secondary Readiness Division (SE&PsR)		X
ISDE Information Technology (IT) Division		X

All representatives are committed to implementing a coherent set of improvement strategies to lead to meaningful change. The SSIP Implementation Workgroup (Phase II workgroup) will direct the development and implementation of Phase II. The workgroup will center on determining the relationship between the improvement strategies and the intended outcomes of Idaho's SiMR, simultaneously constructing a feasible plan of implementation.

Description of Internal and External Stakeholder Involvement in Infrastructure Analysis

In the analysis of the ISDE Infrastructure, multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in the process. Information about stakeholder meetings were outlined earlier in this component, but are summarized here:

Internal Stakeholders

In August 2014 Internal Stakeholders including all ISDE Divisions leaders were involved through collaborative efforts to complete the Infrastructure Analysis Tool. A SWOT analysis template was applied by ISDE divisional staff and the Special Education Team. Information was gathered then shared back out to internal stakeholders. Collaborative Divisional Meetings held in October 2014 aimed to broaden the scope of participants to include all staff in key divisions.

Additional input was gathered during Collaborative Divisional Meetings from internal stakeholders within ISDE Educational Divisions: Assessment, Certification, Content, ESEA, SOSS, SE&PsR and Special Education.

External Stakeholders

In August 2014 external Stakeholders participated in analysis of the ISDE Infrastructure through feedback obtained via the *Education Stakeholder Survey* and the *Agency/Parent Stakeholder Survey*. The *Education Stakeholder Survey* was sent to ISDE staff, superintendents, principals, and special education directors. The *Agency/Parent Stakeholder Survey* was sent to Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST), Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Higher Education Consortium, and advocacy and parent groups.

Information from the surveys were reviewed by the Data Analysis Workgroup in December 2014 and were involved in analysis the results from the Infrastructure Analysis Tool and the Collaborative Divisional Meetings as well as analysis of both survey's results.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

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 Balance.

Description

Component 3: SiMR

Idaho's SiMR

The ISDE Special Education Team conducted data and infrastructure analyses for the purpose of developing Phase 1 of the

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). On completion of the analysis Idaho identified the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) which is aligned with Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments. The ISDE SiMR is:

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 Balance.

The ISDE listened to the stakeholders and with guidance from OSEP narrowed the initial focus to Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessment. In an effort to narrow the SiMR, the SSIP Core Team first determined a need to consider data from both large and small sized LEAs, virtual and brick and mortar charter schools, and consider location with respect to and LEA's distance to state resources, such as state technical assistance centers. The sample size consisted of 43 LEAs to include in the data analysis, and represented the diverse LEAs within the Idaho.

Forty-three LEAs comprised the sample size, resulting of a data pull including demographics and reading and math scores for each LEA. Analysis of the achievement gaps for both reading and math was performed with an interest of finding the greatest gaps. The data showed that students with disabilities, as compared to non-disabled peers experienced a larger achievement gap in reading scores.

The ISDE Special Education Team developed and distributed two surveys in an effort to narrow the scope of the SSIP. The Education Stakeholder's Survey was sent to all staff at the ISDE, the University of Idaho Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHD), the Boise State University Idaho Results Center, as well as statewide to special education directors, principals, and superintendents. The second survey, The Agency/Parent Stakeholder's Survey, was sent to the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition, Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Higher Education Consortium, and various parent groups. The results of the Educator Stakeholder and Agency/Parent Stakeholder Surveys revealed a preference from stakeholders for a reading focus.

The Educator Stakeholder Survey asked respondents their opinions on what academic area students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs) need the most instruction to be successful. When asked what should be given priority when compared to other Indicators, the responses supported Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments. One open-ended question asked respondents to identify what skills are missing for students with disabilities that graduate but are not college and career ready. Academic Content (Indicator 3) was identified as in the top three responses. The Agency/Parent Stakeholder Survey recipients were asked if there were concerns about Idaho's students with disabilities' growth or performance on statewide testing. Sixty-eight (68.1%) of the respondents said "Yes." Seventy (70%) of the respondents answered "Reading" when asked what area students with disabilities need to be most proficientin to be successful.

The analysis of both surveys revealed a need to focus on students with disabilities performance on statewide assessments with an emphasis on reading. In addition to the survey data, the collaborative discussion and infrastructure analysis led the Special Education Team to agree the focus would be Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments with an emphasis on reading.

Narrowed to Literacy

The ISDE SSIP Core Team examined the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data which confirmed the hypothesis that the State's math proficiency was growing at a higher rate than reading.

Reading

Graphic did not upload, see component #3 attachment.

*Only 7% of SWD are proficient in reading/literacy. There is a 25% gap between SWD performances in comparison with all students.

Math

NAEP 2012-2014 -- Grade 4 Math	
All Students	Students with Disabilities

Advanced: 6%	39%	Advanced: 3%	14%
Proficient: 33%		Proficient: 11%	
Basic: 43%	60%	Basic: 33%	86%
Below Basic: 17%		Below Basic: 53%	

*Only 14% of SWD are proficient in math. There is a 25% gap between SWD and all students but the proficient level was higher.

Refining the SiMR

In December 2014 the SiMR Workgroup analyzed the data provided by the SSIP Core Team, and were charged with developing a hypothesis, exploring possible root cause(s), and identifying Idaho's SiMR. The SiMR Workgroup also analyzed the data surrounding the demographic categories of ethnicity, LRE, gender, and disabilities category to determine initial root cause(s).

"Literacy" vs. "Reading"

The SiMR Workgroup determined the more appropriate term should be literacy. Literacy, as defined by Common Core State Standards, is an integrated model that incorporates reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language. These skills together are required for students to be college and career ready. Idaho previously had standards for reading and language and these areas were assessed and reported separately. Idaho's current standards and assessment are for English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy, combining the ISDE's previous stand-alone content area. Additionally, Idaho's new Summative Assessment will assess and report one score for the content area of ELA/Literacy.

Assessment Data

Assessment data was disaggregated by the type of assessment; regular, regular with accommodations or alternate assessment based on Alternate Achievement Standards by Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). The ISDE SSIP Core Team examined if students pulled out of general education classrooms were taking specific assessments and what percentage were completing those assessments. The ISDE SSIP Core Team also examined if the data showed that students who were pulled out of general education classrooms scored more or less proficient on assessments overall.

Percentage of Students Taking Type of Assessment (Reading) by Placement

Placement (LRE)	Type of Assessment	Percentage of Students
<40%	Alternate	64.05%
	Regular with Accommodations	0.11%
	Regular Without Accommodations	35.85%
40-80%	Alternate	8.95%
	Regular with Accommodations	0.41%
	Regular Without Accommodations	90.71%
80%+	Alternate	1.35%
	Regular with Accommodations	0.60%
	Regular Without Accommodations	98.05%

This information provided the detail needed to eliminate any correlation between student placement and the type of assessment provided.

As the SiMR Workgroup continued to narrow the focus, the ISDE SSIP Core Team's data analysis examined the Idaho Standard Achievement Test (ISAT) gaps between third and fourth grade students, since this is where fluency and

comprehension intersect. Data showed that ISAT reading scores for all students had increased year over year with the third and fourth grades showing approximately 90%. The same was not true of third and fourth grade students with disabilities. In 2013 third graders did better than fourth graders by approximately 2%.

As illustrated by the following NAEP graph, Idaho students had been above the national average for many years. However, by 2013, students were on par with the national average. With the continual decline in all fourth grade student literacy scores from 2007 to 2013, it is projected that Idaho SWD would decline as well.

Graphic did not upload, see component #3 attachment.

SiMR Baseline

The SiMR Workgroup expressed concern of Idaho having no baseline data on the ISAT by Smarter Balance, a component of the statewide student assessment system. This lack of data was due to full state field test participation on the ISAT in 2013-2014. The limitations of NAEP were discussed, as well, including the ability to pull state-wide results from NAEP data, but not district-, school- or classroom-specific results.

To assist states in setting their achievement levels, the National Assessment Governing Board, the oversight body for NAEP, compared NAEP achievement levels with the new Smarter Balanced achievement levels. Smarter Balanced projections for student achievement closely aligned with how students have performed historically on NAEP. The achievement levels also generally align with the results of a comprehensive research study on college preparedness conducted by the National Assessment Governing Board (see http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Smarter-Balanced-Achievement-Levels-QA.pdf and https://www.nagb.org/what-we-do/preparedness-research.html for more information).

The SiMR Workgroup reviewed the correlation between NAEP data and ISAT data, and explored data given to support the validity and accuracy of the two separate data sets correlating with each other.

Graphic did not upload, see component #3 attachment.

After establishing the validity of data comparison between the two data sources, the ISDE SSIP Core Team examined Idaho's NAEP fourth grade proficiency in literacy for the last three testing years. The proficiency level for the State's SWD had a mean of 7%. The ISDE then examined the national average for nine year old (fourth grade) SWD which indicated an annual improvement of 1%.

Baseline Data and Targets

The ISDE 2013 baseline for 4th grade literacy is 7%. Based on the national growth average on the NAEP scores our targets were set at 1% annually. Below is our targets for the next five years.

4th Grade Literacy for Students with Disabilities

Year	Baseline 2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Proficiency Percentage	7%	8%	9%	10%	11%	12%

The ISDE believes that the targets are rigorous because the gap between Idaho students with disabilities literacy performance is 25% less than all Idaho students. The national average for literacy performance for students with disabilities was 10% for the 2013 test and had been increasing by 1% per year for the last three testing years. Since Idaho's scores were 3% less than the national average it seemed that increasing the literacy performance by 1% per year would be a rigorous goal.

Consideration of the Infrastructure Analysis

The ISDE SSIP Core Team considered the results of the infrastructure analysis and reviewed areas that supported improvement and could build capacity in LEAs with respect to literacy. The Team concluded that the infrastructure would be needed to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for students with disabilities.

As previously explained in Component 2, the ISDE Special Education Team completed a three-prong systematic process to complete an analysis of infrastructure involving: 1) the dissemination and collection of the Infrastructure Analysis Template; 2) the organization and facilitation of Collaborate Divisional Meetings, and 3) the application of the SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat) Analysis tool.

The results of the Infrastructure Analysis Tool and Collaborative Meetings were cross-referenced. This allowed for further elaboration on specifics of existing and currently-funded initiatives, programs, concerns, and areas for potential collaboration between the Special Education Team and other divisions focused on literacy improvement efforts. The ISDE, as well as the State of Idaho, has many current initiatives centered on literacy development in which the ISDE SiMR is closely aligned.

The ISDE Initiatives and the Idaho statewide initiatives (explained in Component 2) are summarized as follows:

tate Initiatives

- Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Act
- Idaho K-3 Comprehensive Literacy Plan
- Governor's Task Force for Improving Education
- ELA-Literacy Division's Common Core Coaches

ISDE Initiatives

- Boise State Writing Project
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC)
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Division's School Monitoring
- Statewide System of Support (SSOS)
- Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) Project
- Capacity Builders
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC)

Idaho's SiMR: Child-Level Outcome

The SiMR chosen by the ISDE represents a child-level outcome and not a process outcome. One of the recommendations from the Idaho Governor's Task Force for Improving Education is recognizing that literacy proficiency is a major benchmark in a student's education. Enabling a student to read opens the ability to learn content in other subject areas. Idaho's approach is to set clear expectations at a state level to strengthen literacy in the classroom.

As the importance of powerful literacy skills increases in every career or post-secondary education path, it is vital to the future success of all Idaho students that powerful literacy instruction and practices occur in each and every academic discipline.

The Idaho SiMR, supported by internal and external stakeholders, with a need evidenced from multiple data sources, and with resources available as identified through the infrastructure analysis is:

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 Balance.

This SiMR will increase the basic skills that students should know and be able to demonstrate to become college and career ready. By increasing the literacy proficiency, we will be readying Idaho's students for College-and-Career/Post-Secondary and Workforce Readiness.

Stakeholder Involvement in Selection of the SiMR

Multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in the selection of the SiMR. A group of internal stakeholders including all ISDE Divisions, regional coordinators and three institutions of higher education were involved in the review of the different indicators, potential impacts of each on student outcomes, and a broad analysis of indicator data. The internal stakeholders participated in the collaborative efforts to complete the Infrastructure Analysis Tool and the SWOT analysis, and later in the Collaborative Divisional Meetings.

The ISDE Special Education Team developed and distributed two surveys to narrow the scope of the SSIP: The Education Stakeholder's Survey, was sent to all staff at the ISDE, the University of Idaho Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHD), the Boise State University Idaho Results Center, as well as statewide to special education directors, principals, and superintendents; and the Agency/Parent Stakeholder's Survey, was sent to the Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition, Early Childhood Coordinating Council, Higher Education Consortium, and various parent groups.

The Data Analysis Stakeholder Workgroup called together the SSIP Core Team, as well as ISDE's division directors from Content, Assessment, School Choice, School-wide Improvement and Title Programs; leadership from Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL); and two technical advisors from the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC). Representatives from OSEP attended this meeting, as well. This group reviewed statewide, district, and student level data, considered statewide initiatives and the existing infrastructure analysis, and information from the statewide surveys.

The ISDE SSIP Core Team held a week-long meeting that included the Directors Advisory Council (DAC) and the SiMR Workgroup in December 2014. The SiMR Workgroup consisted of: reading specialists, general and special education teachers, parents, special education staff, ISDE: Content, English Language Arts Coordinator, School-wide improvement Director, Title 1 Director, English Language Learner Director, Special Education Assessment Coordinator, Dispute Resolution Coordinator, Special Education Secondary Transition Coordinator, Special Populations Coordinator, Early Childhood Coordinator, University Technical Assistance provider, and Western Regional Resource Center Technical Assistance provider.

In January 2015, the new ISDE Special Education Director was hired and instituted weekly meetings of the SSIP Core Team, consisting of ISDE Special Education Director, coordinators, administrative assistants, Boise State University and the University of Idaho technical assistance providers. The Team meets every Monday to discuss progress on the SSIP and SiMR. Additional technical assistance was provided by NCSI and OSEP when guidance and clarification were required. In January and February 2015 the SEAP and DAC groups met and provided feedback and support of the developing SiMR in literacy.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Component 4: Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

The ISDE, through a systematic process of data and infrastructure analysis followed by identification initiatives and programs within the current system, selected a 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 Balance.

During the December 2014 Data Workgroup meeting, participants engaged in analysis of the data and results from the infrastructure analysis to hypothesize root causes of what was inhibiting students from being proficient in literacy skills. Four root causes were identified: insufficient or poor professional development, lack of family involvement, lack of understanding of the function and use of assessments, and lack of collaboration within the ISDE, LEAs, and schools. The ISDE's two state-wide surveys, the Educator Stakeholder Survey and the Agency/Parent Stakeholder Survey, further supported that these four root causes were contributing causes to student lack of proficiency.

Following the identification of the four (4) primary root causes of low performance, the ISDE identified corresponding strands of action to address them. The four improvement strategies were chosen based on resources available as identified through the infrastructure analysis.

The four (4) root causes and correlating strands of action were identified as follows:

Root Cause	Strand of Action
Ineffective PD, TA and Coaching	Professional Development, Technical Assistance, & Coaching
Lack of Collaboration	Collaboration
Inconsistent, Unbalanced Assessments	Assessment Practices
Lack of Involvement with Families and Community	Family & Community Involvement

Improvement Strategies Based on Infrastructure Analysis

Across ISDE departments, Idaho's infrastructure analysis activities, and statewide initiatives, the SSIP improvement strategies (professional development, technical assistance, and coaching; collaboration; assessment practices; and family and community involvement) capitalized on Idaho's existing initiatives and resources, such as: the State Comprehensive Literacy Plan; a comprehensive assessment system; various ISDE monitoring systems (SOSS, ESEA, ELA); and the Governor's Literacy Task Force for Improving Education. A stated focus of the new ISDE Administration is to increase collaboration across the department and to align activities to reduce duplication of efforts. LEAs have access to an ISDE Hub (system-wide professional development housing and coordination) housed at the ISDE, training feedback survey system, and technical assistance through Capacity Builders, Idaho Building Capacity Project, and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers. Each of these activities, projects, and support systems emphasizes the need for strong statewide literacy practices that involve professional development, collaboration, assessment practices and family involvement to assure effective evidence-based literacy instruction and intervention.

By aligning policies, practices, to focus on providing guidance and support to enhance literacy development for all learners, the ISDE will improve student outcomes related to literacy. As part of cross-divisional collaboration, the ISDE will universalize and formalize the processes for LEAs requesting professional development, school monitoring, requesting and providing technical assistance to schools, improvement initiative selection, and stakeholder selection processes.

Improvement Strategies Based on Literacy Improvement Survey Data

After identification of literacy as the focus of the SiMR, and the extent to which the ISDE systems align/have potential to align to support literacy improvement, the ISDE sent out a follow-up survey to Idaho educators/external stakeholders to identify the contributing factors and root causes for students with disabilities' poor performance in literacy. This data was used to create the improvement strategies the ISDE will implement to reach the goal identified in the 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 Balance.***

There were a total of 1,162 responses to the survey, matching the distribution of the population and schools in Idaho as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Literacy Survey Responses by Idaho Regions

Idaho Region	Percentage of Survey Responses	Number of Survey Responses
1	9.6%	112
2	6.2%	72
3	45.9%	533
4	11.6%	135
5	5.7%	66
6	21.0%	244

Survey responses also came from a diverse group of Idaho educators as shown in Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 2: Literacy Survey Responses: Primary Role, Regarding Literacy Instruction

Primary Role	Percentage of Survey Responses
Regular Education Teacher	44.5%
Special Education Teacher	27.8%
Paraprofessional	4.2%
Mentor Teacher	0.1%
Instructional Literacy/Reading Coach	1.0%
Related Service	2.4%
Building or District (LEA) Administrator	15.3%
Other	4.8%

Table 3: Literacy Survey Responses by Grade Level

Grade Level	Percentage of Survey Responses
Pre K:	13.4%
Kindergarten	40.2%
1st Grade	43.6%
2nd Grade	46.4%
3rd Grade	44.1%
4th Grade	42.3%
5th Grade	35.2%
6th Grade	23.7%
7th Grade and Higher	23.6%

Table 4: Number of Years' Experience Supporting Literacy Development

Number of Years' Experience	Percentage of Survey Responses
0-5	20.8%
6-10	19.2%
11-15	14.6%
15 or more	43.3%
Not Applicable	2.1%

Data from the Literacy Survey will be discussed in the next section as it supports the sound, logical, and aligned improvement strategies proposed.

Sound, Logical, and Aligned Improvement Strategies

Improvement Strategy 1: Professional Development, Technical Assistance, and Coaching

Carefully crafted and well-supported professional development is an essential element of comprehensive "systemic" reform (American Federation of Teachers, 2008; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001). "Professional development is a major mechanism for ensuring sustainability of what works and introducing more complex or needed improvements over time regarding staff knowledge and skills to increase efficiency and effectiveness of data-based decision making as well as instructional planning and evaluating of student success" (March & Gaunt, 2013, p. 24). Professional development links theory and research to organizational practice and outcomes. Effective professional development must be comprehensive, sustained, and job-embedded (Learning Forward, 2012).

Technical Assistance (TA) is the provision of targeted and customized supports by a professional with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills to develop and strengthen process, knowledge application, or implementation of services by recipients (NAEYC & NACCRRA, 2011, p. 9). The goal of technical assistance is needs-driven and is closely aligned, sometimes interchangeably, with professional development and coaching.

In response to the urgent demand of quality instruction, coaching systems are established to provide, effective, job-embedded, and sustained professional learning opportunities (Knight, 2005). According to Neufeld and Roper (2003),to improve teachers' learning – and, in turn, their own practice and their students' learning – it requires professional development that is closely and explicitly tied to teachers' ongoing work. Coaching addresses that requirement. Coaching is considered practice-based and job-embedded professional development because it fosters local learning with structures and practices that are built into the ongoing work of educators (Borman & Feger, 2006).

The ISDE is leveraging current department and state initiatives to provide professional development, technical assistance and coaching to improve literacy instruction. Idaho has two sources for educators to receive access to professional development opportunities that are web-based and offers educators a variety of resources: the Idaho Training Clearinghouse and The Hub. Both of these sites are designed to assist educators in accessing resources, evidence-based practices research and material, learning communities, technical assistance, and a calendar of training opportunities. These sites have been under-utilized and many educators are unaware of the wealth of resources accessible, even though each department and division of the ISDE utilizes these sites to post activities for LEAs. Better utilization of the web-based professional development and technical assistance will assure accessibility and minimizes professional development conflicts. Furthermore, through the intentional collaborative ESEA/SSOS/MTSS monitoring and school visits, opportunities for improvement can be identified and professional development and technical assistance can be developed in a unified and consistent manner.

Data Driven Professional Development Need

The Literacy Survey data revealed the majority of respondents self-reported as *Very*

Comfortable with Literacy Development, with 42.7 percent of respondents placing themselves in this category. The majority of respondents self-identified as *Somewhat Comfortable* or below, with 45.6 percent of respondents self-identified as *Somewhat Comfortable*, 7.1 percent *Somewhat Uncomfortable*, and 4.6 percent identified as *Very Uncomfortable* with Literacy Development.

Fewer respondents, 42.3 percent self-identified as *Very Confident* in determining a student's proficiency in literacy. The majority of respondents, 47.5 percent, were *Somewhat Confident*, 8.1 percent were *Somewhat Unsure*, and 2.2 percent were *Very Unsure* in determining a student's literacy proficiency level.

While the majority of respondents expressed being at least somewhat comfortable in literacy development (88.3%) and somewhat confident in determining a student's proficiency in literacy (89.8%), there is a disconnect when considering that only seven percent of Idaho students with disabilities performed at the proficiency level in fourth grade on the 2012-2014 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading Assessment. The ISDE determined that Idaho must take action to improve the instruction, learning, and performance for, not only all Idaho students, but specifically, Idaho students with disabilities in the area of Literacy Development.

Literacy support activities across ISDE departments, statewide initiatives, and LEA practices align to assure all students

are participants in literacy assessments. Assessment activities that address improving Idaho's literacy proficiency are reflected in the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan, recommendations from the Governor's Literacy Task Force, Idaho Reading Initiative, and K-3 Literacy Plan. Data collected and evaluated using the NAEP, ISAT/ISAT Alt, and IRI provide evidence of the effectiveness of literacy instruction and adjustment will be made when necessary. Additionally, Idaho LEAs have access to core coaches in ELA/Literacy to assure that professional development and technical assistance address the use of diagnostic, formative, interim, and summative assessments as it relates to literacy. Each of these state initiatives and LEAs practices will be scaled up, refined, and replicated to improve literacy skills.

The familiarity and confidence level of survey respondents decreased with respect to the Idaho Core ELA/Literacy Standards. The Literacy Survey results highlighted that Idaho educators have a demonstrated need for effective professional development, technical assistance, and coaching to build their capacity to implement evidence-based practices to increase student learning outcomes in literacy.

Improvement Strategy 2: Collaboration

Effective collaboration results in a change of attitudes, beliefs, skills and strategies that affect the essential goal of educational organizations – instructional practice. Reason (2010) identified the strengths of collaborative practice to: stimulates individual and group learning, challenge inconsistencies and enhance perspective, test values and beliefs, establish accountability, build memories and stimulate emotional ties, provide rewards, reduce stress, fear, and feelings of isolation, reveal problems, allow for legitimate shared leadership, and call on us to shape and reshape goals and objectives.

The goal is to engage the whole system, at the ISDE and LEA levels, in a coherent focused effort (Fullan, 2010). This focused effort consists of vibrant two-way and multi-way partnerships zeroing in on instruction and results (Fullan, 2010). The ISDE plans to build and increase horizontal and vertical collaboration across ISDE divisions, community agencies, LEAs, and schools.

The ISDE infrastructure analysis and Literacy Survey highlighted the need for strong collaboration between LEA administrators, general education teachers, special education teachers, and support staff in the area of literacy instruction. The data supports the claim for a need in increased collaboration which is expanded to include all diverse school practitioners who support literacy development. Idaho educators directly involved in literacy development expressed both need and desire for increased collaboration to include the multiple divisions at the ISDE, community agencies, LEAs, and schools.

Improvement Strategy 3: Assessment Practices

The objective of professional learning opportunities is to build capacity at the state-, LEA-, school-, and classroom-level for educators to understand the purposes of various assessment practices and to utilize these to make accurate programming, curriculum, and instructional decisions.

Assessments are used for different purposes. Formative assessments should be used to identify instructional approaches that will meet student needs (Heritage, Kim, Vendlinski, & Herman, 2009) and as identified by Idaho Literacy Task Force (2014) be used as a tool to gauge student learning and develop instructional goals. Interim Assessments are "administered multiple times during a school year, usually outside of instruction, to evaluate students' knowledge and skills relative to specific set of academic goals in order to inform policymaker or educator decisions at the student, classroom, school, or district level" (CCSSO, 2008.) Summative Assessments are administered after the conclusion of instruction and designed to provide information regarding the level of student, school, or program success at an end point in time. The results from summative assessments will assist in making evaluative judgments about program effectiveness, student's mastery of the curriculum during an in-class instructional sequence, and meet local, state, and federal accountability requirements (CCSS, 2012). Information gained through Diagnostic Assessments is used to identify root causes of specific student deficits, leading to the selection of effective and efficient curriculum and instructional methods (Mellard & Johnson, 2008).

According to the Literacy Survey, data supports there is a high level of need for professional development with regards to various assessment practices and how to utilize them to make accurate instructional decisions. Specifically, data indicates respondents lacked awareness and knowledge in the use of diagnostic, formative, interim, and summative assessments. Practitioners with strong knowledge and skills related to assessment practices will address student's literacy needs and adjust instruction when necessary.

Utilizing formative, interim, summative, and diagnostic assessments will advance literacy implementation process in the selection of evidence-based tools as LEAs integrate ongoing assessments of student learning as an integral part of school life. Teachers must learn to use information collected from students to identify instructional approaches that meet student needs (Heritage et al., 2009). The goal is to use valid and reliable measures to assess literacy needs to target instruction.

The ISDE plans to develop a statewide balanced assessment system for formative, interim, summative and diagnostic assessments. Through professional learning opportunities, it is the ISDE's objective to build capacity at the LEA, school, and classroom level for educators to understand the purposes of various assessment practices and to utilize these to make accurate instructional decisions.

Improvement Strategy 4: Family and Community Involvement

Family and Community Involvement is a critical element in a student's education success. LEAs that encourage parent engagement in three key areas: school-based, home-based, and community-based produce improvement in students' literacy achievement (Sawyer, 2015; Elish-Piper, 2015; Ihmeideh & Oliemat. 2014). Schools that effectively engage families andcommunities in student literacy lead to increased reading and writing skills for students (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

The Idaho State Department of Education (2012) Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan, Birth – 12th Grade, describes effective school, family and community engagement in student literacy to include:

- Supporting, teaching, and enjoying children and youth
- Working together to promote positive outcomes for children and youth
- Supporting efforts to educate and involve parents as literacy partners
- Supporting programs that support children and adolescents as learners
- Working to systematically remove barriers between families and educators
- Promoting connections between schools, public libraries, and early childhood educators to enhance literacy efforts

Schools can enhance reading outcomes for students by encouraging parents to support reading activities outside of school. In 1994, the Department of Education reviewed 30 years of research and concluded that "greater family involvement in children's learning is a critical link to achieving a high-quality education and a safe, disciplined learning environment for every student" (Department of Education, 1994). Twenty years later, this still holds true.

Effective coordinated support enhances collaborations with families and organizations in the community to provide greater support for students. Schools, families, and communities will facilitate literacy development by reducing interfering external and internal barriers. An organized program of school, family, and community partnerships with activities linked to schoolgoals improve schools, strengthen families, invigorate community support, and increase student achievement and success(Epstein, 2001; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Sheldon, 2003).

Idaho's literacy initiatives consistently emphasize parent involvement. While the ISDE Special Education Team deliberately included parents in stakeholder groups during the SSIP development (i.e., SEAP, IPUL, SSIP Workgroup), based on the literacy survey, respondents felt families were disengaged. While on a state level parents are represented and their input is sought, on a practice or classroom level the data reflects a lack of parent involvement. The ISDE recognized the importance of soliciting parent involvement at both levels and will develop strategies to strengthen parent involvement.

Root Cause	Strands of Action	Improvement Strategy	Leveraging these resources from Infrastructure
Ineffective PD, TA and Coaching	Professional Development, Technical Assistance,	Develop a statewide structure that supports the implementation of evidence-based literacy	Idaho Training Clearing house Webinars to reach wide-spread state Survey system for feedback from trainings

	Coaching	practices	MTSS resources Primary resource for Special Education Directors The Hub All SDs have access to PD Designed to align scheduling of all ISDE divisions (easier for LEAs; increased attendance at trainings) Common Core Standards ELA/Literacy · Core Coaches in ELA/Literacy
Lack of Collaboration	Collaboration	Build collaboration across ISDE divisions and community agencies to offer professional learning opportunities on literacy for LEAs and schools	Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan Governor's Literacy Task Force Idaho Reading Initiative K-3 Literacy Plan ESEA/SSOS/MTSS Collaborative Monitoring and school Visits Under direction of New Federal Programs Deputy Superintendent · Unite divisions for consistency and best practices of MTSS.
Inconsistent, unbalanced Assessments	Assessment Practices	Develop a statewide balanced assessment system for formative, diagnostic, interim, and summative assessments	State and Federal Assessments NAEP ISAT/ISAT-Alt. · IRI Common Core Standards ELA/Literacy · Core Coaches in ELA/Literacy
Lack of Involvement with Families and Community	Family & Community Involvement	Facilitate LEAs' capacity to engage families and their local community in early literacy practices	· IPUL · SEAP · 21st Century Classrooms Learning Centers · Parent Interview and Surveys during school monitoring visits · Idaho Commission on Libraries

-

Implementation Strategies to Address Root Causes of Poor Performance

Through infrastructure and data analysis, identification of state resources, stakeholder input, and review of researched-based practices, Improvement Strategies were identified to address root causes. The alignment and correlation is illustrated below:

The SSIP Supporting Systemic Change

The success for implementation of improvement strategies for LEAs and schools is contingent on more than a need for improvement, based on low student outcomes. Idaho will select LEAs and schools for implementation of Improvement Strategies based on the Hexagon Tool's six factors (need, fit, resource availability, evidence, readiness for replication, and capacity to implement) developed by Base, Kiser, and Van Dyke (2013). Selected LEAs and schools will have identified needs, be prepared to embark on the improvement process with the necessary supports in place, will utilize evidence-based practices, will create operational definitions of essential functions, and will focus on sustaining all efforts. Selected LEAs and schools will model sites for scaling up across LEAs, regions and the State.

Need

LEAs identified for implementation of the SiMR will demonstrate an academic need, measured by targeted students scoring less than proficient on statewide summative assessments. The school/LEA recognizes that the current practices are not producing the required outcomes and change is needed. Additionally, parents and the community are aware of student performance being below state benchmarks and support the need for change.

Fit

For a school or LEA to be prepared to meet the challenge of Idaho's SiMR they must be prepared to support students literacy needs on state, LEA, and building level. Idaho's Governors Literacy Task Force has identified literacy as a state priority identifying recommendations for improvement, including the adoption of the Idaho Core Standards and an emphasis on literacy proficiency. Idaho schools have statutory reading goals and are provided legislative funding to provide voluntary 40-hours of extended reading intervention program for students that do not meet benchmarks. The LEA and school must have a commitment to improving literacy skills and will have additional literacy initiative utilizing research-based interventions to move students towards proficiency on state summative assessments. The parents and community support the efforts to improve literacy skills of all students within the school or LEA.

Resource Availability

In order to meet the literacy needs of all students, within identified school or LEA, there must be a commitment to allocate resources to the SiMR. With the support of the ISDE, LEAs must have the capacity and agency to provide opportunities to attend and provide training, staff allocation, acquire and utilization of research-based curricula, coaching and supervision, data collection, and reporting of literacy initiatives and student outcomes. Resource allocation must be sufficient to sustainable full implementation of research-based interventions in multiple grades. Building and LEA administrators will be supportive in building strong literacy teams addressing the needs of all students.

Evidence

Increasing the use of evidence-based practices and improving the fidelity of implementation is a critical variable for maximizing student achievement (Kretlow & Bartholomew, 2010). The ISDE's focus is to increase the use of evidence-based practices to increase student achievement in literacy.

Readiness for Replication

Selected SiMR implementers will be provided professional development to cultivate expertise in literacy mentoring. The ISDE and identified sites will define staff competencies, necessary organizational supports, and leadership cohorts for program replication. Throughout the process, identified LEAs and schools will be formalizing their experience in a format that can be shared with other LEAs and schools regarding essential elements of implementation, operational definitions, staff qualifications and experience, and lessons learned. Over time, these LEAs and schools will be utilized as observational sites for newly identified LEAs and schools.

Capacity to Implement

Finally, identified locations will be able to sustain improved literacy instruction and implementation practices over time. LEAs and specific schools will institutionalize staff competencies, organizational structures, leadership teams, and financial commitment to sustain literacy improvement activities. The changes made to the delivery of literacy instruction will have broad base support by parents, practitioners, school, and LEAs administrator so that when personnel turnover occurs, best practice continues.

Improvement Strategies

The ISDE's analysis of data and infrastructure revealed several initiatives and programs within and across ISDE systems to support the SiMR. LEAs and schools identified through application of the Hexagon Tool's six factors, as described above, will be pilot sites for implementation of Improvement Strategies. The initiatives and programs (shown below in the first column) will be the primary means of support to ISDE SiMR through their alignment to ISDE's four (4) strands of action: (shown below in the first row). The diagram below illustrates the alignment of ISDE resources with strands of action:

	Strands of Action			
ISDE Resources (Program and Initiatives)	**PD, TA & Coaching**	**Collaboration**	**Assessment Practices**	**Family & Community Engagement**
Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan Governor's Literacy Task Force Idaho Reading Initiative K-3 Literacy Plan	X	X	X	X
Common Core Standards ELA/Literacy Core Coaches in ELA/Literacy	X	X	X	
Assessments NAEP ISAT/ISAT-Alt. IRI		X	X	
Idaho Training Clearing house Webinars to reach wide-spread state Survey system for feedback from trainings MTSS resources Primary resource for	X	X	X	X

Special Education Directors				
The Hub All SDs have access to PD Designed to align scheduling of all ISDE divisions (easier for LEAs; increased attendance at trainings)	X	X		X
ESEA/SSOS/MTSS Collaborative Monitoring and school Visits Under direction of New Federal Programs Deputy Superintendent Unite divisions for consistency and best practices of MTSS.	X	X		X

Data and infrastructure analysis (as explained in Component 2b) revealed ISDE system-wide needs that improvement efforts must to address to support the SiMR. These needs align to the strands of action as follows:

ISDE System-wide Needs	Improvement Strategy Alignment (Strands of Actions are **bolded**)
Collaborate with all ISDE divisions in order to effectively use limited resources	Under direction of the Newly-appointed Federal programs deputy, ESEA, SSOS and Special Education will collaborate in schools visits, monitoring, and technical assistance to LEAs and schools. This is an integral part of the **"Collaboration"** and **"PD, TA and Coaching"** strand of action. Additionally, collaboration with Student Engagement and Post-Secondary Readiness Division's 21st Century Learning Community will provide combine resources and foster innovation for increasing Literacy practices in the community and homes, as part of the "**Family and Community Engagement"** strand of action.
Increase effectiveness of webinars to be more interactive and reach all LEAs in the state to ensure LEA access to PD and	Idaho Training Clearing house (ITC) and ISDE's IT Division will collaborate in this endeavor. ITC will house all resources to LEAs, work to provide accurate, timely and insightful feedback. ISDE's IT Division will provide assistance and development in increasing the effectiveness of the current webinar system to increase participation and content relevancy of webinar trainings. This Improvement Strategy is directly linked to the **"PD, TA and Coaching"** and also the **"Assessment Practices"** strand of action. Effective webinars will contribute to the education and implementation of assessment

TA resources	practices and application of appropriate data to LEAs.
Coordinate trainings with other ISDE divisions consistently through a formalized method	The ISDE will increase capabilities of the Hub to make all trainings more accessible, available and convenient to LEAs and schools. Increased Hub development in organization and filtering methods will increase LEA's awareness and participation in PD training. This is directly linked to all Improvement Strategies' strands of action, most closely to **"PD, TA and Coaching",** but also **"Family and Community Engagement"** as the Hub has capabilities and potential to house training webinars for parents and community members.
Collaborate monitoring and visits at LEAs and schools	ESEA, SSOS and Special Education, all conduct schools visits and monitoring; all three divisions had no collaboration in these efforts previously. Improvement efforts to create collaboration are reinforced by the **"Collaboration," "PD, TA and Coaching" and "Assessment"** strand of action. Multi-tier System of Support (MTSS) is embedded into all three of these divisions; by collaborating in school visits and monitoring, MTSS can be simultaneously supported and more effectively implemented, coached and sustained in LEAs and schools. Through collaborative onsite visits and data/file review, LEA understanding and application of formative, diagnostic, interim and summative assessment practices can be monitored, adjusted and accurately implemented. During on-site schools visits, parents are interviewed and surveyed. Application of the **"Family and Community Engagement"** strand of action will open doors for future opportunities to further engage family involvement through the structure of on-site school visits.

To increase the SiMR and achieve the desired rigorous, measurable results, change is required. Change in each Improvement Strategy will begin in specific LEAs and/or schools (as identified through application of the Hexagon Tool) using State resource. Improvement strategies will be implemented with the intent to scale up, build capacity, improve literacy, and elevate student-level results as defined in the SiMR.
Implementation Drivers, engines of change, are processes to produce reliable outcomes for students (Fixsen et al., 2005). The ISDE will integrate Implementation Drivers with Improvement Strategies to develop, improve and sustain initiatives and programs as aligned with the four (4) strands of action. The ISDE's SSIP includes leveraging of Implementation Drivers coupled with evidenced-based improvement strategies.

Current Integration of Implementation Drivers:

Idaho has begun effective integration of some Implementation Drivers in relation to SiMR Improvement Strategies which include:

- **Competency Driver – Training and Coaching**: Embedded into the first Improvement Strategy (PD, TA and Coaching), these drivers are integral in increasing literacy and is key element of the initiatives and programs that will be used to provide evidenced-based literacy supports to LEAs. Special Education Team's involvement with Idaho Common Core ELA-Literacy Coaches is an example of how the Competency Coaching driver will be integrated through an Improvement Strategy to increase and support the SiMR. Core Coaches are willing to collaborate with Special Education in design of Core Coach training materials regarding application of ELA/Literacy standards to students in Special Education. Effectiveness of adapted core coaching in Literacy, after implemented in only *few* LEAs, can be measured through survey feedback. If effective, same coaching can be scaled-up and implemented to *all* LEAs to increase the SiMR.

- **Competency Driver – Performance (Fidelity) Assessment:** This driver consists of monitoring current performance to provide feedback on strengths and areas of necessary adjustments (Fixsen et al., 2005). In order to develop and provide effective training, this driver is vital in the implementation of the SiMR. ISDE's Survey system for training feedback, regarding the ISDE's PD, TA and Coaching Improvement Strategy, is an example of how this driver will be implemented into the SSIP through a strand of action using existing resources. Additionally, collaborated Special

Education, ESEA and SSOS monitoring and school visits will assess performance of schools in all areas, including improvement of Literacy in students with disabilities. Through collaborative on-site monitoring, practices can be implemented in specific schools as selected through the Hexagon Tool's six factors. If identified as successful in selected schools, same practices will be scaled up, coached and trained to more LEAs regionally, potentially all LEAs state-wide.

- **Leadership Driver** – Both Technical Leadership and Adaptive Leaderships drivers are required in effective leadership regarding the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan, and all the subsets of this plan, including the Idaho Reading Imitative and Governor's Literacy task force. Adaptive leadership implementation methods are vital to "champion change' in order to increase literacy proficiency of students with disabilities within state-approved guidelines of a 20-year old state Comprehensive Literacy Plan.

Future Plan for Implementation Driver Integration in Phase II and III

Idaho plans to further leverage additional Implementation Drivers in Phase II and III including the following opportunities:

· The ISDE's Assessment Practices Improvement Strategy has opportunity to leverage **Organization Driver – Decision Support Data System** through working towards more immediate access to Assessment Data, including NAEP, IRI and ISAT, for planning and literacy improvement efforts in student with disabilities.

· Leveraging the **Organization Driver of Facilitative Administrator** through the ISDE's Collaboration Improvement Strategy will include taking full advantage of the newly-appointed ISDE Federal Programs Deputy Superintendent to unite Special Education, ESEA and SSOS in MTSS and literacy support efforts.

· **Organization Driver – Systems Intervention** includes potential for leveraging resources through the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC), ISDE's Hub, and ISDE's Information Technology Divisions (IT) to increase TA and PD availability and accessibility for LEAs regarding literacy.

Stakeholder Involvement in Selection of Improvement Strategies

Multiple internal and external stakeholders were involved in the identification of improvement strategies and root causes. Internal stakeholders consisted of ISDE Divisions, regional coordinators, and three institutions of higher education were involved in review of the infrastructure analysis, surveys, and other stakeholders input. External stakeholders consisted of parents, general education and special education teachers, reading specialists, special education directors, superintendents, principals, paraprofessionals, related service providers, and instructional coaches. Both the internal and external stakeholders engaged in a discussion addressing proposed improvement strategies. The need to align with current statewide initiatives and Governor's priorities were prioritized.

The Data Analysis Stakeholder Workgroup called together the SSIP Core Team, as well as other division directors from the ISDE's Content, Assessment, School Choice, School-wide Improvement and Title Programs; two technical advisors from the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC), general education, special education, reading specialists, and parents. This group completed a Hypothesis Statement Worksheet where the group put forth hypothesis, inquired on agreement status, and asked what questions would be asked to staff/contractors to validate the hypothesis and determine root causes. The discussion was helpful in narrowing the focus to the four strands of action. The ISDE Special Education team consistently collaborated with internal and external stakeholders resulting in the agreement the identified improvement strategies to address root causes.

References

American Federation of Teachers. (2008). Principles for Professional Development. Washington, DC: Author.

Base, K., Kiser, L. and Van Dyke, M. (2013). The Hexagon Tool: Exploring Context. Chapel Hill, NC: National Implementation Research Network, FPG Child Development Institute, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Borman, J., & Feger, S. (2006). Instructional coaching: Key themes from the literature. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance. Brown University.

The Council of Chief State School Officers; TILSA – SCASS, Interim Assessment Subcommittee (2008). Interim Assessment Practices and Avenues for State Involvement. Washington, DC Retrieved from: http://www.ccsso.org /Documents/2008/Interim_Assessment_Practices_and_2008.pdf.

The Council of Chief State School Officers; SCASS, Formative Assessment for Students and Teachers Interim Assessment Subcommittee (2012). Distinguishing Formative Assessments from other Educational Assessment Labels. Washington, DC Retrieved from: http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/FASTLabels.pdf.

Department of Education. (1994) Strong families, strong schools: Building community partnerships for learning. A research base for family involvement in learning from the U.S. Department of Education. Author: Washington D.C.

Elish-Piper, L. (2015). Parent Involvement in Reading. Illinois Reading Council Journal Vol. 43, No. 1 Winter 2014-2015.

Epstein, J. L. (2001). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, National Implementation Research Network. (FMHI Publication No. 231).

Fullan, M. (2010). All systems a go. The change imperative for whole systems reform. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Garet, M.S., Porter, A.C., Desimone, L., Birman, B.F., & Yoon, K.S. (2001). What makes profession development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 915-945.

Henderson, A., & Mapp, K. (2002). A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved from http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/family-engagement-as-a-systemic-sustained-and-integrated-strategy-to-promote-student-achievement

Heritage, M., Kim, J., Vendlinski, T., & Herman, J. (2009). From evidence to action: A seamless process in formative assessment? Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice 28(3), 24.31.

Idaho State Department of Education (2012). Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan, Birth – 12th Grade.

Ihmeideh, F & Oliemat, E. (2014). The Effectiveness of Family Involvement in Early Childhood Programmes: Perceptions of Kindergarten Principals and Teachers. Early Childhood Development and Care. 185 (2), pp. 181-197.

Knight, J. (2005). A primer on instructional coaches. Principal Leadership, 9, 16-21.

Kretlow, A.G., & Bartholomew, C.C. (2010). Using coaching to improve the fidelity of evidence--based practice: A review of studies. Teacher Education and Special Education, 33(4), 279-299.

Learning Forward. (2012). Standards for professional learning. Oxford, OH: Author.

Lewis, T.J., Barrett, S., Sugai, G., & Horner, R.H. (2010). Blueprint for school-wide positive behavior support training and professional development. Eugene, OR: OSEP National Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports. Retrieved from www.pbis.org

March, A.L., & Gaunt, B.T. (2013). Systems coaching. A model for building capacity. Florida's MTTS: A Multi-Tiered System of Support. Retrieved from http://floridarti.usf.edu/resources/topic/building_capacity/index.html

Mellard, D.F., & Johnson, E. (2008). RTI: A practitioner's guide to implementing response to intervention. Thousand

Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Reason, C. (2010). Leading a learning organization. The science of working with others. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Sawyer, Mary. (2015). Connecting with Families to Facilitate and Enhance Involvement. Teaching Exceptional Children Vol. 47., No. 3, pp 172-179.

Sheldon, S. B. (2003). Linking school-family-community partnerships in urban elementary schools to student achievement on state tests. Urban Review, 35(2), 149-165.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful changein LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Theory of Action Graphic Theory of Action Graphic

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Idaho State Department of Education's Theory of Action

Only seven percent of Idaho's students with disabilities are proficient in reading/literacy. Idaho's theory of action takes aim at improving this statistic. The graphic illustration below outlines the rationale of how implementing a coherent set of improvement strategies will increase Idaho's capacity to meet Idaho's State-identified Measurable Result: ***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 Balance.***

IDAHO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: THEORY OF ACTION

Strands of Action	If ISDE…	Then…	Then…	Then…
Professional Development, Technical Assistance, Coaching	…develops a statewide structure that supports the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices	…the ISDE will provide collaborative professional learning opportunities, technical assistance, and coaching to LEAs and schools regarding literacy …LEA and school educational staff will have standardized literacy resources and ongoing supports necessary to	...evidence-based literacy practices will be implemented with fidelity and sustained over time to achieve an increase in literacy outcomes	…**Increase the percent of fourth-grade students with disabilities in Idaho who will be proficient in literacy as measured on the state summative assessment,**

		consistently and effectively implement and maintain evidence-based practices in literacy			
Collaboration	…builds collaboration across ISDE divisions and community agencies to offer professional learning opportunities on literacy for LEAs and schools	…the ISDE will leverage current department and community initiatives to streamline messages around effective literacy instruction …the ISDE and community agencies will broaden and deepen their own understanding of each other's literacy initiatives	…ISDE and community initiatives will be supported and implemented to best serve students …LEAs and schools will build collaboration vertically and horizontally,including allstakeholders, building their capacity to implement evidence-based literacy practices		
Assessment Practices	…develops a statewide balanced assessment system for formative, diagnostic, interim, and summative assessments	…LEA and school educational staff will develop an understanding of the uses and purposes for formative, diagnostic, interim, and summative assessments …LEA and school educational staff will use appropriate data to make decisions regarding, programming, curriculum, and instruction	…LEA and school educational staff will use accurate data to make daily instructional choices for students	**currently ISAT by Smarter Balance.**	
Family & Community Involvement	…facilitates LEAs' capacity to engage families and their local community in early literacy practices	…meaningful conversations will occur and the capacity of families and in their child's literacy development will increase …the ISDE will increase support and	…families and community stakeholders will understand the literacy standards and their role in developing literacy skills in their children		

		resource availability for families and communities in regards to literacy		

The ISDE has identified four (4) strands of action and correlating improvement strategies to ***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 Balance.***

Improvement Strategy 1: Professional Development, Technical Assistance, and Coaching

The ISDE will develop a statewide structure that supports the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices. This statewide structure will include the delivery of professional learning opportunities, technical assistance, and coaching to LEAs and school regarding literacy. Standardized literacy resources and ongoing supports will be provided to LEA and educational staff, building their capacity to consistently and effectively implement and maintain the use of evidence-based literacy practices. The goal of these actions is for evidence-based literacy practices to be implemented with fidelity and sustained over time to achieve an increase in literacy outcomes.

Improvement Strategy 2: Collaboration

The ISDE will actively work to build collaboration across ISDE divisions and community agencies to offer professional learning opportunities on literacy for LEAs and school. In broaden and deepening their understanding of Idaho's various literacy initiatives, the ISDE will also leverage current department and community initiatives to streamline messages around effective literacy instruction. With streamlined messages and understanding, these ISDE and community initiatives will be enhanced and supported to better serve Idaho students. At the LEA level, LEAs, school, and classrooms will build vertical and horizontal collaboration, including all stakeholders, building their capacity to implement evidence-based literacy practices.

Improvement Strategy 3: Assessment Practices

The ISDE will develop a statewide balanced assessment system for formative, diagnostic, interim, and summative assessments and assist LEAs in building coherent assessment systems, aligned to the standards, to ensure learners are reliably and accurately assessed. With support from the ISDE, LEA and school educational staff will develop an understanding of the uses and purpose for formative, diagnostic, interim, and summative assessments and utilize the data from these assessments to make decisions regarding, programming, curriculum, and instruction. LEA and school educational staff will use accurate literacy data to make daily effective instructional decisions through differentiating pedagogy at the student's point of learning.

Improvement Strategy 4: Family and Community Involvement

The ISDE will facilitate LEAs' capacity to engage families and their local community in early literacy practices. The ISDE will increase the communications, support, and resource availability provided for families in regards to literacy. Additionally, LEAs will identify community resources and partners to develop activities and assets to increase access to literacy material. This will result in families and community stakeholders increasing their understanding of literacy standards and their role in developing literacy skills in their children.

Stakeholder Involvement in the Creation of the Theory of Action

Idaho State Department of Education's Theory of Action is based on the Infrastructure and Data Analysis, surveys, state, regional, and local meetings, webinars, conferences, research of evidence-based practices, by the ISDE Special Education Division staff, ISDE divisions, Data Analysis Stakeholder group, DAC, SEAP, Director's Webinars, SSIP Core Team, SiMR Workgroup, parent groups. Throughout the process the ISDE Special Education Division collaborated, aligned to current educational research, analyzed data, supported current initiatives, leveraged resources, modified and refined our Theory of Action to meeting Idaho's literacy needs.

Idaho is committed to ongoing collaboration with stakeholders and has scheduled meetings throughout April and May 2015 to update and provide additional input from SEAP, DAC, Idaho Special Education Directors (through a webinar), and ISDE Division Directors.

Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Please see PDF documents below due to graphics and font changes.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Please see PDF documents below due to graphics and font changes.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Please see PDF documents below due to graphics and font changes.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Please see PDF documents below due to graphics and font changes.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.