

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

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2022**

**Idaho**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2024**

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

## Introduction

### Instructions

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

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

The Idaho Department of Education is the state agency that supports and strengthens public education in Idaho. By advocating for Idaho's families, educators, and schools with funding and educational policy alignment, we support and lead academic achievement to ensure every student is prepared with the skills and job readiness to succeed.

In Idaho, the Superintendent of Public Education is an elected position that heads the Idaho Department of Education (department). The 2022-2023 school year began with one administration and transitioned to new leadership in January 2023.

Under the prior administration, the department's strategic plan included the following goals.

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

Under the current administration, the department has rebranded.

As the action arm of Idaho's public education system, the department supports schools, school districts, and students through leadership, expertise, and technical assistance.

Mission:

To support Idaho students, educators, and school leaders with the tools and resources needed to achieve academic excellence through strategic thought leadership and policy alignment.

Vision:

All Idaho students have access to a high-quality education that prepares them for their future with the skills and job readiness to become engaged, successful citizens.

Core Values:

Listen with intention.

Lean into collaboration.

Lead with integrity.

Priority goals moving forward include:

Increasing student achievement in literacy and math;  
recruiting and retaining quality educators statewide;  
modernizing the school funding formula;  
addressing issues of behavioral health amongst students; and  
preparing students for life beyond the classroom.

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

The department showed that COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data of any indicator. The long-term impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are evident in some indicators, including 3C, 7, and 6.

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

188

#### General Supervision System:

**The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).**

The information provided in this section is a summary as character limits prevent the department from providing a complete description of Idaho's system for support and general supervision. For a complete user friendly version, access a copy of the Idaho System of Support & General Supervision Handbook at the following link:

<https://sde.idaho.gov/sped/files/handbooks/Idaho-General-Support-and-Supervision-Handbook.pdf>

Idaho's System of Support and General Supervision is the framework that outlines our responsibility for enforcing the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and ensuring continuous improvement, resulting in;

- improved educational and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities,
- local education agencies (LEAs) meeting IDEA program requirements.

Monitoring compliance with IDEA requirements is critical to our role, we believe all activities should be accompanied by guidance, training, technical assistance, and follow-up.

The department's role is one of servant leadership. We recognize the grave importance of ensuring compliance with IDEA. We believe that the best and most effective way of fulfilling this obligation is to emphasize support and guidance for parents, teachers, and administrators who engage directly in the special education process. Our monitoring practices help us prioritize and target the support provided.

This value is reflected in the abundance of resources available through our Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) and the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (ITC). It is also reflected in our state-level spending practices and positive relationships with the State's LEAs.

Integrated Monitoring Activities:

In accordance with IDEA, the Department employs general supervision activities that include monitoring of LEAs with a particular emphasis on improving educational results and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities. The Department's integrated monitoring activities directly align with the SPP while ensuring that LEAs meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. The Department's monitoring process is completed during specific periods throughout the year using multiple sources of evidence. All of Idaho's LEAs undergo monitoring annually with a focus on components of IDEA conducted through file review as well as indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, & 16. As mentioned, all LEAs are reviewed annually for all indicators, with

subsequent reviews for LEAs failing to meet the state targets. Through the Department's tiered support system, the monitoring may be conducted onsite, through desk audit, or both based on monitoring outcomes. This tiered monitoring structure is part of the differentiated support provided to our LEAs. We are explicit in maintaining high expectations while supporting efforts in the improvement process.

The Department does not use a formal risk assessment for monitoring, except in the case of fiscal monitoring. The Department, in partnership with Idaho SESTA, compiles information and data for each LEA around the key components of our monitoring system. By tracking LEA performance data, we assess the health of an LEA's special education system and provide differentiated support as needed. Focused monitoring activities include GSFR, LEA Determinations, Significant Disproportionality, Dispute Resolution, Fiscal and Indicator 17 Cultivating Readers. Details around the individual monitoring components are as follows:

General Supervision File Review (GSFR) GSFR focuses on LEAs processes and procedures around identification (eligibility) and service delivery (IEPs).

Indicators 11 & 12, deal with timelines around initial determination or eligibility meeting dates. Indicator 11 addresses Child Find and the 60-day timeline requirements. Indicator 12 addresses Early Childhood Transition. Noncompliance on both indicators are reported in the CTT but follow a different timeline than GSFR. Indicators 11 & 12 timeline data is acquired through the Idaho System of Educational Excellence (ISEE). The data collection period for indicators 11 & 12 runs from July 1- June 30 to capture all initial eligibility determination, and as needed for Indicator 12, development of the initial IEP completed during the reporting year.

LEA Determination: Annually, we review each LEA's performance on a preidentified set of results indicators, compliance indicators, and special conditions areas to meet general supervision requirements. Data is compiled into an LEA Determination Report, and LEAs are placed into one of three Differentiated Levels of Support according to the score on the LEA Determination Report. We provide tiered technical assistance according to LEA needs. Superintendents and LEA Special Education Directors receive their LEA Determination on the second Friday in June.

LEAs earn points for each indicator within the areas of Results and Compliance. A percentage is calculated, and the Department uses the LEA Determination percentile to rank order the LEAs and assign a level of determination and support. LEAs are sorted as follows:

- Level 1 - Meets Requirements, Top 80%
- Level 2 - Needs Assistance, Bottom 15%
- Level 3 - Needs Intervention, Bottom 5%
- Level 4 - Needs Substantial Intervention, Determined base on multiple data sources across the department that demonstrate the a need for substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of IDEA.

Equity in IDEA Significant Disproportionality: IDEA requires each state to annually examine whether significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in the state and LEAs. The Department has developed a robust system to assist LEAs in addressing factors contributing to Significant Disproportionality. The system focuses on a proactive approach. LEAs receive a copy of their Significant Disproportionality Report annually, documenting three years of calculations.

Fiscal Monitoring: Idaho employs proactive, systematic analysis of LEA systems and practices to ensure alignment with evidence based best practices and efficiencies that adhere to state and federal policies and regulations. Through a tiered monitoring system, LEAs are provided with support systems to improve practices and student outcomes that reflect their full potential.

Dispute Resolution (DR) Monitoring: The Dispute Resolution office provides ongoing support to parents and LEAs by taking calls to answer questions or address concerns related to policy, practices, and procedures specific to IDEA. DR staff then connects individuals with resources, people, or dispute resolution options (facilitation, mediation, state administrative complaints, and due process hearings) that will provide them with support to resolve their concerns at the lowest level appropriate.

Indicator 17 is designed to "increase the percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities in Idaho who will be proficient in literacy as measured on the state summative assessment, currently Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) by Smarter Balanced." Based on input from a broad base of educational partners, the Department selected a multi-strand, multi-year program where participating LEAs/schools implement evidence-based practices (EBPs) to positively impact students' reading. EBPs are implemented on two levels: state/LEA level - Implementation Science and continuous improvement strategies; and coaching/instructional level – professional development related to the five foundational reading skills, explicit instruction, and instructional coaching.

Idaho, monitors annually for compliance. All finding(s) of noncompliance must be corrected by the LEA at the student-level as soon as possible but no later than one year (365 days) from the date of notification. The LEA must also provide evidence from additional subsequent student files that demonstrate the LEA's as a whole (system-level) is 100% compliant for the identified issue.

#### **Technical Assistance System:**

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

Technical Assistance (TA), Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA), and Professional Development (PD) are ongoing activities and comprise the main components of our general support and supervision system. TA is designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The TA links directly to The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requirements, State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR) indicators, and improved outcomes for Idaho's students with disabilities. In partnership with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA), the Idaho Department of Special Education (Department) uses reporting and compliance data to inform the development and provision of resources and technical assistance to all LEAs in Idaho. Our comprehensive approach to TA enables us to differentiate the scope of services provided for LEAs based on local needs.

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

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

Character limits did not allow for a full description of Idaho's technical assistance system. For additional information regarding technical assistance and training provided by the department to special educators throughout the state, please see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/> and Idaho SESTA Home at <https://idahotc.com/SESTA>.

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

1. New Teacher (Essential Components of the Special Education Process) <https://idahotc.com/SESTA/Essential>
2. Secondary Transition (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/ST>)
3. Funding and Fiscal Accountability (<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/funding/index.html>)
4. Early Childhood (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/EC>)
5. Results Driven Accountability Monitoring System (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS>)
6. Parents (<https://idahotc.com/Parents>)
7. Comprehensive Evaluation (<https://idahotc.com/Comprehensive-Evaluation>)
8. Behavior (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/Behavior>)

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

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

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

Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA);

- Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHD), University of Idaho, 875 Perimeter Drive MS 4061, Moscow, ID 83844-4061, Phone: (208) 885-6132, Fax: (208) 885-6145; and
- Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies, Boise State University, Ron and Linda Yanke Family Research Park 220 E. Parkcenter Blvd., Boise, ID 83706-3940.

Professional Development Projects hosted by the department and Idaho SESTA:

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

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

1. Annually, the Division of Special Education, in collaboration with the Assessment and Accountability, provides information regarding data on students with disabilities as part of the Data Drill Down, conducted in multiple regional sites around the state.
2. The Division of Special Education participates as an active partner in the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow with the Idaho Office of the State Board of Education, Technology Services. The ISEE Roadshow provides LEAs with information regarding the importance of data quality, proper data entry procedures, and information on how data quality interacts across educational systems.
3. The department Division of Special Education collaborates with the IDHW on the biannual Early Years Conference, promoting networking and strengthening early childhood partnerships, programs, and systems-building initiatives.
4. The department collaborates with the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) and the National Technical Assistance Center for Transitions: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) to provide regional and customized training to improve post-secondary outcomes for low-incidence disabilities and connect students to competitive employment options.
5. The department collaborates with the Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL) to train and educate secondary transition teachers on how to utilize information regarding trends in employment, available training, and job requirements to benefit and promote successful student transitions.
6. The department collaborates with the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW) to provide a system of care, Youth Empowerment Services (YES), designed to support the mental health needs of children and youth.

#### **Stakeholder Engagement:**

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

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

SEAP membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and department staff. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure

representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state. IICST includes Division of Vocation Rehabilitation, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, University and College representatives, Disability Rights Idaho (Protection and Advocacy), Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Assistive Technology Project, Idaho Parents Unlimited (Parent Training and Information), the three Centers for Independent Living, district and charter school representatives, Idaho Division of Career Technical Education, and Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

Idaho began preparing educational partners, including SEAP and DAC, to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. The department encouraged educational partners including parents, SEAP, and LEAs to further examine the changes and submit comments during the 60-day, and 30-day open comment periods.

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

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

The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Feedback from educational partners indicated that the data needed to be updated to accurately reflect Idaho's educational system. Educational partners requested that the department provide more student-centered examples that would better illustrate the impacts of targets on local education agencies (LEAs) and student outcomes.

The department scheduled a follow-up workgroup session with educational partners one month later to provide for additional discussion and more student-centered examples per the educational partner's request. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

After an overview of goals and materials, workgroup participants discussed the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including system challenges and supports, and then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

Educational Partners are integral to Idaho's processes and provide valuable, diverse input on SPP/APR priority indicators and general supervision processes. Information on target setting and educational partner input specific to each indicator are available in the stakeholder sections of these indicators.

Per educational partners input, the has developed two-page informational sheets for SPP/APR priority indicators called Indicator Summaries. These Indicator Summaries briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, are broken up by sub-indicator so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022. The department has modified the template based on educational partner feedback and the majority of Indicator Summaries are now available to the public through the Idaho Department of Education, Special Education, RDA Monitoring System webpage <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/> under SPP/APR Indicators 1-16 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. The department is still in the process of releasing summaries for equity indicators (4, 9, and 10), dispute resolution indicators (15 and 16), and Indicator 17.

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

The department is currently working with educational partners to update and improve collection processes for Indicator 8 Parent Involvement and make revisions to Idaho's Specific Learning Disability (SLD) eligibility criteria. Additional information will be available in the FFY 2023 submission.

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

NO

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

35

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

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

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

SEAP membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and department staff.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

Idaho began preparing educational partners, including SEAP to discuss changes to the SPP/APR before the 2020-2025 package was finalized. The department encouraged educational partners including parents, SEAP, and families to further examine the changes and submit comments during the 60-day, and 30-day open comment periods.

The department discusses SPP/APR priority indicators and data with educational partners as part of face-to-face or virtual meetings, conferences,

webinars, and training. In fall of 2021, Idaho developed updated layouts for indicator information based on educational partners request. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help educational partners better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes. The department has expanded the use of these infographics to SPP/APR priority indicators to improve communication and further facilitate educational partners involvement.

The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Feedback from educational partners indicated that the data needed to be updated to accurately reflect Idaho's educational system. Educational partners requested that the department provide more student-centered examples that would better illustrate the impacts of targets on local education agencies (LEAs) and student outcomes.

The department scheduled a follow-up workgroup session with educational partners one month later to provide for additional discussion and more student-centered examples per the educational partner's request. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

After an overview of goals and materials, workgroup participants discussed the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including system challenges and supports, and then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

The department continues to provide information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with educational partners no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, the department includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent. In the spring of 2023, the SEAP membership requested the addition of mini-group sessions for future meetings. Mini-groups include Support and Monitoring, Transitions (Early Childhood and Secondary, Fiscal, and the final group is focused on student outcomes with an emphasis on statewide assessment.

The department is currently working with educational partners to update and improve collection processes for Indicator 8 Parent Involvement and make revisions to Idaho's Specific Learning Disability (SLD) eligibility criteria. Parents are key participants in these discussions for improvement to systems. Additional information will be available in the FFY 2023 submission.

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

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

Idaho, through its parent center, IPUL continues to provide the Serving on Groups training to educational partners to improve their ability to effectively serve on decision-making groups. The training developed by Wisconsin and modified to meet Idaho's needs provides participants with information on:

How to get involved;

Types of groups;

Understanding data;

Roles of families on groups; and

Skills for serving on groups.

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

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

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

Current, relevant dispute resolution information is provided to LEAs, parents, and educational partners in a variety of formats and locations. This is in an effort to ensure that all are aware that any of the dispute resolution options offered by SDE may be initiated at any time and in any sequence, without prerequisite actions, and that more than one DR process (e.g., facilitation and complaint investigation) may be in effect at the same time.

Additionally, in collaboration with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) the DR office recommends and develops updated guidance for LEAs and resources for parents. The DR office also presents regular updates to our educational partners, including SEAP and parents in partnership with IPUL.

The department continues to provide information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with educational partners no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, the department includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent. In the spring of 2023, the SEAP membership requested the addition of mini-group sessions for future meetings. Mini-groups include Support and Monitoring, Transitions (Early Childhood and Secondary, Fiscal, and the final group is focused on student outcomes with an emphasis on statewide assessment. Mini groups are designed to provide members with a focused timeframe to gain knowledge, provide feedback, and request clarifications.

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

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

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

SEAP membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and department staff. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state. IICST includes Division of Vocation Rehabilitation, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, University and College representatives, Disability Rights Idaho (Protection and Advocacy), Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Assistive Technology Project, Idaho Parents Unlimited (Parent Training and Information), the three Centers for Independent Living, district and charter school representatives, Idaho Division of Career Technical Education, and Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

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

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

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

The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Feedback from educational partners indicated that the data needed to be updated to accurately reflect Idaho's educational system. Educational partners requested that the department provide more student-centered examples that would better illustrate the impacts of targets on local education agencies (LEAs) and student outcomes.

The department scheduled a follow-up workgroup session with educational partners one month later to provide for additional discussion and more student-centered examples per the educational partner's request. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

After an overview of goals and materials, workgroup participants discussed the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including system challenges and supports, and then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

Educational Partners are integral to Idaho's processes and provide valuable, diverse input on SPP/APR priority indicators and general supervision processes. Information on target setting and educational partner input specific to each indicator are available in the stakeholder sections of these indicators.

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

The department continues to provide information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with educational partners no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, the department includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent. In the spring of 2023, the SEAP membership requested the addition of mini-group sessions for future meetings. Mini-groups include Support and Monitoring, Transitions (Early Childhood and Secondary, Fiscal, and the final group is focused on student outcomes with an emphasis on statewide assessment).

The department is currently working with educational partners to update and improve collection processes for Indicator 8 Parent Involvement and make revisions to Idaho's Specific Learning Disability (SLD) eligibility criteria. Parents are key participants in these discussions for the improvement of systems. Additional information will be available in the FFY 2023 submission.

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

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

Idaho reports to the public in a variety of means. Information is posted to the department website after the close of the SPP/APR clarification period and includes reporting for all LEAs compared to state targets for all SPP/APR indicators as well as local determination levels in an accessible Excel document posted to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>. For information specific to SPP/APR indicators, go to

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/> and select State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report. Information, including the comparison of LEA performance against state targets, is available by submission year. Additional information is also made available on

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

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

Per educational partner input, the department has developed two-page informational sheets for SPP/APR priority indicators called Indicator Summaries. These Indicator Summaries briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. Indicators such as 3 and 7, which contain multiple sub-indicators, are broken up by sub-indicators so that they remain short and provide a quick access resource. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December 2022.

The department has modified the template based on educational partner feedback and the majority of Indicator Summaries are now available to the public through the Idaho Department of Education, Special Education, RDA Monitoring System webpage <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/> under SPP/APR Indicators 1-16 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. The department is still in the process of releasing summaries for equity indicators (4, 9, and 10), dispute resolution indicators (15 and 16), and Indicator 17.

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

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR**

**§300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.**

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

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

<https://idahoschools.org/>

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

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

### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **Intro - OSEP Response**

OSEP conducted a Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) monitoring visit with representatives from the State Educational Agency, Idaho State Department of Education, during October 2023. OSEP will address any issues related to OSEP's DMS activities, including any issues relevant to the SPP/APR, under separate cover.

### **Intro - Required Actions**



# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	63.84%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	65.40%	65.48%	70.70%	63.84%	63.85%
Data	60.95%	65.48%	62.45%	71.51%	60.29%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho’s Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private school, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) includes Division of Vocation Rehabilitation, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, University and College representatives, Disability Rights Idaho (Protection and Advocacy), Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Assistive Technology Project, Idaho Parents Unlimited (Parent Training and Information), the three Centers for Independent Living, district and charter school representatives, Idaho Division of Career Technical Education, and Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

Idaho established targets for Indicator 1 in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners’ ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

- Descriptions of the changes.
- Anticipated impacts for the state.
- An overview of state historical data.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Based on small group discussions, educational partners recommended using FFY 2019 as a baseline. That year of information best reflected the current data collection and aggregation processes, but was free of COVID-19 impact.

In the small group discussions, educational partners expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Educational partners recognized that Idaho currently has several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19-

related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. For graduation, educational partners recommended maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, recognizing that students' path to graduation reflects multiple years of effort from students, educational teams, and families. Educational partners justified the recommendation, indicating that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline presents a challenging but reasonable target. Educational partners then recommended more challenging targets for the last three years, noting that Idaho needs to address gaps in graduation between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers. Idaho established targets per educational partner feedback with a slight increase from baseline early in the SPP/APR cycle to 67.37% by FFY 2025, representing an increase of 3.53 percentage points from baseline or a total improvement of greater than 5% over baseline.

**Current Activities:**

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

The department developed a two-page indicator summary for Indicator 1 per educational partner input. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-1/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-1-Graduation.pdf> .

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,375
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	325
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	65
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	332

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,375	2,097	60.29%	63.90%	65.57%	Met target	No Slippage

**Graduation Conditions**

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

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

A copy of the High School Graduation Minimum Requirements, revised May 03, 2023, may be viewed at: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/topics/hs-grad-req/files/general/High-School-Graduation-Minimum-Requirements.pdf> .

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

NO

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

Please note that the Historical Data table provides data and targets FFY 2017 through FFY 2019 for Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate and does not reflect the current Indicator 1 measure.

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

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

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes graduation and other performance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs receive their determination and are designated a differentiated level of

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

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

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

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

In November of 2021, the Transition Institute was provided in both face-to-face and virtual format to facilitate health and safety recommendations from the CDC. The Transition Institute hosted in the fall of 2022 and 2023 returned to a face-to-face-only layout which better encourages involvement in the institute. Lead state partner agencies included the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities (ICDD), Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ICBVI), and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL). The 2023 Transition Institute linked 56 LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. A total of 280 individuals participated in the institute representing staff from LEAs, IDVR, ICBVI, Career Technical Education (CTE), colleges and universities, and IPUL. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. As a result of activities initiated at the Transition Institute, 40 of the participating LEAs have developed annual District Action Plans to improve transition at the local level. District Action Plans were turned in to the department for follow-up activities. Idaho intends to continue the Transition Institute and expects growth for students with disabilities in future Secondary Transition, Program Exit, and Post School Outcomes data.

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

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

None

## **1 - OSEP Response**

## **1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	17.90%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	3.08%	2.58%	2.08%	17.70%	17.50%
Data	4.32%	7.63%	5.18%	14.87%	17.31%

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho’s Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) includes Division of Vocation Rehabilitation, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, University and College representatives, Disability Rights Idaho (Protection and Advocacy), Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Assistive Technology Project, Idaho Parents Unlimited (Parent Training and Information), the three Centers for Independent Living, district and charter school representatives, Idaho Division of Career Technical Education, and Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

Idaho established targets for Indicator 2 in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners’ ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

- Descriptions of the changes.
- Anticipated impacts for the state.
- An overview of state historical data.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Based on small group discussions, educational partners recommended using FFY 2019 as a baseline. That year of information best reflected the current data collection and aggregation processes, but was free of COVID-19 impact.

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

For Indicator 2, educational partners felt that dropout was an area of need that should show improvement directly from the baseline. Educational

partners recognized stresses on Idaho's education system and families and indicated that it was appropriate to start at a more conservative improvement and then progress to more challenging end targets as Idaho's system recovers from COVID-19 impacts. Idaho established targets per educational partner feedback with annual improvement of .2 percentage points early in the SPP/APR cycle to an end target of 15.61% by FFY 2025, representing a total improvement of 2.29 percentage points from baseline.

**Current Activities:**

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

The department developed a two-page indicator summary for Indicator 2 per educational partner input. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-2/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-2-Dropout.pdf>

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,375
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	325
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	65
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	332

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
332	2,097	17.31%	17.30%	15.83%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Dropouts are defined as students who:

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

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

NO

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

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

Please note that the Historical Data table provides data and targets FFY 2017 through FFY 2019 for Option 2 measurement used during those reporting years and does not reflect the current Indicator 2 measurement. Option 2 focused on the count of students with disabilities grades 9-12 who dropped out divided by students with disabilities grades 9-12 included as part of membership.

The department showed that COVID-19 pandemic had no impact on the completeness, validity, or reliability of data for Indicator 2. FFY 2022 data reflects a normalization of program exit data.

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

Communication between internal department internal teams is a continued area of focus. The department has seen several positive outcomes due to improved internal communication, including enhanced communication to LEAs regarding timelines and training, the development of a quick reference crosswalk between LEA exit reasons and program exit reasons, and cross-team collaboration on LEA training. Idaho has seen substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff in the local education agencies. Short staffing, including limited numbers of substitute teachers, has reduced LEA team's flexibility to attend professional development or training. LEAs have shown an increase in new hires certified through alternative authorizations to fill positions. To address training needs, the department Secondary Special Education Coordinator now maintains a secondary transition staff list and conducts monthly recorded webinars on secondary transition, program exit, and other secondary special education topics to improve access to training. By maintaining communication and providing directed webinars at the teacher and provider level, the department is working to make sure that training reaches the necessary individuals. For more information on Idaho's secondary training offerings, please see the Secondary Transition section within the Idaho Training Clearinghouse (<https://idahotc.com/Topics/ST?page13547=1&size13547=6>). The department provides exit data and coding training to LEA personnel through the annual regionally offered Data Drill Down training, the Federal Directors Meeting, Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Roadshow, Secondary Transition Institute, and monthly special education Directors Webinars. The Secondary Coordinator participates as part of the Data Drill Down, providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data, available supports, and strategies for improvement. Idaho has also established partnerships with other state agencies to improve secondary outcomes. One of the main events resulting from the cross-agency collaboration is the Transition Institute. Lead state partner agencies included the Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Council on Developmental Disabilities (ICDD), Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ICBVI), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), and the department. In November of 2021, the Transition Institute was provided in both face-to-face and virtual format to facilitate health and safety recommendations from the CDC. The Transition Institute hosted in the fall of 2022 and 2023 returned to a face-to-face-only layout which better encourages involvement in the institute. The 2023 Transition Institute linked 56 LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. A total of 280 individuals participated in the institute representing staff from LEAs, IDVR, ICBVI, Career Technical Education (CTE), colleges and universities, and IPUL. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. As a result of activities initiated at the Transition Institute, 40 of the participating LEAs have developed annual District Action Plans to improve transition at the local level. District Action Plans were turned in to the department for follow-up activities. Idaho intends to continue the Transition Institute and expects growth for students with disabilities in future Secondary Transition, Program Exit, and Post School Outcomes data. Idaho has developed processes, validations, and rules of completion to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. Idaho EdPlan has rules and validations embedded to generate appropriate exit coding based on evaluation and written notice processes. The process-based approach improves program exit data quality by ensuring the completion of all necessary documentation and limiting user coding errors.

## **2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **2 - OSEP Response**

## **2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendent(s), adult corrections, special education director(s), teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

The department established targets for Indicator 3A in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Educational partners requested that the department provide more student-centered examples that would better illustrate the impacts of targets on local education agencies (LEAs) and student outcomes.

The department scheduled a follow-up workgroup session with educational partners one month later to provide for additional discussion and more student-centered examples per the educational partner's request. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

After an overview of goals and materials, workgroup participants discussed the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including system challenges and supports, and then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

In the discussions, workgroup participants expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Educational partners noted several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment.

For Indicator 3A, participation in statewide assessments, educational partners approved of the continued alignment of SPP/APR targets with ESEA and the Idaho Consolidated State Plan at 95% per year for each grade level. The department established baseline using data from the 2020-2021 administration FFY 2020, as this is the only year that included the current Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). In fall 2022, the department discussed target setting for Indicator 3C and provided clarification, assuring educational partners that the test administration remained the same and did not impact Indicator 3A.

Current Activities:

The department continues to provide information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with educational partners no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, the department includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent. In the spring of 2023, the SEAP membership requested the addition of mini-group sessions for future meetings. One of those mini-groups is focused on student outcomes with an emphasis on statewide assessment.

The department developed a two-page indicator summaries for Indicator 3A per educational partner input. Indicator 3A represents two assessment areas. The department represented each area, Reading and Math, in separate documents to facilitate easy access and use of these resources. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurements, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-3/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-3A-Participation-in-Statewide-Assessments-Reading.pdf>

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-3/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-3A-Participation-in-Statewide-Assessments-Math.pdf>

## FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

### Date:

01/10/2024

### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	3,194	2,666	2,082
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	2,316	1,959	1,709
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	696	544	237
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	182	163	133

### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

### Date:



**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	3,188	2,654	2,087
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	1,784	1,185	1,295
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	1,224	1,308	660
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	180	161	130

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

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

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,194	3,194	98.15%	95.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,666	2,666	95.40%	95.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2,079	2,082	91.68%	95.00%	99.86%	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,188	3,188	98.08%	95.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2,654	2,654	95.24%	95.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2,085	2,087	91.38%	95.00%	99.90%	Met target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Comparison data for all students with participation and performance - <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/accountability/files/accountability-results/2023/2022-2023-ALL-STUDENTS-ISAT-By-Level-Aggregates.xlsx>

Idaho Report Card - <https://idahoschools.org/>

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

Access Idaho's assessment participation and performance data for students with disabilities by visiting the Idaho Department of Education website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/>. Then scroll down to the Special Education tile, which will take you to the Special Education webpage. Next, select Public Reporting on the right-hand menu or scroll down and select the Public Reporting tile from the Department Areas section.

Once on the Special Education Public Reporting page, select State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. Data are then available based on the reporting year. When you select the reporting year of interest, the section will expand and provide access to all reports and documents related to that reporting year.

Access information for assessment participation and performance for all students and subgroups by visiting the Idaho Department of Education website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/>. Then scroll down to the Assessment & Accountability tile, which will take you to the Assessment & Accountability webpage. Next, select Accountability on the right-hand menu or scroll down and select the Data and Results tile from the Highlights section. Once on the Accountability page, select ISAT/IDAA. Data are then available based on the year that the assessment was administered. When you select the reporting year of interest, the section will expand and provide access to all reports and documents related to that administration year.

Idaho's public reporting for assessment participation and performance is under review to reflect corrected data submitted to the U.S. Department of Education on April 12, 2024. The department will update publicly reported data using the same links as previously posted.

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

Idaho submitted corrected data on April 12, 2024, for participation corrected data, and further explanations are provided below.

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade:

- a. Children with IEPs:  
Grade 4 = 3,252; Grade 8 = 2,780; Grade HS 2,186
  - b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations:  
Grade 4 = 2,316; Grade 8 = 1,959; Grade HS = 1,709
  - c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations:  
Grade 4 = 696; Grade 8 = 544; Grade HS = 237
  - d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards:  
Grade 4 = 182; Grade 8 = 163; Grade HS = 133
- Participation Rate Reading:  
Grade 4 = 98.22% Met Target No Slippage  
Grade 8 = 95.90% Met Target No Slippage  
Grade HS = 95.11% Met Target No Slippage

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade:

- a. Children with IEPs:  
Grade 4 = 3,249; Grade 8 = 2,773; Grade HS 2,184
  - b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations:  
Grade 4 = 1,784; Grade 8 = 1,185; Grade HS = 1,295
  - c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations:  
Grade 4 = 1,224; Grade 8 = 1,308; Grade HS = 660
  - d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards:  
Grade 4 = 180; Grade 8 = 161; Grade HS = 130
- Participation Rate Math:  
Grade 4 = 98.12% Met Target No Slippage  
Grade 8 = 95.71% Met Target No Slippage  
Grade HS = 95.47% Met Target No Slippage

Additional analysis by the Idaho Department of Education (department) identified rostering and grade-level assignment issues that impacted data for all grade levels for Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science. Two categories of participation, Did Not Participate (NPART) and Medical Exemption (MEDEXEMPT), were affected.

NPART data were impacted by a rostering issue that identified students into specific subgroups. Students were included properly in the overall counts for participation as NPART but were not flagged appropriately or included as NPART in the aggregations for the following categories: Children with one or more disabilities IDEA (WDIS), Migratory Students (MS), and Foster Care (FCS).

The MEDEXEMPT category was also affected by the rostering issue and a grade-level assignment issue, resulting in improper reporting for all students and subcategories.

The department worked with Technology Services (IT) staff under the Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE) to fix both the rostering and grade-level assignment issues. The state is collaborating across agencies to implement additional business rules, validations, and processes to ensure data accuracy for future submissions. To support this work, the department has scheduled a cross-agency day-long session facilitated by the IDEA Data Center to document assessment data processes.

The Department, Assessment and Accountability and Special Education teams are now coordinating to ensure corrected data are made available to the public in a timely manner, ensuring that participation and performance data for students with disabilities participating in the regular assessment, regular assessment with accommodations, and alternate assessment are reported with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f).

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

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

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

According to the current Idaho Administrative Code (IDAPA 08.02.03.112(e)), "failure to include ninety-five percent (95%) of all students and ninety-five percent (95%) of students in designated subgroups automatically identifies the school as not having achieved measurable progress in ISAT proficiency."

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

Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education uses performance and compliance indicators, including Indicator 3A, as part of

LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs are designated to receive a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review performance data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the department developed several self-assessment protocols to help conduct a root cause analysis and assist LEAs in determining contributing factors to low performance in specific areas, including Indicator 3. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timebound (SMART) goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. The department continues to provide training to LEAs regarding assessment data and coding through the regionally offered Data Drill Down training and special education director webinars. In the fall of 2022 the department could only provide Idaho Reading Indicator data. All other statewide data were embargoed with the OSBE during the time of the training. Trend data for Math and Reading, including data from the 2021-2022 assessment administration, were included as part of the fall 2023 Data Drill Down. The training supported LEA teams in accessing statewide assessment data, analysis techniques, and conducting root-cause analysis. The department continues to add training opportunities for IDAA, including the Developing Academic Instructional Resources for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities module, participation criteria training, online training vignettes, and an IDAA participation worksheet designed to assist IEP team member discussions during the IEP meeting. Idaho has developed online training modules cross-walking Idaho's extended content standards. For more information on these modules and training related to students with significant cognitive disabilities, please go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse website at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/SCD#14375>. For resources related to IDAA available on the department website, please go to <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/sped/>.

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

None

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

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

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

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

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

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

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendent(s), adult corrections, special education director(s), teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private school, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

The department established targets for Indicator 3B in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, IPUL, the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Initially, the department proposed using 2015-2016 data as the baseline as this matched with Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan). Feedback from educational partners indicated that the data needed to be updated to accurately reflect Idaho's educational system. Educational partners requested that the department provide more student-centered examples that would better illustrate the impacts of targets on local education agencies (LEAs) and student outcomes.

The department scheduled a follow-up workgroup session with educational partners one month later to provide for additional discussion and more student-centered examples per the educational partner's request. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The department also updated baseline information to reflect the 2018-2019 test administration. The 2018-19 school year represented the most recent data not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis. It also reflected changes in Idaho processes based on the Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

After an overview of goals and materials, workgroup participants discussed the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including system challenges and supports, and then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

In the discussions, workgroup participants approved of the change in baseline and expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Educational partners noted several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19-related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment.

For Indicator 3B, performance on regular statewide assessments, educational partners advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative target increases. FFY 2020 Math assessment results were well below baseline data, and educational partners noted that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline for multiple years would present challenging targets. Reading assessments did not show the same decrease in proficiency, but educational partners indicated that consistency between target progression would benefit educators and the community. The aligned target progressions between Math and Reading would make it easier to communicate with educational partners and reduce confusion while promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

Current Activities:

The department continues to provide information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with educational partners no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, the department includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent. In the spring of 2023, the SEAP membership requested the addition of mini-group sessions for future meetings. One of those mini-groups is focused on student outcomes with an emphasis on statewide assessment.

The department developed a two-page indicator summaries for Indicator 3B per educational partner input. Indicator 3B represents two assessment areas. The department represented each area, Reading and Math, in separate documents to facilitate easy access and use of these resources. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurements, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-3/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-3B-Performance-on-the-Regular-Statewide-Assessments-ISAT-Reading.pdf>

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-3/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-3B-Performance-on-the-Regular-Statewide-Assessments-ISAT-Math.pdf>

### FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:** 01/10/2024

#### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	3,012	2,503	1,946
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	362	166	246
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	53	29	29

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:** 01/10/2024

#### Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	3,008	2,493	1,955
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	394	75	53
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	42	23	10

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	415	3,012	16.85%	14.30%	13.78%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	195	2,503	8.54%	8.20%	7.79%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	275	1,946	13.71%	10.35%	14.13%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

The department attributes the 2023 decrease to Idaho students participating in a longer ISAT rather than the shortened version used in 2021 and 2022. Evidence indicates that the lengthy assessment duration lead to lower scores based on testing fatigue. For a complete set of information, including year-to-year differences for all students, please see Idaho's news release at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/communications/files/news-releases/10-03-2023-Newly-Released-Test-Scores-Show-Significant-Gains-in-Early-Literacy-Losses-on-Idaho-Standards-Achievement-Test.pdf> .

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

The department attributes the 2023 decrease to Idaho students participating in a longer ISAT rather than the shortened version used in 2021 and 2022. Evidence indicates that the lengthy assessment duration lead to lower scores based on testing fatigue. For a complete set of information, including year-to-year differences for all students, please see Idaho's news release at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/communications/files/news-releases/10-03-2023-Newly-Released-Test-Scores-Show-Significant-Gains-in-Early-Literacy-Losses-on-Idaho-Standards-Achievement-Test.pdf> .

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	436	3,008	16.51%	16.16%	14.49%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	98	2,493	4.63%	4.05%	3.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	63	1,955	3.47%	3.13%	3.22%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

The department attributes the 2023 decrease to Idaho students participating in a longer ISAT rather than the shortened version used in 2021 and 2022. Evidence indicates that the lengthy assessment duration lead to lower scores based on testing fatigue. For a complete set of information, including year-to-year differences for all students, please see Idaho's news release at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/communications/files/news-releases/10-03-2023-Newly-Released-Test-Scores-Show-Significant-Gains-in-Early-Literacy-Losses-on-Idaho-Standards-Achievement-Test.pdf> .

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

The department attributes the 2023 decrease to Idaho students participating in a longer ISAT rather than the shortened version used in 2021 and 2022. Evidence indicates that the lengthy assessment duration lead to lower scores based on testing fatigue. For a complete set of information, including year-to-year differences for all students, please see Idaho's news release at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/communications/files/news-releases/10-03-2023-Newly-Released-Test-Scores-Show-Significant-Gains-in-Early-Literacy-Losses-on-Idaho-Standards-Achievement-Test.pdf> .

**Regulatory Information**

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

## Public Reporting Information

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

Comparison data for all students with participation and performance - <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/accountability/files/accountability-results/2023/2022-2023-ALL-STUDENTS-ISAT-By-Level-Aggregates.xlsx>

Idaho Report Card - <https://idahoschools.org/>

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

Access Idaho's assessment participation and performance data for students with disabilities by visiting the Idaho Department of Education website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/>. Then scroll down to the Special Education tile, which will take you to the Special Education webpage. Next, select Public Reporting on the right-hand menu or scroll down and select the Public Reporting tile from the Department Areas section. Once on the Special Education Public Reporting page, select State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. Data are then available based on the reporting year. When you select the reporting year of interest, the section will expand and provide access to all reports and documents related to that reporting year.

Access information for assessment participation and performance for all students and subgroups by visiting the Idaho Department of Education website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/>. Then scroll down to the Assessment & Accountability tile, which will take you to the Assessment & Accountability webpage. Next, select Accountability on the right-hand menu or scroll down and select the Data and Results tile from the Highlights section. Once on the Accountability page, select ISAT/IDAA. Data are then available based on the year that the assessment was administered. When you select the reporting year of interest, the section will expand and provide access to all reports and documents related to that administration year.

Idaho's public reporting for assessment participation and performance is under review to reflect corrected data submitted to the U.S. Department of Education on April 12, 2024. The department will update publicly reported data using the same links as previously posted.

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

Since taking office in January 2023, Superintendent of Public Instruction Debbie Critchfield has instituted several areas of focus to improve early literacy in Idaho students, including:

Facilitating and supporting review of both Idaho standards and curriculum;

providing high-quality, research-based professional development and fostering collaboration throughout Idaho;

implementing the K-3 SMART program in which instructors can sign up for two years of programming that includes monthly book studies on the science of reading as well as on-demand collaboration and support in the classroom from a state coach;

tapping into expiring federal funds to provide evidence-based supplemental reading interventions at no cost to schools; and

requesting necessary funding to hire a state Early Literacy Coordinator to support schools and districts in their instructional efforts.

providing dyslexia professional development to equip Idaho teachers with effective interventions and support for all students

The department is in the process of implementing a variety of resources and professional development programs focused on supporting math instruction. These include:

Renewed focus on essential Idaho math standards in cooperation with the Office of the State Board of Education;

supporting Regional Math Centers to foster regional collaboration while improving systems and instruction and to fulfill the obligations set forth in Idaho Statute 331627;

providing districts with the Imagine Math curriculum resource free of charge. House Bill 623 provides funding for an online, adaptive math program for all Idaho school districts; and

establishing the Idaho Council of Teachers of Mathematics to increase statewide leadership and collaboration.

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

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

To address issues identified in instruction, the department continues to collaborate across Divisions. The Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content divisions cooperate in providing teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and teaching of the Idaho Content Standards. Idaho's Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) also focuses on improving 4th-grade literacy and addressing low performance through training, coaching, and tools for LEA staff.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

## 3B - Required Actions

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3C - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2021	43.14%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2021	46.20%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	50.72%
Math	A	Grade 4	2021	41.67%
Math	B	Grade 8	2021	36.48%
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	37.78%

#### Targets

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



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

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendent(s), adult corrections, special education director(s), teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

The department established targets for Indicator 3C in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, IPUL, the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Initially, the department proposed using 2015-2016 data as the baseline as this matched with Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan). Feedback from educational partners indicated that the data needed to be updated to accurately reflect Idaho's educational system. Educational partners requested that the department provide more student-centered examples that would better illustrate the impacts of targets on local education agencies (LEAs) and student outcomes.

The department scheduled a follow-up workgroup session with educational partners one month later to provide for additional discussion and more student-centered examples per the educational partner's request. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

After an overview of goals and materials, workgroup participants discussed the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including system challenges and supports, and then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

In the discussions, workgroup participants approved of the change in baseline and expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Educational partners noted several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19-related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment.

For Indicator 3C, educational partners indicated that consistency between target progression across assessment indicators would be beneficial.

Reasoning that aligned target progressions would make it easier to communicate with educational partners and reduce their confusion while still promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities, Idaho's educational partners noted that the department should use a similar progression for both Reading and Math on the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). Educational partners noted that further review would be necessary once additional information is available to show a trend for IDAA in Math and Reading. Throughout the target-setting process, the department reminded educational partners that Idaho would need to reset the baseline and establish targets again for FFY 2021 because the FFY 2020 test administration utilized another consortium state's scoring to set proficiency levels. The department provided updates on Idaho's progress towards setting cut scores for proficiency on the IDAA in spring and fall 2022.

In November 2022, after the Idaho State Board of Education accepted cut scores and released performance data, the ISDE met face-to-face with educational partners to discuss baseline and target setting for Indicator 3C. The ISDE provided updated data and information on changes and continued activities, including the Idaho Extended Content Standards Alignment Project. Stakeholders unanimously voted to use the FFY 2021 data as the baseline and then apply the target-setting methodology discussed in winter 2021 to establish targets. The baseline was established using data from the 2021-2022 FFY 2021 test administration, as this is the only year that includes current Idaho-approved cut scores for the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IDAA). Per stakeholder recommendations, the ISDE is applying a .25 percentage point increase annually to each group and subject area. FFY 2022 targets show a slight variance to the incremental target increase to create a more orderly target progression.

In FFY 2022, the department engaged educational partners in Extended Content Standards alignment. The department conducted a total of 27 meetings across the year. Approximately 9% of participants engaged in the Extended Content Standard alignment work were parents of students with disabilities.

### **Current Activities:**

The department continues to provide information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with educational partners no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, the department includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent. In the spring of 2023, the SEAP membership requested the addition of mini-group sessions for future meetings. One of those mini-groups is focused on student outcomes with an emphasis on statewide assessment.

The department developed a two-page indicator summaries for Indicator 3C per educational partner input. Indicator 3C represents two assessment areas. The department represented each area, Reading and Math, in separate documents to facilitate easy access and use of these resources. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurements, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-3/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-3C-Performance-on-Alternate-Assessment-IDAA-Math.pdf>

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-3/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-3C-Performance-on-Alternate-Assessment-IDAA-Reading.pdf>

## **FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

### **Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### **Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	182	163	133
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	58	84	68

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	180	161	130
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	62	65	48

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	58	182	43.14%	43.50%	31.87%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	84	163	46.20%	46.50%	51.53%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	68	133	50.72%	51.00%	51.13%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

The department attributes the decrease in performance for grade 4 students participating in the IDAA for FFY 2022 to disruption in their early education as a result of COVID-19-related soft closure and educational environment changes. Students participating in the IDAA are identified as having the most significant cognitive impairments and are highly vulnerable. The department reasons that soft closures and changes in the educational environment experienced as early learners by students at this grade level had a greater impact on this population, given their level of vulnerability. The prior test administration FFY 2021 reflects the lower performance of this group of students in grade 3. Improved training and implementation of the IDAA participation criteria have resulted in more accurate identification of students for participation in the IDAA. Improved identification means that students who may have been proficient on the IDAA but inaccurately identified are now participating in the regular assessment with or without accommodations, thus reducing performance on the IDAA.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	62	180	41.67%	42.00%	34.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	65	161	36.48%	36.75%	40.37%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	48	130	37.78%	38.00%	36.92%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

### **Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

The department attributes the decrease in performance for grade 4 students participating in the IDAA for FFY 2022 to disruption in their early education as a result of COVID-19-related soft closure and educational environment changes. Students participating in the IDAA are identified as having the most significant cognitive impairments and are highly vulnerable. The department reasons that soft closures and changes in the educational environment experienced as early learners by students at this grade level had a greater impact on this population, given their level of vulnerability. The prior test administration FFY 2021 reflects the lower performance of this group of students in grade 3.

Improved training and implementation of the IDAA participation criteria have resulted in more accurate identification of students for participation in the IDAA. Improved identification means that students who may have been proficient on the IDAA but inaccurately identified are now participating in the regular assessment with or without accommodations, thus reducing performance on the IDAA.

### **Regulatory Information**

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

### **Public Reporting Information**

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

Comparison data for all students with participation and performance - <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/accountability/files/accountability-results/2023/2022-2023-ALL-STUDENTS-ISAT-By-Level-Aggregates.xlsx>

Idaho Report Card - <https://idahoschools.org/>

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

Access Idaho's assessment participation and performance data for students with disabilities by visiting the Idaho Department of Education website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/>. Then scroll down to the Special Education tile, which will take you to the Special Education webpage. Next, select Public Reporting on the right-hand menu or scroll down and select the Public Reporting tile from the Department Areas section.

Once on the Special Education Public Reporting page, select State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. Data are then available based on the reporting year. When you select the reporting year of interest, the section will expand and provide access to all reports and documents related to that reporting year.

Access information for assessment participation and performance for all students and subgroups by visiting the Idaho Department of Education website at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/>. Then scroll down to the Assessment & Accountability tile, which will take you to the Assessment & Accountability webpage. Next, select Accountability on the right-hand menu or scroll down and select the Data and Results tile from the Highlights section.

Once on the Accountability page, select ISAT/IDAA. Data are then available based on the year that the assessment was administered. When you select the reporting year of interest, the section will expand and provide access to all reports and documents related to that administration year.

Idaho's public reporting for assessment participation and performance is under review to reflect corrected data submitted to the U.S. Department of Education on April 12, 2024. The department will update publicly reported data using the same links as previously posted.

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

Since taking office in January 2023, Superintendent of Public Instruction Debbie Critchfield has instituted several areas of focus to improve early literacy in Idaho students, including:

Facilitating and supporting review of both Idaho standards and curriculum;

providing high-quality, research-based professional development and fostering collaboration throughout Idaho;

implementing the K-3 SMART program in which instructors can sign up for two years of programming that includes monthly book studies on the science of reading as well as on-demand collaboration and support in the classroom from a state coach;

tapping into expiring federal funds to provide evidence-based supplemental reading interventions at no cost to schools; and

requesting necessary funding to hire a state Early Literacy Coordinator to support schools and districts in their instructional efforts.

providing dyslexia professional development to equip Idaho teachers with effective interventions and support for all students

The department is in the process of implementing a variety of resources and professional development programs focused on supporting math instruction. These include:

Renewed focus on essential Idaho math standards in cooperation with the Office of the State Board of Education;

supporting Regional Math Centers to foster regional collaboration while improving systems and instruction and to fulfill the obligations set forth in Idaho Statute 331627;

providing districts with the Imagine Math curriculum resource free of charge. House Bill 623 provides funding for an online, adaptive math program for all Idaho school districts; and establishing the Idaho Council of Teachers of Mathematics to increase statewide leadership and collaboration.

In addition to newly implemented activities, Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan) established targets for all students on statewide assessments.

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

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

To address issues identified in instruction, the department continues to collaborate across Divisions. The Special Education, Assessment and

Accountability, and Content divisions cooperate in providing teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and teaching of the Idaho Content Standards. Idaho's Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) also focuses on improving 4th-grade literacy and addressing low performance through training, coaching, and tools for LEA staff.

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

None

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

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

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

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

#### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	37.92	37.21	36.50	35.79
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	45.85	44.98	44.12	43.25
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	49.75	48.81	47.86	46.92
Math	A <=	Grade 4	33.78	33.15	32.52	31.89
Math	B <=	Grade 8	36.58	35.89	35.21	34.52
Math	C <=	Grade HS	30.19	29.63	29.07	28.51

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendent(s), adult corrections, special education director(s), teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

The department established targets for Indicator 3D in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Initially, the department proposed using 2015-2016 data as the baseline as this matched with Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan). Feedback from educational partners indicated that the data needed to be updated to accurately reflect Idaho's educational system. Educational partners requested that the department provide more student-centered examples that would better illustrate the impacts of targets on local education agencies (LEAs) and student outcomes.

The department scheduled a follow-up workgroup session with educational partners one month later to provide for additional discussion and more student-centered examples per the educational partner's request. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The department also updated baseline information to reflect the 2018-2019 test administration. The 2018-19 school year represented the most recent data not impacted by the COVID-19 health crisis. It also reflected changes in Idaho processes based on the Plan, increased use of interim assessments, and improved training. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

After an overview of goals and materials, workgroup participants discussed the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including system challenges and supports, and then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

In the discussions, workgroup participants approved of the change in baseline and expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Educational partners noted several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19-related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment.

For performance on regular statewide assessments, educational partners advocated maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, then proceeding with conservative target increases. FFY 2020 Math assessment results were well below baseline data, and educational partners noted that maintaining the target near the pre-COVID-19 baseline for multiple years would present challenging targets. Reading assessments did not show the same decrease in proficiency, but educational partners indicated that consistency between target progression would benefit educators and the community. The aligned target progressions between Math and Reading would make it easier to communicate with educational partners and reduce confusion while promoting improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Educational partners further encouraged alignment of progression across assessment indicators, including Indicator 3D, with the same justification.

#### Current Activities:

The department continues to provide information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with educational partners no less than quarterly. As part of the meetings, the department includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent. In the spring of 2023, the SEAP membership requested the addition of mini-group sessions for future meetings. One of those mini-groups is focused on student outcomes with an emphasis on statewide assessment.

The department developed a two-page indicator summaries for Indicator 3D per educational partner input. Indicator 3D represents two assessment areas. The department represented each area, Reading and Math, in separate documents to facilitate easy access and use of these resources. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurements, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-3/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-3D-Gap-in-Performance-on-Regular-Assessment-ISAT-Reading.pdf>

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-3/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-3D-Gap-in-Performance-on-Regular-Assessment-ISAT-Math.pdf>

#### FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

##### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

##### Date:

01/10/2024

##### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	23,398	24,129	23,225
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	3,012	2,503	1,946
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10,857	11,920	14,639
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	380	374	112
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	362	166	246
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	53	29	29

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	23,501	24,218	23,285
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	3,008	2,493	1,955
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10,824	8,557	7,670
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	124	127	40
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	394	75	53
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	42	23	10

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	13.78%	48.03%	35.23	37.92	34.25	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7.79%	50.95%	45.67	45.85	43.16	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	14.13%	63.51%	47.54	49.75	49.38	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14.49%	46.59%	32.22	33.78	32.09	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	3.93%	35.86%	31.25	36.58	31.93	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	3.22%	33.11%	29.70	30.19	29.89	Met target	No Slippage

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

Since taking office in January 2023, Superintendent of Public Instruction Debbie Critchfield has instituted several areas of focus to improve early literacy in Idaho students, including:

Facilitating and supporting review of both Idaho standards and curriculum;

providing high-quality, research-based professional development and fostering collaboration throughout Idaho;

implementing the K-3 SMART program in which instructors can sign up for two years of programming that includes monthly book studies on the science of reading as well as on-demand collaboration and support in the classroom from a state coach;

tapping into expiring federal funds to provide evidence-based supplemental reading interventions at no cost to schools; and  
requesting necessary funding to hire a state Early Literacy Coordinator to support schools and districts in their instructional efforts.

providing dyslexia professional development to equip Idaho teachers with effective interventions and support for all students

The department is in the process of implementing a variety of resources and professional development programs focused on supporting math instruction. These include:

Renewed focus on essential Idaho math standards in cooperation with the Office of the State Board of Education;

supporting Regional Math Centers to foster regional collaboration while improving systems and instruction and to fulfill the obligations set forth in Idaho Statute 331627;

providing districts with the Imagine Math curriculum resource free of charge. House Bill 623 provides funding for an online, adaptive math program for all Idaho school districts; and

establishing the Idaho Council of Teachers of Mathematics to increase statewide leadership and collaboration.

In addition to newly implemented activities, Idaho's Consolidated State Plan (the Plan) established targets for all students on statewide assessments.

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

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

The department continues to collaborate across Divisions to address issues identified in instruction. The Special Education, Assessment and Accountability, and Content divisions cooperate in providing teachers with training to improve instruction, the fidelity of implementation, understanding of assessments, use of accommodations, and teaching of the Idaho Content Standards. Idaho's Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) also focuses on improving 4th-grade literacy and addressing low performance through training, coaching, and tools for LEA staff.

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

None

### **3D - OSEP Response**

### **3D - Required Actions**



## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	2.08%	0.00%	

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), private schools, charter schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

When discussing the differences between SPP/APR equity indicators and significant disproportionality, Idaho's educational partners have consistently expressed confusion.

In the spring of 2021, the department provided further information on SPP/APR equity indicators, noting that the lack of a defined cell size resulted in false positives where a single instance constituted a significant discrepancy. The stakeholder's discussion included potential changes to calculation (i.e., n-size, cell size, the number of years of analysis, and target setting) and processes to address equity in a more cohesive system. The department and educational partners continued discussing SPP/APR equity measures in November 2021. Educational partners recommended further alignment and consistency between equity indicators and significant disproportionality. Recommendations included using OSEP's presumptively reasonable cell size of 10 and n-size of 30, the same as Idaho's significant disproportionality measure, and increasing to two years of data analysis while maintaining a target of 0%. Discussion participants felt the changes would help establish a unified support system for equity, address false positives, and reduce confusion between measures.

After further review of data for out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities, the department determined that Idaho's data did not support increasing the cell size to 10. The department implemented the recommended change to n-size but reduced the cell size to five. Five is the minimum count required per the Idaho Data Management Council public reporting requirements. The use of this minimum helps the measure be more sensitive while also maintaining the protection of students' personally identifiable information.

Throughout the process of updating the criteria for the Indicator 4 calculation, Idaho consulted with the IDEA Data Center (IDC). Educational partner feedback had proposed that the two years of data might be combined to more effectively monitor LEAs. Consultation with IDC and other national technical assistance centers revealed that combining two or more years of data was a statistically valid option to increase the counts of disciplinary actions and comparison data used for analysis. They also clarified that Indicator 4 measurement allows for multiple years of analysis but not the combination of data from multiple reporting years. Based on this additional information, Idaho maintained using one year of data analysis for Indicator 4 as increasing to two years of analysis would further impact the number of LEAs reviewed annually for Indicator 4.

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

The department is developing two-page informational sheets for SPP/APR indicators per educational partner request. These information sheets briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, and why the indicator is important, and they provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A template draft was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December 2022. The department has released the majority of the SPP/APR Indicator Summaries to the public but is still in the process of releasing the layout for Indicators 4A and 4B.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

178

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	2		0.00%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

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

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

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

Cell size = 5

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 1

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

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

The formula for FFY 2022 is as follows:

$((\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2021-2022} > 10 \text{ days}) / (\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs in the state for SY 2021-2022})) * 100$

Total # of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2021-2022 > 10 days = 63

Total # of SWDs in the state for SY 2021-2022 = 36,871

State-level suspension/expulsion rate =  $(63 / 36,871) \times 100$

Application of data:

State-level suspension/expulsion rate =  $(63 / 36,871) \times 100 = 0.17\%$

The state suspension/expulsion-rate bar is  $0.17\% + 1.00\% = 1.17\%$ .

An LEA will have a significant discrepancy if it meets the cell size and n-size criteria and its suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.17% for FFY 2021 data.

For Indicator 4A, Idaho has established a minimum cell size of 5 and an n-size of at least 30.

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

Indicator 4A data for the FFY 2022 reporting year are from the 2021-2022 school year.

55 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size of 30 students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA, and 2 LEAs met the minimum cell size of 5 instances of out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days. All but two LEAs in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for Indicator 4A for FFY 2022.

As a result of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho saw a substantial decrease in the number of disciplinary instances, including the number of students reported as receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days. Data are starting to normalize, but there are still only 28 LEAs in the state for the school year 2021-2022 that reported issuing out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days for students with disabilities. Of those LEAs that reported one or more instances of out-of-school suspension/expulsion greater than ten days, the median number of students per LEA receiving this form of disciplinary action was one. The mean number of students with disabilities receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days at the LEA level was two.

The two LEAs which met n-size and cell size criteria were under the state suspension/expulsion-rate bar of 1.17% and the LEAs were determined not to have a significant discrepancy in long term out of school suspension/expulsion.

After receiving guidance related to discipline from OSEP in the fall of 2022, the department began providing additional information to LEAs through webinars vetted through its legal counsel. The regionally offered Data Drill Down training also added sections specific to disciplinary action. Data displays were available for state and local levels for comparison during the fall 2022 and 2023 Data Drill Down training. The displays showed the difference between counts of disciplinary actions of all students, students with disabilities, and the percentage that students with disabilities contributed to all students' disciplinary actions. Data were aggregated by disciplinary action type and included in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and expulsions over the last three reporting years. For the fall 2023 training the department expanded to securely provide LEAs with access to their data using the IDEA Data Center's LEA EDFacts Edit Check and Data Display Tool for Disciplinary Action.

Before reviewing and discussing the disciplinary action data, LEA teams received an overview of the data collection source, the definition of each discipline type, and selected questions from the Discipline Self-Assessment Protocol. In the fall of 2022, a majority of LEAs who returned action items at the close of each training indicated one or more action items related to disciplinary action. Fall of 2023 action items focused on documenting data processes to improve data quality for data concerning students with disabilities.

Idaho continues to provide information during regular webinars with local special education directors and staff to address data and reporting requirements, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, and Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) guidance.

The department and Idaho SESTA developed several resources for educators related to disciplinary action and behavioral intervention specific to students with disabilities. Training and documents are available to all levels, but many resources focus on new principals and superintendents. For additional information and to view resources related to disciplinary action, go to <https://idahotc.com/> and search for discipline. Behavior resources, including a four-part webinar series on the Escalation Cycle, online modules for Functional Behavioral Assessment, and Behavioral Intervention Plan Process, are available directly through the following link: <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Behavior?page13537=1&size13537=6>. For materials specific to principals, including the Discipline Flowchart, Manifest Determination Flowchart, and Student Removal Quick Guide go to ITC Principals Corner at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Principals-Corner?page13542=1&size13542=6>. Also available on the ITC are the Discipline Resources for Principals Module at [https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#](https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#/), The Educators Guide to Student Discipline and Supports at <https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/738>, and Idaho Tiered Behavior Supports at <https://idahotc.com/itbs?page15083=1&size15083=6>. In addition to universal support and resources, Idaho SESTA provides free intensive multi-year support to LEAs for Positive Behavior Interventions and Support by application.

Note that the additional information provided in the Prior FFY Required Actions section regarding Idaho's processes for determining the calculation methodology does not reflect a revision in methodology. The department was providing added clarification regarding the original process used to create the current methodology as reflected in the stakeholder input section.

New activities with educational partners will include a review of thresholds to make sure they align with Idaho's systems for equity and make sense to educational partners.

#### **Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)**

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

Idaho did not identify any instances of significant discrepancy for FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data.

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

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

The department adopted the Self-Assessment for Discipline as part of the process to determine if the identification of significant discrepancy is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Discipline was developed as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. Using the same tool for Indicator 4 and significant disproportionality improves alignment and reduces confusion for LEAs and educational partners. The self-assessment protocol works in combination with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timebound (SMART) Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation.

LEAs needing the most intensive support can work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. Department staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the self-assessment process.

Idaho continues to access national technical assistance centers to strengthen review processes to ensure compliance with the IDEA.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology, and how the State's threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

As part of its SPP/APR Post Clarification follow-up communication with OSEP, Idaho was encouraged to utilize national technical assistance resources to evaluate the reasonableness of the state's methodology for determining if there is a significant discrepancy in the long-term out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days occurring in its LEAs. Idaho then reviewed available resources in particular but not limited to Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide, Equity Requirements in IDEA, and Setting the Stage for Reasonably Designed Methodology: Back to Basics on Indicator 4. When determining cell and n-size criteria, Idaho carefully considered educational partner feedback, Idaho public reporting minimum requirements, and OSEP's defined presumptively reasonable values for significant disproportionality. As the Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide states, "States need to try to balance the risk of inappropriately identifying districts because of small cell sizes against the risk of not identifying districts because of large minimum cell sizes..." When developing criteria for Idaho's Indicator 4 calculation, discussions with educational partners, including parents, revealed that educational partners did not feel it was reasonable to calculate Indicator 4 based on one instance of long-term out-of-school suspension/expulsion for a reporting year. Many of small group discussions centered around confusion between significant disproportionality and significant discrepancy calculations. Educational partners recommended further alignment and consistency between equity indicators and significant disproportionality. Recommendations included using OSEP's presumptively reasonable cell size of 10 and n-size of 30, the same as Idaho's significant disproportionality measure, and increasing to two years of data analysis while maintaining a target of 0%. Discussion participants felt the changes would help establish a unified support system for equity, address false positives, and reduce confusion between measures. After further review of data for out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities, the department determined that Idaho's data did not support increasing the cell size to 10. The department implemented the recommended change to n-size but reduced the cell size to five. Five is the minimum count required per the Idaho Data Management Council public reporting requirements. The use of this minimum helps the measure be more sensitive while also maintaining the protection of students' personally identifiable information. Throughout the process of updating the criteria for the Indicator 4 calculation, Idaho consulted with the IDEA Data Center (IDC). Educational partner feedback had proposed that the two years of data might be combined to more effectively monitor LEAs. Consultation with IDC and other national technical assistance centers revealed that combining two or more years of data was a statistically valid option to increase the counts of disciplinary actions and comparison data used for analysis. They also clarified that Indicator 4 measurement allows for multiple years of analysis but not the combination of data from multiple reporting years. Based on this additional information, Idaho maintained using one year of data analysis for Indicator 4 as increasing to two years of analysis would further impact the number of LEAs reviewed annually for Indicator 4. Idaho also maintained the state bar at one percentage point over the state rate. Idaho's current rate is very low at 0.17%. The additional one percentage point shows that if an LEA meets criteria for calculation and even just over one percent of their special education population has long-term suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days, they will be flagged as having a significant discrepancy. All of Idaho's criteria are well within the examples provided within the Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide document which was the primary resource the state was encouraged by OSEP to reference when reviewing its calculation. The guidance further notes that "Each state must decide whether to periodically (e.g., annually) recalculate the bar that is based on this rate or to set the bar in the first year of the SPP/APR and not change it." Idaho's state bar is recalculated annually to make sure that the measure is more sensitive to data from the given reporting year.

Note that the additional information provided above regarding Idaho's processes for determining the calculation methodology does not reflect a revision in methodology. The department was providing added clarification regarding the original process used to create the current methodology as reflected in the stakeholder input section.

The department continues to access national technical assistance centers and collaborate with educational partners to strengthen Idaho's equity systems, ensuring compliance with the IDEA and promoting successful outcomes for students with disabilities. New activities with educational partners will include a review of thresholds to make sure they align with Idaho's systems for equity and make sense to educational partners.

Indicator 4 is not the only mechanism for monitoring discipline for students with disabilities. The department takes a proactive approach to addressing disciplinary action through training and resources. New principals, administrators, and special education directors receive targeted training around disciplinary action to ensure that LEAs have appropriate policies, practices, and procedures. Idaho uses an early warning system to address significant disproportionality. Any LEA determined to have exceeded the state's threshold of three times

the rate for disciplinary action as compared to other races/ethnicities in a given analysis category for even one year of analysis has required activities. LEAs in Idaho are frequently small and homogeneous. Idaho's significant disproportionality calculation effectively reviews homogenous populations using the alternate risk ratio. At year two of exceeding the state's threshold, an LEA is required to participate in an onsite review discussing the LEA's educational system, policies, practices, and processes, as well as examples of those being implemented. The department also annually provides disciplinary action data, including expulsion information, as part of the regional Data Drill Down training. Teams review data, conduct root cause analysis, and develop action plans to address areas of need. Additional information related to disciplinary action is available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at <https://idahotc.com/>.

#### **4A - OSEP Response**

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State was required to explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP appreciates the State reported it consulted with stakeholders to determine if its methodology is reasonably designed. However, OSEP notes that the State's methodology continues to result in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States. Additionally, OSEP notes that the State included 1.1 percent of LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEP. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State's revised methodology is reasonably designed to determine significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with disabilities.

Additionally, OSEP conducted a Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) monitoring visit with representatives from the State Educational Agency, Idaho State Department of Education, during October 2023. OSEP will address any issues related to OSEP's DMS activities, including any issues relevant to this indicator, under separate cover.

#### **4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

179

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	1		0%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

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

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

The calculation for significant discrepancy uses the following criteria:

Cell size = 5

N-size = 30

Number of years of analysis = 1

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

The cell size criteria reflect the count of students of the racial/ethnic category of analysis with long-term out-of-school suspension/expulsion. The n-size criteria reflect the count of students with disabilities of the racial/ethnic category of analysis included as part of Child Count. For FFY 2022, an LEA will be flagged with significant discrepancy if the rate of suspension/expulsion for students with disabilities in the racial/ethnic category of analysis is equal to or higher than the state-level bar of 1.17%.

The calculation is performed separately for each race/ethnicity.

An example of the formula for FFY 2022 using the Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity is as follows:

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

$((\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the LEA of Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity for SY 2021-2022} > 10 \text{ days}) / (\text{Total} \# \text{ of Hispanic/Latino SWDs in the LEA for SY 2021-2022})) * 100$

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

$((\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the state for SY 2021-2022} > 10) / (\text{Total} \# \text{ of SWDs in the state for SY 2021-2022})) * 100$

State-level SWD suspension/expulsion rate =  $(63 / 36,871) \times 100$

Application of data:

State-level SWD suspension/expulsion rate =  $63 / 36,871 \times 100 = 0.17\%$

The state suspension/expulsion rate bar is  $0.17\% + \text{one percentage point} = 1.17\%$ .

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

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

Indicator 4B data for the FFY 2022 reporting year are from the 2021-2022 school year.

One LEA met the criteria for both cell and n-size based on data for the 2021-2022 school year. 80 LEAs did not meet the minimum n-size of 30 students with disabilities in one or more racial/ethnic categories for students with disabilities enrolled in the LEA, and one LEA met the minimum cell size of 5 instances of out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days by race/ethnicity. 179 LEAs in Idaho were excluded from the calculation for Indicator 4B for FFY 2022.

As a result of the COVID-19 health crisis, Idaho saw a substantial decrease in the number of disciplinary instances, including the number of students reported as receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days. Data are starting to normalize, but there are still only 28 LEAs in the state for the school year 2021-2022 that reported issuing out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days for students with disabilities. Of those LEAs that reported one or more instances of out-of-school suspension/expulsion greater than ten days, the median number of students per LEA receiving this form of disciplinary action was one. The mean number of students with disabilities receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than ten days at the LEA level was two.

The LEA that met n-size and cell size criteria was under the state suspension/expulsion rate bar of 1.17%. Based on this analysis, the LEA was determined not to have a significant discrepancy in long-term out-of-school suspension/expulsion.

After receiving guidance related to discipline from OSEP in the fall of 2022, the department began providing additional information to LEAs through webinars vetted through its legal counsel. The regionally offered Data Drill Down training also added sections specific to disciplinary action. Data displays were available for state and local levels for comparison during the fall 2022 and 2023 Data Drill Down training. The displays showed the difference between counts of disciplinary actions of all students, students with disabilities, and the percentage that students with disabilities contributed to all students' disciplinary actions. Data were aggregated by disciplinary action type and included in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and expulsions over the last three reporting years. For the fall 2023 training the department expanded to securely provide LEAs with access to their data using the IDEA Data Center's LEA EDFacts Edit Check and Data Display Tool for Disciplinary Action.

Before reviewing and discussing the disciplinary action data, LEA teams received an overview of the data collection source, the definition of each discipline type, and selected questions from the Discipline Self-Assessment Protocol. In the fall of 2022, a majority of LEAs who returned action items at the close of each training indicated one or more action items related to disciplinary action. Fall of 2023 action items focused on documenting data processes to improve data quality for data concerning students with disabilities.

Idaho continues to provide information during regular webinars with local special education directors and staff to address data and reporting requirements, dispute resolution hot topics, newly developed resources for LEAs and families, and Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) guidance.

The department and Idaho SESTA developed several resources for educators related to disciplinary action and behavioral intervention specific to students with disabilities. Training and documents are available to all levels, but many resources focus on new principals and superintendents. For additional information and to view resources related to disciplinary action, go to <https://idahotc.com/> and search for discipline. Behavior resources, including a four-part webinar series on the Escalation Cycle, online modules for Functional Behavioral Assessment, and Behavioral Intervention Plan Process, are available directly through the following link: <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Behavior?page13537=1&size13537=6>. For materials specific to principals, including the Discipline Flowchart, Manifest Determination Flowchart, and Student Removal Quick Guide go to ITC Principals Corner at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/Principals-Corner?page13542=1&size13542=6>. Also available on the ITC are the Discipline Resources for Principals Module at [https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#](https://idahotc.com/Portals/0/Resources/730/discipline-resources-for-school-principals/index.html#/), The Educators Guide to Student Discipline and Supports at <https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/738>, and Idaho Tiered Behavior Supports at <https://idahotc.com/itbs?page15083=1&size15083=6>. In addition to universal support and resources, Idaho SESTA provides free intensive multi-year support to LEAs for Positive Behavior Interventions and Support by application.

Note that the additional information provided in the Prior FFY Required Actions section regarding Idaho's processes for determining the calculation methodology does not reflect a revision in methodology. The department was providing added clarification regarding the original process used to create the current methodology as reflected in the stakeholder input section.

New activities with educational partners will include a review of thresholds to make sure they align with Idaho's systems for equity and make sense to educational partners.

The department is partnering with national technical assistance centers, including the Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), to review the self-assessments used at the LEA level to review policies, practices, and procedures. The department uses the same self-assessments for significant disproportionality and significant discrepancy. Based on the feedback from these centers and input from educational partners, Idaho plans to revise the self-assessments, improving their clarity in relation to related requirements and addressing compliance.

#### **Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)**

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

Idaho did not identify any instances of significant discrepancy for FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data.

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

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

The department adopted the Self-Assessment for Discipline as part of the process to determine if the identification of significant discrepancy is a result of inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures. The Self-Assessment Protocol for Discipline was developed as part of the state's significant disproportionality work. Using the same tool for Indicator 4 and significant disproportionality improves alignment and reduces confusion for LEAs and educational partners. The self-assessment protocol works in combination with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timebound (SMART) Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation.

LEAs needing the most intensive support can work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. Department staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the self-assessment process.

Idaho continues to access national technical assistance centers to strengthen review processes to ensure compliance with the IDEA.

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



**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, under the State’s chosen methodology; and how the State’s threshold for measuring significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

As part of its SPP/APR Post Clarification follow-up communication with OSEP, Idaho was encouraged to utilize national technical assistance resources to evaluate the reasonableness of the state’s methodology for determining if there is a significant discrepancy in the long-term out-of-school suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days occurring in its LEAs.

Idaho then reviewed available resources in particular but not limited to Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide, Equity Requirements in IDEA, and Setting the Stage for Reasonably Designed Methodology: Back to Basics on Indicator 4.

When determining cell and n-size criteria, Idaho carefully considered educational partner feedback, Idaho public reporting minimum requirements, and OSEP’s defined presumptively reasonable values for significant disproportionality.

As the Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide states, "States need to try to balance the risk of inappropriately identifying districts because of small cell sizes against the risk of not identifying districts because of large minimum cell sizes..." When developing criteria for Idaho’s Indicator 4 calculation, discussions with educational partners, including parents, revealed that educational partners did not feel it was reasonable to calculate Indicator 4 based on one instance of long-term out-of-school suspension/expulsion for a reporting year. Many of small group discussions centered around confusion between significant disproportionality and significant discrepancy calculations. Educational partners recommended further alignment and consistency between equity indicators and significant disproportionality. Recommendations included using OSEP’s presumptively reasonable cell size of 10 and n-size of 30, the same as Idaho’s significant disproportionality measure, and increasing to two years of data analysis while maintaining a target of 0%. Discussion participants felt the changes would help establish a unified support system for equity, address false positives, and reduce confusion between measures.

After further review of data for out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities, the department determined that Idaho’s data did not support increasing the cell size to 10. The department implemented the recommended change to n-size but reduced the cell size to five. Five is the minimum count required per the Idaho Data Management Council public reporting requirements. The use of this minimum helps the measure be more sensitive while also maintaining the protection of students’ personally identifiable information.

Throughout the process of updating the criteria for the Indicator 4 calculation, Idaho consulted with the IDEA Data Center (IDC). Educational partner feedback had proposed that the two years of data might be combined to more effectively monitor LEAs. Consultation with IDC and other national technical assistance centers revealed that combining two or more years of data was a statistically valid option to increase the counts of disciplinary actions and comparison data used for analysis. They also clarified that Indicator 4 measurement allows for multiple years of analysis but not the combination of data from multiple reporting years. Based on this additional information, Idaho maintained using one year of data analysis for Indicator 4 as increasing to two years of analysis would further impact the number of LEAs reviewed annually for Indicator 4.

Idaho also maintained the state bar at one percentage point over the state rate. Idaho’s current rate is very low at 0.17%. The additional one percentage point shows that if an LEA meets criteria for calculation and even just over one percent of their special education population by race/ethnicity has long-term suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days, they will be flagged as having a significant discrepancy. All of Idaho’s criteria are well within the examples provided within the Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide document which was the primary resource the state was encouraged by OSEP to reference when reviewing its calculation. The guidance further notes that "Each state must decide whether to periodically (e.g., annually) recalculate the bar that is based on this rate or to set the bar in the first year of the SPP/APR and not change it." Idaho’s state bar is recalculated annually to make sure that the measure is more sensitive to data from the given reporting year.

The department continues to access national technical assistance centers and collaborate with educational partners to strengthen Idaho’s equity systems, ensuring compliance with the IDEA and promoting successful outcomes for students with disabilities.

Indicator 4 is not the only mechanism for monitoring discipline for students with disabilities. The department takes a proactive approach to addressing disciplinary action through training and resources. New principals, administrators, and special education directors receive targeted training around disciplinary action to ensure that LEAs have appropriate policies, practices, and procedures.

Idaho uses an early warning system to address significant disproportionality. Any LEA determined to have exceeded the state’s threshold of three times the rate for disciplinary action as compared to other races/ethnicities in a given analysis category for even one year of analysis has required activities. LEAs in Idaho are frequently small and homogeneous. Idaho’s significant disproportionality calculation effectively reviews homogenous populations using the alternate risk ratio. At year two of exceeding the state’s threshold, an LEA is required to participate in an onsite review discussing the LEA’s educational system, policies, practices, and processes, as well as examples of those being implemented.

The department also annually provides disciplinary action data, including expulsion information, as part of the regional Data Drill Down training. Teams

review data, conduct root cause analysis, and develop action plans to address areas of need. Additional information related to disciplinary action is available on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at <https://idahotc.com/>.

Note that the additional information provided above regarding Idaho's processes for determining the calculation methodology does not reflect a revision in methodology. The department was providing added clarification regarding the original process used to create the current methodology as reflected in the stakeholder input section. New activities with educational partners will include a review of thresholds to make sure they align with Idaho's systems for equity and make sense to educational partners.

The department is partnering with national technical assistance centers, including the Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), to review the self-assessments used at the LEA level to review policies, practices, and procedures. The department uses the same self-assessments for significant disproportionality and significant discrepancy. Based on the feedback from these centers and input from educational partners, Idaho plans to revise the self-assessments, improving their clarity in relation to related requirements and addressing compliance.

#### **4B - OSEP Response**

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State was required to explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity. OSEP appreciates the State reported it consulted with stakeholders to determine if its methodology is reasonably designed. However, OSEP notes that the State's methodology continues to result in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspension and expulsion rates of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States. Additionally, OSEP notes that the State included 0.5 percent of LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEP. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State's revised methodology is reasonably designed to determine significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with disabilities.

Additionally, OSEP conducted a Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) monitoring visit with representatives from the State's Educational Agency, Idaho State Department of Education, during October 2023. OSEP will address any issues related to OSEP's DMS activities, including any issues relevant to this indicator, under separate cover.

#### **4B- Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	63.75%	63.80%
A	63.75%	Data	62.02%	62.69%	64.77%	63.75%	65.20%
B	2020	Target <=	5.98%	5.50%	5.02%	9.58%	9.55%
B	9.58%	Data	9.13%	8.99%	8.64%	9.58%	9.05%
C	2020	Target <=	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.11%	1.10%
C	1.11%	Data	1.42%	1.45%	1.33%	1.11%	1.06%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendent(s), adult corrections, special education director(s), teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

The department established targets for Indicator 5 in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions. Educational partners requested that the department provide more student-centered examples as they could not see the connection between indicator percentages and impacts on students. Educational partners also noted concern that listing specific targets for inclusive environments could result in teams establishing inclusion quotas. The department clarified that Idaho's training and guidance for the least restrictive environment (LRE) reflect that placement is based on the IEP team's decisions specific to the student's individual needs. In addition, the department supports compliance with IDEA requirements regarding placement through the annual General Supervision File Review process.

The department scheduled a follow-up workgroup session with educational partners one month later to provide for additional discussion and more student-centered examples per the educational partner's request. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

After an overview of goals and materials, workgroup participants discussed the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including system challenges and supports, and then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

In the discussions, workgroup participants expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Educational partners noted several stresses on its educational system, especially COVID-19 related trauma, staffing loss, and frequent changes in the educational environment. As part of the discussion, parents stated that their students had experienced frequent changes in placement in the 2019-20 and 2020-21 school years. Parents further noted that implementing aggressive targets without time to plan and communicate would likely result in even more changes and cause further strain between parents/families and educators.

For Indicator 5, educational environments for students age 5 enrolled in kindergarten through age 21, educational partners advocated using FFY 2020 data as a baseline, maintaining targets near the baseline for multiple years, and then proceeding towards more challenging targets. Educational partners justified the recommendation, indicating that maintaining the target near the baseline would allow general and special education staff time to train and implement system changes and better facilitate communication between educators and families.

Current Activities:

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

The department developed a two-page indicator summary for Indicator 5 per educational partner input. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurements, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-5/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-5-School-Age-Least-Restrictive-Environment.pdf> .

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	36,087
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	23,355
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,426
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	260
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	84
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	26

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

NO

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	23,355	36,087	65.20%	63.85%	64.72%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	3,426	36,087	9.05%	9.52%	9.49%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	370	36,087	1.06%	1.09%	1.03%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Idaho annually includes trend data on Indicator 5 as part of the regionally offered Data Drill Down training. Data Drill Down focuses on improving data literacy within local education agencies (LEAs). During the training, department staff facilitate data discussions, root cause analysis, and action planning designed to improve LEA systems and outcomes for students with disabilities.

The department continues to emphasize proper coding of kindergarten-age eligible students. The department and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) have developed additional guidance and resources to help teams plan for students transitioning from preschool-grade level to kindergarten. Guidance and resources focused particularly on timelines, proper consideration of grade level coding, access to typically developing peers, and access to general education curriculum for kindergarten-age eligible students. The department also developed changes to validations within Idaho's statewide longitudinal data system, the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE), to address coding issues.

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

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

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

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

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

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS089.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

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

NO

### Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	36.40%	37.40%	38.40%	12.56%	12.57%
A	Data	24.43%	25.35%	27.01%	12.56%	11.98%
B	Target <=	45.30%	44.30%	43.30%	71.04%	71.03%
B	Data	54.59%	53.18%	53.14%	71.04%	72.30%
C	Target <=					
C	Data				0.34%	0.26%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho established the current targets based on data analysis and educational partner input. Idaho engaged broad educational partner groups, including the Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Head Start Collaboration Office, Idaho Child Care Program Advisory Panel, Early Childhood Advisory Committee, Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), and Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC).

Each educational partner group represents different members. SEAP membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendent(s), adult corrections, special education director(s), teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department)staff.

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

The Early Childhood Advisory Committee is a Governor's appointed Early Childhood Committee representing the following: the medical community, state legislators, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW); Head Start and Early Head Start, Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Medicaid, Title V Maternal and Child Health programs, Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program, Idaho children's Trust

Fund, and IDEA Part C, membership also included representatives from private child care facilities, the judicial system, State Department of Insurance, early intervention providers, tribal relations, and the Council on Developmental Disabilities.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

In the spring and fall of 2020, the Idaho Department of Education (department) discussed Indicator 6 for FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR submissions and data collection and reporting changes. The department informed educational partners of decreased inclusion rates for early childhood due to federal reporting requirements shifting the reporting of students age five enrolled in kindergarten to school-age reporting. Idaho does not have a state-funded preschool program. As a result, students age five enrolled in kindergarten previously contributed substantially to Idaho's indicator 6a inclusion rate.

In the Data Drill Down training conducted in the fall of 2021, the department provided LEA and state-level comparison information to LEA representatives, including special education directors, consulting teachers, and data enterers. During the training, participants had opportunities to review the data, which incorporated changes FFY 2020 to reporting for Indicators 5 and 6 and showed impacts on their LEA versus the state.

Participants asked clarifying questions, provided feedback on changes and target setting, discussed supports and obstacles to improvement, and developed strategies for improving inclusion within their LEA.

The department established targets for Indicator 6 in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods in preparation for target setting. Through its parent center, IPUL, the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

The department scheduled a follow-up workgroup session with educational partners one month later to provide for additional discussion and more student-centered examples per the educational partner's request. Idaho developed additional information that included estimates of the actual number of students positively impacted at the state level if Idaho met the proposed targets. The updated information was laid out in short visual infographic style to help members better understand the connection between the increasing target percentages and the positive impact on student outcomes.

After an overview of goals and materials, workgroup participants discussed the current landscape of Idaho's educational system, including system challenges and supports, and then proceeded to the pros and cons of conservative and aggressive targets.

In the discussions, workgroup participants expressed uncertainty and concern about the duration and overall impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on student learning. Educational partners noted several stresses on its educational system, such as staffing losses, shifting between virtual and in-person learning, and a lack of universal preschool.

Based on the change in collection methodology per federal reporting requirements and educational partner input, the department established FFY 2020 data as the baseline for Indicator 6. Targets were established inclusive for ages 3-5 as Idaho has small n-sizes, especially when observed at the LEA level. For early childhood placement, educational partners unanimously recommended that Idaho maintain targets near the baseline for multiple years and then proceed towards conservative increases for end-year targets. Educational partners cited Idaho's lack of universal preschool and the state legislators' refusal to accept additional federal preschool funds as the justification for establishing conservative targets. Group discussions noted that in Idaho, early childhood inclusion issues are not about IEP teams placing students with disabilities in restrictive environments. Instead, it is more about finding and encouraging typically developing peers to attend available early childhood programs.

Idaho is not required to establish targets for indicator 6c until counts exceed 10 for this category. The department is ready and willing to engage educational partners in target-setting activities when state data reaches the minimum count required. Targets are established inclusive for ages 3-5 as Idaho has small n-sizes, especially when observed at the LEA level.

**Current Activities:**

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

The department developed a two-page indicator summary for Indicator 6 per educational partner input. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurements, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-6/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-6-Early-Childhood-Least-Restrictive-Environment.pdf> .

**Targets**

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=				

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:** 08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	747	1,234	230	2,211
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	48	134	29	211
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	520	786	141	1,447
b2. Number of children attending separate school	.	.	.	207
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	NA	NA	NA	NA
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	.	.	.	8

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

NO

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	211	2,211	11.98%	12.58%	9.54%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,654	2,211	72.30%	71.02%	74.81%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	8	2,211	0.26%		0.36%	N/A	N/A

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

Idaho does not have a state-funded universal preschool program. LEAs are encouraged to develop inclusive programs through the use of Title I funds, collaborating with local Head Start and private preschool programs. Without support from state funding, many LEA programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in more students participating in less inclusive environments. The IdahoSTARS Project conducted a survey in November of 2022 of nearly 500 owners and directors of childcare programs across the state. Results posted in the Early Childhood Care and Workforce Report show that 41% of respondents indicated their facility(ies) had zero openings for any age ranges. In addition, respondents indicated that COVID-19-related relief funds played a significant role in their facilities staying in operation while maintaining consistent tuition rates. Idaho already has limited access to options that offer inclusive early childhood environments. The lack of childcare openings and anticipated tuition rate increases further reduces the availability of these inclusive options. To view a copy of the report, access the following link: [https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport\\_2022.pdf](https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport_2022.pdf) .

Idaho continues to see substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff in the local education agencies. Evidence collected through communication and training indicates that LEA teams need added training and resources related to how to approach discussions with families, specifically how to discuss what settings the student is involved with beyond the educational setting at the LEA. The department is connecting with national technical assistance centers to improve training and resources available to LEA teams. IdahoSTARS Project, through its 2022-2023 annual report, [https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/AR\\_22-23.pdf](https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/AR_22-23.pdf), shows positive increases for individuals accessing higher education for early childhood professional development. The data on professional development indicates potential future increases in qualified providers. Idaho is also leveraging available resources as part of the Kindergarten readiness initiative. For additional information regarding state initiatives and future collaborations, see the following links:



[https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/about-us/impactstmnt\\_23.pdf](https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/about-us/impactstmnt_23.pdf)  
[https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/PyrModColRpt\\_22-23.pdf](https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/PyrModColRpt_22-23.pdf)

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

Idaho does not have a state-funded universal preschool program. LEAs are encouraged to develop inclusive programs through the use of Title I funds, collaborating with local Head Start and private preschool programs. Without support from state funding, many LEA programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in more students participating in less inclusive environments. The IdahoSTARS Project conducted a survey in November of 2022 of nearly 500 owners and directors of childcare programs across the state. Results posted in the Early Childhood Care and Workforce Report show that 41% of respondents indicated their facility(ies) had zero openings for any age ranges. In addition, respondents indicated that COVID-19-related relief funds played a significant role in their facilities staying in operation while maintaining consistent tuition rates. Idaho already has limited access to options that offer inclusive early childhood environments. The lack of childcare openings and anticipated tuition rate increases further reduces the availability of these inclusive options. To view a copy of the report, access the following link: [https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport\\_2022.pdf](https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport_2022.pdf) .

Idaho continues to see substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff in the local education agencies. Evidence collected through communication and training indicates that LEA teams need added training and resources related to how to approach discussions with families, specifically how to discuss what settings the student is involved with beyond the educational setting at the LEA. The department is connecting with national technical assistance centers to improve training and resources available to LEA teams. IdahoSTARS Project, through its 2022-2023 annual report, [https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/AR\\_22-23.pdf](https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/AR_22-23.pdf), shows positive increases for individuals accessing higher education for early childhood professional development. The data on professional development indicates potential future increases in qualified providers. Idaho is also leveraging available resources as part of the Kindergarten readiness initiative. For additional information regarding state initiatives and future collaborations, see the following links:

[https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/about-us/impactstmnt\\_23.pdf](https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/about-us/impactstmnt_23.pdf)  
[https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/PyrModColRpt\\_22-23.pdf](https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/PyrModColRpt_22-23.pdf)

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

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

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

The department continues to develop and produce training modules and recordings related to early childhood coding and inclusive practices. To access available training, go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/EC> . The recordings are open to the public with a target audience of new teachers and existing staff who need additional training.

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

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

Idaho is participating in a national initiative to address inclusive policies and practices at the state, local program leadership, and early care and education environments levels. The department, Idaho Special Education Support & Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA), Head Start Collaborative Office, Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHC/University of Idaho), IdahoSTARS, and Boise State University are working together to improve early childhood in Idaho. The framework being used focuses on supporting Idaho's early childhood educators in building strong evidence-based teaching and learning practices. These practices center on developing positive relationships, supportive and nurturing environments, inclusion, teaching social/emotional skills, and reducing challenging behavior through training and ongoing support.

The department has several upcoming activities designed to improve early childhood outcomes. The department is;

1. Establishing an Early Childhood Advisory Panel consisting of special education directors, early childhood education teachers, consulting teachers, with representation from Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Infant Toddler Program (ITP), IPUL, and Head Start;
2. Creating a webinar series on inclusion in collaboration with IPUL, the Infant Toddler Program, Head Start, and childcare providers;
3. Adding inclusion indicators to the new Early Learning Collaborative application (PDG);
4. Working with Head Start to explore an online application for eGuidelines;
5. Updating Part C Interagency agreement; and
6. Creating an online training module for early childhood.

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

None

#### **6 - OSEP Response**

#### **6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2020	Target >=	85.70%	85.20%		70.12%	70.32%
A1	70.12%	Data	66.79%	68.29%	64.25%	70.12%	62.67%
A2	2020	Target >=	55.88%	56.38%		48.76%	48.96%
A2	48.76%	Data	49.51%	50.45%	45.95%	48.76%	44.55%
B1	2020	Target >=	80.05%	80.55%		69.49%	69.69%
B1	69.49%	Data	64.19%	69.96%	62.88%	69.49%	62.29%
B2	2020	Target >=	29.37%	29.87%		16.14%	16.34%
B2	16.14%	Data	19.61%	17.52%	13.75%	16.14%	13.00%
C1	2020	Target >=	85.31%	85.81%		65.60%	65.80%
C1	65.60%	Data	61.34%	67.42%	64.89%	65.60%	60.23%
C2	2020	Target >=	67.41%	67.91%		55.76%	55.96%
C2	55.76%	Data	57.45%	57.95%	54.75%	55.76%	50.67%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho established the current targets based on data analysis and educational partner input. Idaho engaged broad educational partner groups, including the Infant Toddler Coordinating Council, Head Start Collaboration Office, Idaho Child Care Program Advisory Panel, Early Childhood Advisory Committee, Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), and Special Education Directors Advisory Council (DAC).

Each educational partner group represents different members. SEAP membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendent(s), adult corrections, special education director(s), teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

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

The Early Childhood Advisory Committee is a Governor's appointed Early Childhood Committee representing the following: the medical community, state legislators, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW); Head Start and Early Head Start, Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), Medicaid, Title V Maternal and Child Health programs, Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program, Idaho children's Trust Fund, and IDEA Part C, membership also included representatives from private child care facilities, the judicial system, State Department of Insurance, early intervention providers, tribal relations, and the Council on Developmental Disabilities.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

The department established targets for Indicator 7 in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods in preparation for target setting. Through its parent center, IPUL, the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Educational partners unanimously agreed that Idaho should pursue conservative targets for Indicator 7. Idaho's lack of universal preschool was noted as a significant obstacle to making large gains in early childhood outcomes. Members also noted that the impacts of COVID-19 would be long-lasting.

Based on discussions with educational partners the department established FFY 2020 as a baseline with a yearly percentage point increase of 0.2. Current Activities:

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

The department developed two-page indicator summaries for Indicator 7 per educational partner input. Indicator 7 represents three different early childhood outcome areas. The department represented each outcome area in a separate document to facilitate easy access and use of these resources. The summaries briefly describe the indicator measurements, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-7/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-7A-Early-Childhood-Outcomes-Social-Emotional.pdf>.

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-7/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-7B-Early-Childhood-Outcomes-Use-of-Knowledge-and-Skills.pdf>

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-7/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-7C-Early-Childhood-Outcomes-Use-of-Appropriate-Behaviors.pdf>

## FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

1,135

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	37	3.26%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	299	26.34%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	304	26.78%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	243	21.41%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	252	22.20%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	547	883	62.67%	70.52%	61.95%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	495	1,135	44.55%	49.16%	43.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	17	1.50%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	434	38.24%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	537	47.31%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	122	10.75%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	25	2.20%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	659	1,110	62.29%	69.89%	59.37%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	147	1,135	13.00%	16.54%	12.95%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	30	2.64%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	286	25.20%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	229	20.18%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	279	24.58%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	311	27.40%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	508	824	60.23%	66.00%	61.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	590	1,135	50.67%	56.16%	51.98%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B1	<p>Studies show that students with disabilities show the most growth when they have access to typically developing peers. Idaho does not have a state-funded universal preschool program. LEAs are encouraged to develop inclusive programs through the use of Title I funds, collaborating with local Head Start and private preschool programs. Without support from state funding, many LEA programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in more students participating in less inclusive environments with fewer opportunities for peer modeling. The IdahoSTARS Project conducted a survey in November of 2022 of nearly 500 owners and directors of childcare programs across the state. Results posted in the Early Childhood Care and Workforce Report show that 41% of respondents indicated their facility(ies) had zero openings for any age range. In addition, respondents indicated that COVID-19-related relief funds played a significant role in their facilities staying in operation while maintaining consistent tuition rates. Idaho already has limited access to options that offer inclusive early childhood environments. The lack of childcare openings and anticipated tuition rate increases further reduce the availability of these inclusive options. To view a copy of the report, access the following link: <a href="https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport_2022.pdf">https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/WorkforceReport_2022.pdf</a> .</p> <p>Idaho continues to see substantial turnover and shortages of educational staff. IdahoSTARS Project, through its 2022-2023 annual report, <a href="https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/AR_22-23.pdf">https://idahostars.org/portals/61/docs/About-Us/AR_22-23.pdf</a> , shows positive increases for individuals accessing higher education for early childhood professional development. The data on professional development indicates potential future increases in qualified providers.</p> <p>The department is identifying the lowest 10% of LEAs with respect to early childhood data to provide targeted training and support. The department collaborates with other entities, including Idaho Head Start, the Idaho Commission for Libraries, Idaho Public Television, and the Idaho Association for the Education of Young Children, to develop resources supporting the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills and kindergarten readiness.</p>

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

Early Childhood Outcome rating data and information are collected and incorporated into the Early Childhood IEP using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process. Once documented as part of the ECO/IEP, ECO entry ratings are then reported to the department in the Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System. The ECO application establishes records for students based on demographic data reported to the statewide longitudinal data system. Using demographic and enrollment data helps guarantee that students are recorded under the correct LEA and eliminates records duplication. Upon student exit, LEA staff finalize the student record by submitting ECO exit and progress ratings. The system uses validations on entry and exit date fields to ensure that only students who have received special education and related services for at least six months are reported to the federal level. In addition to the Early Childhood Outcome Data Collection System, Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. For Indicator 7 Early Childhood Outcome data, Idaho EdPlan routes users through the Early Childhood Outcome Decision Tree for Summary Ratings process for each outcome area. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate rating based on the user's responses to decision tree questions. The process-based approach reduces the risk of recording errors and ensures that progress is tracked appropriately for exit ratings.

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

Historically, Idaho has struggled to improve outcomes for the early childhood age group. A substantial contributing factor is that Idaho does not have a state-funded universal preschool program. LEAs are encouraged to develop inclusive programs through the use of Title I funds, collaborating with local Head Start and private preschool programs. Without support from state funding, many LEA programs provide services exclusively to students receiving special education and related services, resulting in higher numbers of students participating in less inclusive environments with limited access to peer modeling. The department regularly accesses national technical resources to improve understanding of strategies to improve systems and implementation. The information gained from national centers has enabled the department to increase partnerships with fellow agencies and leverage internal resources. Strategies to address data quality and performance for Indicator 7 include increased and improved communication and training developed through collaboration with other state agencies and grant opportunities. The department continues to develop and produce training modules and recordings related to early childhood outcomes and inclusive practices. To access available training, go to the Idaho Training Clearinghouse at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/A-M/Early-Childhood?page13538=1&size13538=6> . The recordings are open to the public with a target audience of new teachers and existing staff who need additional training. Idaho's 619 (Early Childhood) Coordinator facilitates LEA team training upon request. The department provided access to and trained on the use of national technical assistance center-created tools so that LEAs can better monitor their data against state targets. All LEAs received a copy of their trend ECO data as part of the annual regionally offered Data Drill Down training. Since including early childhood data in the Data Drill Down, the department has seen increased awareness and understanding of data. For example, some LEAs now incorporate ECO data into their internal evaluation processes. Data-related training incorporating early childhood information includes the Data Drill Down, IDEA and Federal Directors meeting, and the Director's Webinars. The department partners with other state agencies to increase training, resources, and develop guidance documents related to ECO. IdahoSTARS provides oversight and training to childcare providers across the State. Materials, including guidance documents and training, are shared with childcare providers and made available to the public on the IdahoSTARS Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). Idaho continues to scale up Idaho's Pyramid Model Collaborative, a social and emotional program for early childhood settings. Idaho joined a national initiative to address inclusive policies and practices at the state, local program leadership, and early care and education environments levels. The State Department of Education, Idaho SESTA (Special Education Support & Technical Assistance), Idaho Head Start Collaborative Office, Center on Disabilities and Human Development (CDHC/University of Idaho), IdahoSTARS, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), and Boise State University are working together to improve early childhood outcomes and increase positive social-emotional competencies for all children. In the 2022-2023 school year, Idaho's Pyramid Collaborative included 37 Program Leadership Teams, 29 Programs (14 Child Care Programs, 3 Head Start Programs, 12 School District Programs), 102 Teachers (38 Child Care Teachers, 24 Head Start Teachers, 40 School District Teachers). Idaho's Pyramid Model follows the guidance from the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI), a federally-funded project established to

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

The department has several upcoming activities designed to improve early childhood outcomes. The department is;

1. Establishing an Early Childhood Advisory Panel consisting of special education directors, early childhood education teachers, consulting teachers, with representation from Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Infant Toddler Program (ITP), IPUL, and Head Start;
2. Creating a webinar series on inclusion in collaboration with IPUL, the Infant Toddler Program, Head Start, and childcare providers;
3. Adding inclusion indicators to the new Early Learning Collaborative application (PDG);
4. Working with Head Start to explore an online application for eGuidelines;
5. Updating Part C Interagency agreement; and
6. Creating an online training module for early childhood.

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

None

## **7 - OSEP Response**

## **7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Idaho's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) was directly involved in developing questions, processes, and targets for the Indicator 8 collection. SEAP membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff. The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state. The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

Targets for Indicator 8 were established in winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

- Descriptions of the changes.
- Anticipated impacts for the state.
- An overview of state historical data.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Reviewing historical Indicator 8 Parent Involvement survey processes, data, and national comparisons, educational partners recommended resetting the baseline and targets for FFY 2017. The 2017-2018 school year represented several small changes to the survey focused on improving the response rate and clarity of response. The department reviewed Indicator 8 processes from other states with input from Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), IDEA Data Center (IDC), and educational partners. At the time, the department and educational partners considered the changes nominal and deemed them not to constitute a change to the collection methodology. The department maintained the calculation of responses on a 100-point scale and made no changes to the participant selection process, LEA participation cycle, or survey questions. After reviewing subsequent data, the



department and educational partners determined that changes to the FFY 2017 data collection resulted in increased response rates and substantially impacted the data trend. Updating the baseline to FFY 2017 captured the shift in process and aligned targets to current data. With educational partner input, the department selected FFY 2017 as the baseline year; the data was at 70.26%. Targets were established with a .25% percentage point increase every two years. Idaho surveys LEAs on a two-year rotation, so increasing targets every two years better aligns indicator results and targets, allowing both sample groups to be evaluated against the same objectives. A minimal increase was added between baseline and FFY 2020 to create a more orderly target progression.

**Current Activities:**

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

The department developed a two-page indicator summary for Indicator 8 per educational partner input. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-8/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-8-Parent-Involvement.pdf> .

Idaho reviewed processes for Indicator 8 based on feedback from OSEP and began discussing the Indicator 8 collection with educational partners in the Spring of 2023. Idaho is coordinating with educational partners and national technical assistance providers, including the IDEA Data Center and Weiss Center, to update Idaho's survey collection methodology for Indicator 8. The new collection aims to improve families' access to the survey, offer multiple formats, and better address accessibility needs. Discussions are ongoing regarding modifications, with a plan to implement them in the Spring of 2024.

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	70.26%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	55.75%	55.75%	56.00%	70.50%	70.75%
Data	70.26%	68.29%	71.74%	71.50%	70.47%

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
763	1,055	70.47%	70.75%	72.32%	Met target	No Slippage

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

The selection process for participants is dependent on the size of the population of students with disabilities within the LEA. For LEAs with 105 students with disabilities or less, all families are selected for participation. LEAs having more than 105 students with disabilities utilize a sample selection process that stratifies the population based on grade level (pre-k-12), race/ethnicity, primary disability, and gender. These procedures help to ensure that the resulting sample accurately represents the population. Sampling procedures were applied to families of all students ages 3-21. There was not a separate selection process for preschool students.

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

4,056

**Percentage of respondent parents**

26.01%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	25.69%	26.01%

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

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

Idaho analyzed race/ethnicity, disability category, and grade level to determine if the demographics of the parents responding to the parent involvement survey represent the demographics of students receiving special education and related services. Based on the data analysis using a plus or minus three percentage point discrepancy, the department identified one difference by race/ethnicity. The sample of students with disabilities for the reporting year was 18.38% students of Hispanic/Latino racial/ethnic background. Respondents included 13.58% of parents of students of Hispanic/Latino racial/ethnic background. The difference between the percentage of students with disabilities and respondents was 4.8 percentage points, which exceeds the plus or minus 3 percentage point difference. All other race/ethnicities, disabilities, and grade differences were within plus or minus three percentage points.

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

NO

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

Idaho is coordinating with educational partners and national technical assistance providers, including the IDEA Data Center and Weiss Center to update Idaho's survey collection methodology. The new collection aims to improve families' access to the survey, offer multiple formats, and better address accessibility needs.

The department is expanding the collection process to improve the response rate for underrepresented groups. If approved, the proposed sampling process will be reflected in the SPP/APR submitted for FFY 2023. The new sampling plan includes half of the LEAs annually, with participation offered to all families (census) with student(s) present during Child Count. The department, with assistance from national technical assistance centers, including the Rhonda Weiss Center for Accessible IDEA Data and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), coordinated with a survey statistician to update the sampling frame. The updated sampling frame takes into account the LEA geographical region, total enrollment separated by quartiles, and the percentage of enrollment of students with disabilities. Other considerations made as part of developing the sampling frame were:

- LEA's proximity to Native American Reservations.
- LEAs with a Minority population above the state median.
- Even distribution of the two largest LEAs in the state across the two survey groups.

The change in the collection process allows for improved communications with LEAs and families. As part of developing new survey questions, the department had representatives of Hispanic/Latino and Native American populations review the survey wording to ensure that the language is culturally sensitive. Reviewers provided feedback on tone and language that could impact the likelihood of a response, and based on that feedback, the department made adjustments. Idaho's new Parent Involvement survey will be available in the top 13 languages in Idaho. Previously, the survey was available in Spanish and English versions. The increase in translations allows a broader range of non-English-speaking families to participate. Idaho's proposed sample frame is available through the following link: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-8/Parent-Involvement-Survey-LEAs-by-Cohort.pdf>.

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

Educational partners, including parents of students with disabilities, emphasized the importance of providing multiple access points to improving participation and response rates. Parents indicated they are more likely to respond to survey requests via a cell phone. Along with other changes to the Parent Involvement survey collection, Idaho is working to offer secure surveys not only via mail and electronic links but also through QR codes. Encouragement for the expansion of options to access the survey was echoed by Idaho Department of Education coordinators that support Migrant and Native American populations. Coordinators noted that the populations they support are more likely to have access to cell phones than computers or other reliable internet connections.

Idaho is coordinating with educational partners and national technical assistance providers, including the IDEA Data Center and Weiss Center, to update Idaho's survey collection methodology. The new collection aims to improve families' access to the survey, offer multiple formats, and better address accessibility needs.

The department is expanding the collection process to improve the response rate for underrepresented groups. If approved, the proposed sampling process will be reflected in the SPP/APR submitted for FFY 2023. The new sampling plan includes half of the LEAs annually, with participation offered to all families (census) with student(s) present during Child Count. The department, with assistance from national technical assistance centers, including the Rhonda Weiss Center for Accessible IDEA Data and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), coordinated with a survey statistician to update the sampling frame. The updated sampling frame takes into account the LEA geographical region, total enrollment separated by quartiles, and the percentage of enrollment of students with disabilities. Other considerations made as part of developing the sampling frame were:

- LEA's proximity to Native American Reservations.
- LEAs with a Minority population above the state median.
- Even distribution of the two largest LEAs in the state across the two survey groups.

The change in the collection process allows for improved communications with LEAs and families. As part of developing new survey questions, the department had representatives of Hispanic/Latino and Native American populations review the survey wording to ensure that the language is culturally sensitive. Reviewers provided feedback on tone and language that could impact the likelihood of a response, and based on that feedback, the department made adjustments. Idaho's new Parent Involvement survey will be available in the top 13 languages in Idaho. Previously, the survey was available in Spanish and English versions. The increase in translations allows a broader range of non-English-speaking families to participate. Idaho's proposed sample frame is available through the following link: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-8/Parent-Involvement-Survey-LEAs-by-Cohort.pdf>.

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

Idaho examined three criteria to determine nonresponse bias. The first criterion examined was the overall response rate. A high response rate limits the maximum nonresponse bias. Idaho's response rate is 26.01%, which is relatively high for surveys. The FFY 2022 response rate is similar to last year's response rate of 25.69%. Second, department examined the representativeness of the responses combined with the positivity of parent responses. As described in the analysis for representativeness, the department found one difference in response rates by race/ethnicity. No differences were found by grade or disability category. The results did not identify any significant differences in the positivity of the actual responses of parents by racial/ethnic subgroups. Third, the department compared the responses of parents who responded early in the process to those who responded later. This comparison targets the idea that parents who did not immediately respond and needed multiple prompts to respond are different in some meaningful way from those who respond immediately. These results showed no significant differences between parents who responded earlier and later in the collection period. Based on the analysis of these three criteria, although the responses were not representative of the parents by race/ethnicity, the

department concludes that nonresponse bias was not an issue within the Indicator 8 data collection.

Idaho is coordinating with educational partners and national technical assistance providers, including the IDEA Data Center and Weiss Center to update Idaho's survey collection methodology. The new collection aims to improve families' access to the survey, offer multiple formats, and better address accessibility needs.

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

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

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

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

To determine the percentage of parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement, a percent of the maximum score was calculated based on all 21 survey items. A percent of the maximum score of 66% is the minimum score required for a parent to report that the school facilitated his/her involvement. This rating indicates that, on average, the parent agreed with all items.

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

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

Idaho is focused on improving resources and opportunities for the inclusion of families in educational processes. Idaho is coordinating with educational partners and national technical assistance providers, including the IDEA Data Center and Weiss Center, to improve publicly available information. In the 2022-2023 school year SPP/APR indicator summaries were developed and posted for the majority of indicators. These summaries allow educational partners to quickly access and gain an understanding of data for students with disabilities. Having these summaries available has resulted in deeper conversations with educational partners around the SPP/APR indicators and how to use data to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

In the Spring of 2023, the department revised its Special Education web page to a more parent-friendly layout. Parents and families now have a dedicated tile with direct access to new and updated resources on Understanding Special Education, Resolving Conflict, Preparing for Graduation, and Behavior and Discipline. All resources focus on providing families with clear, concise, and easy reference resources that allow families to access key information quickly.

The department continues collaborating with IPUL and DisAbility Rights Idaho (DRI), Idaho's designated Protection and Advocacy System for individuals with disabilities, to provide webinar training and increase resource awareness for families.

The department is expanding the collection process to improve the response rate for underrepresented groups. If approved, the proposed sampling process will be reflected in the SPP/APR submitted for FFY 2023. For additional information, see the section on describing strategies to improve the response rate for underrepresented groups.

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

Idaho analyzed race/ethnicity, disability category, and grade level to determine if the demographics of the parents responding to the parent involvement survey represent the demographics of students receiving special education and related services. Based on the data analysis using a plus or minus three percentage point discrepancy, the department identified one difference by race/ethnicity. The sample students with disabilities population for the reporting year was 18.38% students of Hispanic/Latino racial/ethnic background. Respondents included 13.58% of parents of students of Hispanic/Latino racial/ethnic background. The difference between the percentage of students with disabilities and respondents was 4.8 percentage points, which exceeds the plus or minus 3 percentage point difference. All other race/ethnicities, disabilities, and grade differences were within plus or minus three percentage points.

Idaho is coordinating with educational partners and national technical assistance providers, including the IDEA Data Center and Weiss Center to update Idaho's survey collection methodology. The new collection aims to improve families' access to the survey, offer multiple formats, and better address accessibility needs.

The department is expanding the collection process to improve the response rate for underrepresented groups. If approved, the proposed sampling process will be reflected in the SPP/APR submitted for FFY 2023. The new sampling plan includes half of the LEAs annually, with participation offered to all families (census) with student(s) present during Child Count. The department, with assistance from national technical assistance centers, including the Rhonda Weiss Center for Accessible IDEA Data and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), coordinated with a survey statistician to update the sampling frame. The updated sampling frame takes into account the LEA geographical region, total enrollment separated by quartiles, and the percentage of enrollment of students with disabilities. Other considerations made as part of developing the sampling frame were:

- LEA's proximity to Native American Reservations.
- LEAs with a Minority population above the state median.
- Even distribution of the two largest LEAs in the state across the two survey groups.

The change in the collection process allows for improved communications with LEAs and families. As part of developing new survey questions, the

department had representatives of Hispanic/Latino and Native American populations review the survey wording to ensure that the language is culturally sensitive. Reviewers provided feedback on tone and language that could impact the likelihood of a response, and based on that feedback, the department made adjustments. Idaho's new Parent Involvement survey will be available in the top 13 languages in Idaho. Previously, the survey was available in Spanish and English versions. The increase in translations allows a broader range of non-English-speaking families to participate. Idaho's proposed sample frame is available through the following link: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-8/Parent-Involvement-Survey-LEAs-by-Cohort.pdf> .

### **8 - OSEP Response**

In its description of strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, the State did not specifically address strategies to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

### **8 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

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

### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

24

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	164	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

Where:

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

The calculation for disproportionate representation uses the following criteria:

- Minimum cell size, number of students in a specific analysis category = 10
- Minimum n-size, number of students for comparison = 30
- Number of years of analysis = two consecutive years
- Threshold, the minimum value used to flag an LEA for disproportionate representation = 3

The first step in calculating disproportionate representation is calculating the risk of an outcome for a specified racial/ethnic group or target population within the LEA. Risk is calculated by dividing the number of children of the racial/ethnic group in special education by the total number of children from that racial/ethnic group enrolled in the LEA.

If the minimum cell size or n-size requirements are not met, the risk cannot be calculated and the process stops. There has to be 10 or more students of the analyzed race/ethnicity receiving special education and 30 or more students of the same race/ethnicity enrolled in the LEA to calculate the risk. If one or both of these criteria were not met, disproportionate representation could not be calculated for that race/ethnicity for the specific disability category for that LEA.

The second step in calculating disproportionate representation is calculating the risk of an outcome for all other racial/ethnic groups or comparison population. Divide the number of other racial/ethnic group students receiving special education within the LEA by the total number of other racial/ethnic group students enrolled in the LEA.

If the minimum cell size or n-size requirements are not met for the comparison population within the LEA, an alternate risk is calculated using the same formula, but with state-level data.

LEAs calculated to have a risk or alternate risk ratio of three or more in two consecutive years of analysis for the same race/ethnicity are flagged for disproportionate representation.

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

The number of LEAs analyzed for FFY 2022 was 164 (those meeting minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30 for at least one category of analysis). Analysis of data showed zero instances of disproportionate representation.

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

By applying the risk and alternate risk ratio formula to LEA-level data, the department identifies LEAs with a ratio equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, for two consecutive years in the same category of analysis as having disproportionate representation. Based on this analysis, no LEAs were flagged as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services for FFY 2022.

No LEAs were flagged as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services for FFY 2022.

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

Idaho continues to access national technical assistance centers to strengthen review processes to ensure compliance with the IDEA.

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

Idaho continues to develop evidence-based training to support LEAs and families through identification processes, including creating online training modules, quick guides, and guidance documents. Last year, the Idaho Department of Education (department) revised the Special Education website to improve communication with educational partners. Resource buttons are now more clearly defined linking educational partners to additional resources and training. The department expands resources every year to improve communication and understanding of IDEA requirements. For additional information including access to Idaho’s topic page on Comprehensive Evaluation go to <https://idahotc.com/>. The topic pages provides quick access to resources, including information on referral, consent and evaluation, eligibility, reevaluation, etc. To view the Comprehensive Evaluation topic page, access the following link: <https://idahotc.com/Comprehensive-Evaluation?page14266=1&size14266=6>.

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

The department is partnering with national technical assistance centers, including the Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), to review the self-assessments used at the LEA level to review policies, practices, and procedures. The department uses the same self-assessments for significant disproportionality and disproportionate representation. Based on the feedback from these centers and input from educational partners, Idaho plans to revise the self-assessments, improving their clarity in relation to related requirements and addressing compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

OSEP conducted a Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) monitoring visit with representatives from the State Educational Agency, Idaho State Department of Education, during October 2023. OSEP will address any issues related to OSEP's DMS activities, including any issues relevant to this indicator, under separate cover.

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets



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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

64

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	124	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

YES

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

Idaho has established a cell of 10, n-size of 30, and uses two years of data analysis. The calculation for the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories utilizes a risk ratio and an alternate risk ratio formula.

Where:

DLR = District-level risk for the racial/ethnic group and specific disability category

DLRC = District-level risk for the comparison group

SLRC = State-level risk for the comparison group

Risk ratio = DLR/DLRC

Alternate risk ratio = DLR/SLRC

The calculation for disproportionate representation uses the following criteria:

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

Minimum n-size, number of students for comparison = 30

Number of years of analysis = two consecutive years

Threshold, the minimum value used to flag an LEA for disproportionate representation = 3

The first step in calculating the disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories is calculating the risk of an outcome for a specified racial/ethnic group or target population within the LEA. Risk is calculated by dividing the number of children of the racial/ethnic group in the category of analysis by the total number of children from that racial/ethnic group enrolled in the LEA.

If the minimum cell size or n-size requirements are not met, the risk cannot be calculated, and the process stops. There have to be 10 or more students for a specific analysis category and 30 or more students of the same race/ethnicity enrolled in the LEA to calculate the risk. If one or both of these criteria were not met, disproportionate representation could not be calculated for that race/ethnicity for the specific disability category for that LEA.

The second step in calculating the disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories is calculating the risk of an outcome for all other racial/ethnic groups or comparison population. Divide the number of other racial/ethnic group students identified with the specific disability category within the LEA by the total number of other racial/ethnic group students enrolled in the LEA.

If the minimum cell size or n-size requirements are not met for the comparison population within the LEA, an alternate risk is calculated using the same formula, but with state-level data.

LEAs calculated to have a risk or alternate risk ratio of three or more in two consecutive years of analysis for the same category of analysis are flagged for the disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

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

The number of LEAs analyzed for FFY 2022 was 124 (those meeting minimum cell size of 10 and n-size of 30 for at least one category of analysis).

Analysis of data flagged two LEAs for disproportionate representation.

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

By applying the risk and alternate risk ratio formula to LEA-level data, the department flags LEAs with a ratio equal to or greater than 3.0, as described above, for two consecutive years in the same category of analysis as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Two LEAs were flagged for the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories for FFY 2022.

LEAs flagged for disproportionate representation completed the Self-Assessment for Identification and reviewed policies, practices, and procedures related to referral as part of the self-assessment. The department also selected student eligibility files to review. LEA responses and eligibility documentation were examined and evaluated by the department and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) staff to ensure appropriate assessments have been selected based on the student's English language proficiency. If standardized assessments were not

appropriate, the department looked for a preponderance of evidence based on data collected to support eligibility for special education. The department also verified if the LEA has adequately addressed exclusionary factors. From this information, the department determined whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Idaho continues to access national technical assistance centers to strengthen review processes to ensure compliance with the IDEA.

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

Idaho continues to develop evidence-based training to support LEAs and families through identification processes, including creating online training modules, quick guides, and guidance documents. Last year, the Idaho Department of Education (department) revised the Special Education website to improve communication with educational partners. Resource buttons are now more clearly defined linking educational partners to additional resources and training. The department expands resources every year to improve communication and understanding of IDEA requirements. For additional information, including access to Idaho’s topic page on Comprehensive Evaluation, go to <https://idahotc.com/>. The topic pages provide quick access to resources, including information on referral, consent and evaluation, eligibility, reevaluation, etc. To view the Comprehensive Evaluation topic page, access the following link: <https://idahotc.com/Comprehensive-Evaluation?page14266=1&size14266=6>.

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

The department is partnering with national technical assistance centers, including the Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), to review the self-assessments used at the LEA level to review policies, practices, and procedures. The department uses the same self-assessments for significant disproportionality and disproportionate representation in specific disability categories. Based on the feedback from these centers and input from educational partners, Idaho plans to revise the self-assessments, improving their clarity in relation to related requirements and addressing compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

OSEP conducted a Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) monitoring visit with representatives from the State Educational Agency, Idaho State Department of Education, during October 2023. OSEP will address any issues related to OSEP’s DMS activities, including any issues relevant to this indicator, under separate cover.

**10 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	97.32%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.14%	98.36%	98.58%	97.98%	97.16%

### Targets

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

### FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
7,242	7,048	97.16%	100%	97.32%	N/A	N/A

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

194

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

A total of 194 students for whom parental consent to evaluate was received had an initial eligibility determination that exceeded the state-established timeline.

The need for additional assessments was listed as the primary reason for delay for 16 instances, which ranged between 24 and 113 days beyond 60 calendar days with a median of 44 days.

Scheduling difficulties were listed as the primary reason for delay for 49 instances, which ranged between 2- 131 days beyond 60 calendar days with a median of 17 days.

Inaccurate calendaring was a primary reason for the delay for 121 instances, which ranged between 2-445 days beyond 60 calendar days with a median of 24 days. Ninety-seven of those instances indicated a direct relationship to inaccurate application of the state's exception rule.

Staffing issues were listed as the primary reason for delay for eight instances, which ranged between 12 - 160 days with a median of 26.5 days.

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

Periods when regular school was not in session for five (5) or more consecutive school days (see Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03) were not factored into the ranges of days listed above.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

Idaho Code 08.02.03.109.03 states;

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

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

Idaho has modernized the notification of potentially eligible students from Part C to Part B to a nightly automated notification. As part of this modernization, the department also developed an application that allows LEAs to view and provide tracking for the full list of potentially eligible students. The modernizations for improved tracking of students referred as potentially eligible, enhanced communication between Part C, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Infant Toddler Program (ITP), and Part B through automated nightly uploads from ITP, and an interface with the state's longitudinal data system data to reduce duplication of effort. Idaho released the notification automation and the department application in October of 2022. These updates have impacted the timeliness of transition and Child Find for students transitioning between Part C and Part B services. As initial eligibility counts reflected in Indicator 12 also show up as part of Indicator 11, the release of these updates is being considered a change in collection methodology for both Indicator 11 and Indicator 12 for data collected in the school year 2022-2023 (FFY 2022). FFY 2022 data are no longer comparable to the prior years' data. As a result, the department with input from educational partners reset its baseline to FFY 2022 at 97.32%. Idaho's Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes Indicator 11 and other compliance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs receive their determination and are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities at the LEA level. All LEAs are required to review data for students with disabilities on an annual basis for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the department developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct a root-cause analysis and assist LEAs in identifying factors contributing to low performance in specific areas, including initial evaluation. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely (SMART) Goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART Goals. Department staff provide information and training on the process to SESTA coordinators and LEAs.

Idaho has developed processes, validations, and completion rules to improve data quality in multiple indicators as part of its optional statewide IEP software system, Idaho EdPlan. For Indicator 11 data, Idaho EdPlan includes calendar information with timelines and reminders to LEA staff related to compliance requirements. The system allows teachers and supervisors to monitor caseloads and IEP teams to ensure compliance with timeline requirements. Once the user completes all necessary selections, the system automatically generates the appropriate date fields based on finalization. The process-based approach improves systems by linking validations and completion rules from referral through eligibility determination. The department developed a two-page indicator summary for Indicator 11 per educational partner input. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-11/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-11-Child-Find-60-Day-Timeline.pdf>.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
58	58		0

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure that the fifty-eight LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the department conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The department reviewed updated Child Find 60-day timeline data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the department identified noncompliance in FFY 2021. As a result of this subsequent review of updated data, the department determined that all fifty-eight LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to the noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely identification for special education and related services. Department and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed. All fifty-eight LEAs have verified the correction of noncompliance in a timely manner.

The department confirmed the correction of noncompliance for all fifty-eight LEAs, and each passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the department's review of subsequent updated data, the department verified that all fifty-eight LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for Indicator 11 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

After issuance of OSEP QA 23-01 the department implemented changes to its verification processes related to the correction of noncompliance. Future SPP/APR reporting will reflect these changes implemented to ensure compliance monitoring processes appropriately apply regulatory requirements based on updated guidance provided in OSEP QA 23-01.

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

The department verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the fifty-eight LEAs had completed all 194 initial eligibility evaluations. The department investigated all instances of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 at the student level. The department verified that all students had an evaluation, although late, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

To ensure that the fifty-eight LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the department conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The department reviewed updated Child Find 60-day timeline data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the department identified noncompliance in FFY 2021. As a result of this subsequent review of updated data, the

department determined that all fifty-eight LEAs demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and that they were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to the noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely identification for special education and related services. Department and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed. All fifty-eight LEAs have verified the correction of noncompliance in a timely manner.

The department confirmed the correction of noncompliance for all fifty-eight LEAs, and each passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the department's review of subsequent updated data, the department verified that all fifty-eight LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for Indicator 11 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner.

After issuance of OSEP QA 23-01 the department implemented changes to its verification processes related to the correction of noncompliance. Future SPP/APR reporting will reflect these changes implemented to ensure compliance monitoring processes appropriately apply regulatory requirements based on updated guidance provided in OSEP QA 23-01.

The department verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the fifty-eight LEAs had completed all 194 initial eligibility evaluations. The department investigated all instances of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 at the student level. The department verified that all students had an evaluation, although late, and if eligible, an IEP was developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

## **11 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## **11 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	97.51%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.82%	98.95%	96.95%	99.24%	89.79%

#### Targets

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Measurement	Count
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,154
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	.
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	353
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.	740
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	.
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	.

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	353	362	89.79%	100%	97.51%	N/A	N/A

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

9

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

Scheduling difficulties were listed as the primary reason for the delay in the early childhood timeline for eight instances, which exceeded the timeline by 1-123 days with a median of 21 days. Additional Assessments was listed as the primary reason for the delay in the early childhood timeline for one instance, which exceeded the timeline by 51 days.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The Idaho Department of Education (department) collects Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition data through the statewide longitudinal data system Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE). After the school year's final data upload, a report is pulled from ISEE, representing all early childhood transitions for the year. These data are compared to the list of potentially eligible students referred by Idaho's lead agency for Part C, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Infant-Toddler Program (ITP).

Idaho released an automated secure data transfer between the two agencies in October of 2022. The data transfer modernizes and automates the communication of information on students who may be eligible for preschool services under part B of the IDEA. The goal of this modernization was to improve the timely transition of children from Part C to Part B special education and related services. Historically, notifications of potentially eligible students were issued monthly by regional ITP offices to contacts listed in annual interagency agreements. The new layout shifted these notifications to a centralized standard nightly communication directed to the SEA and the current Special Education Directors/Designee(s). As part of the modernization, the department also built an online application, the Early Childhood Transition (ECT) Data Collection System, which allows the state and local educational agencies (LEAs) to track student-level progress to transition in the same application used for notifications. The ECT Data Collection System requires that all students for whom parental consent for initial assessment is received be assigned a state Educational Unique Identifier (EDUID). EDUIDs are cross checked to data submitted through ISEE to check data quality.

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

Updates to the state's data system have improved communication between Part C and Part B and positively impacted the timeliness of transition for students between Part C and Part B services. The modernization constitutes a change in Idaho's collection. As a result, Idaho, with input from educational partners, reset its baseline using data from FFY 2022 at 97.51%

Throughout 2022, the department and ITP collaborated to modernize and improve systems integration related to the transition of children from Part C to Part B special education and related services. Idaho began discussions of modernization after participating in ECTA and DaSy facilitated review of Early Childhood systems using the ECTA/DaSy Framework Self-Assessment. In this review, Idaho identified areas for improvement related to communication and data governance.

To address these areas for improvement, Idaho released an automated secure data transfer between the two agencies in October of 2022. The data transfer modernizes and automates the communication of information on students who may be eligible for preschool services under part B of the IDEA. Historically, notifications of potentially eligible students were issued monthly by regional ITP offices to contacts listed in annual interagency agreements. The new layout shifted these notifications to a centralized standard nightly communication directed to the SEA and the current Special Education Directors/Designee(s). Contact information is updated as needed through the statewide longitudinal data system. The goal of this update is to improve the timely transition of children from Part C to Part B special education and related services by improving:

1) Communication of potentially eligible children to the state educational agency (SEA) and local educational agencies (LEAs) by:

- a) Clarifying the processes to identify LEAs based on the child's address and LEA boundaries;
- b) Standardizing notifications;
- c) Reducing the timeframe required for issuance of notifications 34 CFR 303.209(b);



- i) Notifications issued within 24 hours of an ITP-eligible student turning age two years six months 34 CFR 303.209(b)(1)(i);
- ii) Notification issued within 24 hours of ITP eligibility being determined for students determined eligible after age two years six months through age two years 10.5 months 34 CFR 303.209 (b)(1)(ii);
- (1) Initial eligibility for ITP;
- (2) Update in eligibility category from Informed Clinical Opinion to either Developmental Delay or Established Medical Condition based on subsequent eligibility evaluation assessments or medical information;
- d) Issuing notifications at minimum to the SEA through secure transfer protocol (SFTP) and the LEA special education director/designee based on current contact information maintained as part of regular uploads to the statewide longitudinal data system, the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) Personnel File;
- 2) Data security;
- 3) Systems integration;
- 4) Tracking;
- a) SEA and LEAs are able to track student-level progress to transition in the same application used for notifications.
- b) ITP is able to confirm notification to LEA's Special Education Director for each student based on the return file from the department.
- c) The department is able to monitor and follow up with LEAs to ensure that they are completing IDEA requirements related to transition in a timely manner.

After implementing the modernization of notifications of potentially eligible students and the ECT Data Collection System, the department provided training in face-to-face and virtual formats. Training included clarification of requirements after receipt of notification from ITP, addressing specific scenarios, and data reporting processes. The training utilized OSEP guidance to emphasize SEA, LEA, and lead agency (ITP) responsibilities.

The department developed a two-page indicator summary for Indicator 12 per educational partner input. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at: <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-12/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-12-Early-Childhood-Transition.pdf>.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14	0	0

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To ensure that the fourteen LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the department conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The department reviewed updated Early Childhood Transition data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the department identified noncompliance in FFY 2021. As a result of this review of updated data, each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely transition from Part C to Part B. The department and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed based on documentation uploaded to the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

The department confirmed that the correction of noncompliance passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the department's review of subsequent updated data, the department determined that all fourteen LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for Indicator 12 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner. After issuance of OSEP QA 23-01 the department implemented changes to its verification processes related to the correction of noncompliance. Future SPP/APR reporting will reflect these changes which were implemented to ensure that compliance monitoring processes appropriately apply regulatory requirements based on updated guidance provided in OSEP QA 23-01.

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

The department verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the fourteen LEAs had completed all 34 early childhood transitions. The department investigated all instances of noncompliance in FFY 2021 at the student level. The department verified that all eligible students had an evaluation and IEP developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement, although late, and were either receiving special education and related services or had exited. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the CTT.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

### Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

To ensure that the fourteen LEAs correctly implemented the regulatory requirements, the department conducted a two-part verification of system-level information. The department reviewed updated Early Childhood Transition data subsequently collected through the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) for each LEA, where the department identified noncompliance in FFY 2021. As a result of this review of updated data, each LEA demonstrated 100% compliance at the systems level and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA. LEAs were also required to provide information on improvement activities designed to address factors contributing to noncompliance. Improvement activities included training or changes to policies, practices, or procedures to ensure students' timely transition from Part C to Part B. The department and/or Idaho SESTA staff verified that the LEA's improvement activities were designed to address the area of noncompliance and were completed based on documentation uploaded to the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT).

The department confirmed that the correction of noncompliance passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02. Based on the department's review of subsequent updated data, the department determined that all fourteen LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for Indicator 12 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements under the IDEA in a timely manner. After issuance of OSEP QA 23-01, the department implemented changes to its verification processes related to the correction of noncompliance. Future SPP/APR reporting will reflect these changes which were implemented to ensure that compliance monitoring processes appropriately apply regulatory requirements based on updated guidance provided in OSEP QA 23-01.

The department verified the correction of all instances of noncompliance by reviewing subsequent data and verifying that the fourteen LEAs had completed all 34 early childhood transitions. The department investigated all instances of noncompliance in FFY 2021 at the student level. The department verified that all eligible students had an evaluation and IEP developed and implemented based on parental consent for placement, although late, and were either receiving special education and related services or had exited. The review of additional information was tracked and documented in the CTT.

## 12 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022 and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 12 - Required Actions

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	95.35%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.62%	95.80%	90.48%	95.35%	92.55%

### Targets

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

### FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
151	157	92.55%	100%	96.18%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

Data for Indicator 13 - Secondary Transition are collected as part of state monitoring in a process called General Supervision File Review (GSFR). All local education agencies (LEAs) with one or more secondary students are reviewed annually for Indicator 13 Secondary Transition requirements. For a copy of the Secondary Checklist used for determining compliance and training videos, go to <https://idahotc.com/Resources/View/ID/1009>. Idaho’s GSFR is completed in a virtual layout. To complete GSFR, LEAs conducted an internal file review and provided the Idaho Department of Education (department) with an assurance of the review. Each LEA then provides a list of the students who underwent the internal review in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT) application. The required sample is based on child count and represents a broad representation of the students served by the LEA, including a range of disability categories, environments, etc. Department staff then select student files for review. The files sampled by the department establish the denominator for Indicator 13. The LEA provides self-review results, uploads all required materials to the CTT application, or grants access to student files through the optional statewide IEP software.

Before the 2020-2021 school year (FFY 2020), LEA teams had the authority to self-select files for GSFR. Starting in FFY 2020, LEAs were required to provide a larger sample from which department staff select. Department staff selection improves internal review processes and compliance with IDEA. For the 2022-2023 GSFR process, all LEAs with one or more secondary students, per the department selection process, provided a minimum of one secondary file for review. Small groups of department staff and Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (Idaho SESTA) staff conducted a desk review of all individual student files and documents submitted by LEAs. The department and Idaho SESTA staff entered data gathered during the desk review into the CTT student-by-student. LEAs were informed of desk review results and provided an opportunity to address any areas of concern resulting from an incomplete submission of review materials by uploading existing materials to the CTT.

Areas of concern not addressed by providing existing documentation, missing from the initial review, received a final evaluation by department staff. The final review determined if the area of concern constituted noncompliance.

All LEAs identified with noncompliance in Indicator 13 Secondary Transition during the 2022-2023 school year, GSFR received written notification of noncompliance on February 14-15, 2023.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

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

Data for Indicator 13 - Secondary Transition is collected as part of state monitoring in a process called General Supervision File Review (GSFR). Idaho does not specify an age younger than 16 that local education agencies must meet these requirements. Idaho rules establish that the IEP in effect when the student turns age 16 must meet these requirements. LEA teams may elect to include secondary transition elements prior to age 16 and include them for review as part of the State’s monitoring. All files submitted for secondary transition review as part of the State’s monitoring are included as part of the indicator and held to these requirements. Idaho’s GSFR is completed in a virtual layout. For a full list of GSFR processes, see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse RDA Monitoring System page at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6> and select GSFR (General Supervision File Review).

Idaho’s Results Driven Accountability (RDA) system for special education includes Indicator 13 and other compliance indicators as part of LEA-level determinations. Based on combined performance and compliance scoring, LEAs receive their determination and, based on rank order, are designated a differentiated level of support to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. All LEAs are required to review data for students with disabilities annually for the RDA system. As part of the differentiated levels of support, the department developed several self-assessment protocols to help teams conduct root-cause analysis and assist LEAs in identifying factors contributing to low performance in specific areas, including secondary transition. The self-assessment protocols work in combination with specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time-bound (SMART) goals to facilitate improvement plan development and implementation. LEAs needing the most intensive support have the opportunity to work one-on-one with Idaho SESTA coordinators to complete the self-assessment and develop SMART goals. Department staff provide information and training to Idaho SESTA coordinators and LEAs on the process.

The Secondary Special Education Coordinator participates as part of the annual data training, Data Drill Down, by providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data and indicators. The department’s Secondary Special Education Coordinator also hosts monthly webinars on secondary transition topics for secondary transition staff.

Joint department and IDVR administrator training have resulted in LEA/IDVR funding partnerships to provide dedicated school-to-work counselors who are full-time or shared between smaller LEAs. LEAs engaged in these shared resource have begun to show an increase in their students connecting to pre-employment activities offered by IDVR.

In the summer of 2023, the department applied for and received a grant from the Rehabilitation Services Administration. The grant, the Disability Innovation Fund Pathways to Partnership Model Demonstration Project, is to support innovative activities aimed at increasing competitive integrated employment for youth and other individuals with disabilities. The purpose of the Pathways to Partnerships Model Demonstration project is to focus on the creation of systemic approaches to transition services for children and youth with disabilities. Ensuring that key agents of change and required partners, including State vocational rehabilitation agencies (SVRAs), State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), and federally funded Centers for Independent Living (CILs), are actively collaborating to support coordinated transition processes is critical to the success of children and youth with disabilities.

In the last year, the department and IDVR conducted two Transition surveys to gain additional information about the differences between the services accessed and what educators and counselors list as being available. One survey was sent to parents and families to learn what secondary transition services they know of and are accessing. The second was issued to educators and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors to identify the type and availability of secondary transition services for students ages 15-21 with disabilities in Idaho. Idaho continues to analyze results to determine if there are regions with lower access to secondary transition services or if improved messaging is needed to inform families of available services. The Secondary Special Education Coordinator has partnered with other state agencies to provide training and information to parents and LEAs about the availability of local resources and benefits. Partnering agencies include the IDVR, Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL), and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW).

Communication with parents frequently illuminates a concern that the employment of the exited student with disabilities will result in a loss of benefits and services. There is a need to keep families and secondary transition students informed, so the IDHW is making a concerted effort to provide training regarding benefits in multiple formats to address various learning types and accessibility needs.

In November of 2021, the Transition Institute was provided in both face-to-face and virtual format to facilitate health and safety recommendations from the CDC. The Transition Institute hosted in the fall of 2022 and 2023 returned to a face-to-face-only format which better encourages involvement in the institute. Lead state partner agencies included the IDVR, IDOL, ICDD, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ICBVI), and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL). The 2023 Transition Institute linked 56 LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. A total of 280 individuals participated in the institute representing staff from LEAs, IDVR, ICBVI, Career Technical Education (CTE), colleges and universities, and IPUL. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from

participating agencies to review LEA-specific secondary data, including secondary transition review results, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. As a result of activities initiated at the Transition Institute, 40 of the participating LEAs have developed annual District Action Plans to improve transition at the local level. District Action Plans were turned in to the department for follow-up activities. Idaho intends to continue the Transition Institute and expects growth for students with disabilities in future Secondary Transition and Post School Outcomes data.

The department developed a two-page indicator summary for Indicator 13 per educational partner input. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-13/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-13-Secondary-Transition.pdf>

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10		0

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Ten local education agencies (LEAs) received notification of noncompliance related to twelve students. LEAs identified with compliance issue(s) were required to develop improvement activities documenting the LEA's plans to address underlying factors contributing to noncompliance. Once an LEA completed its improvement activities, they were required to demonstrate completion through assurances and documentation to ensure that the LEA correctly implemented the regulatory requirements. All ten LEAs showed completion of these activities in a timely manner, 365 days or less, through assurances and documentation.

All improvement activities and documentation were recorded in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). LEAs were also required to submit additional student files subsequent to the notification of noncompliance, to demonstrate 100% compliance at the systems level and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. The department and Idaho SESTA reviewed improvement activities and implementation documentation to ensure the activities addressed contributing factors to the item(s) of noncompliance. The department verified that subsequent information provided through additional student files pulled after notification of noncompliance showed 100% compliance, indicating that the ten LEAs are implementing the regulatory requirements correctly. The review of additional files was tracked and documented in the CTT.

The department passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02 which was the most current guidance available during the period that verification of correction of noncompliance occurred. Based on the department's review of subsequent information, the department determined that all ten of the LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for Indicator 13 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements.

After issuance of OSEP QA 23-01 the department implemented changes to its verification of the correction of noncompliance processes. These changes were to ensure that compliance monitoring processes appropriately apply regulatory requirements based on updated guidance provided in OSEP QA 23-01.

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

Within the ten LEAs the department identified noncompliance in twelve student files. The department verified the correction of noncompliance in the twelve student files through subsequent review of the individual student files. All of the instances of noncompliance were verified as corrected within 365 days of issuance of written notification of noncompliance. After the department issued notification of noncompliance, LEAs submitted student files showing subsequent correction of noncompliance at the student level. The department has verified that all student files where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2021 were corrected to 100% compliance. For a full list of GSFR processes, see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse RDA Monitoring System page at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6> and select GSFR (General Supervision File Review).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

Ten local education agencies (LEAs) received notification of noncompliance related to twelve students. LEAs identified with compliance issue(s) were required to develop improvement activities documenting the LEA's plans to address underlying factors contributing to noncompliance. Once an LEA completed its improvement activities, they were required to demonstrate completion through assurances and documentation to ensure that the LEA correctly implemented the regulatory requirements. All ten LEAs showed completion of these activities in a timely manner, 365 days or less, through assurances and documentation.

All improvement activities and documentation were recorded in the Compliance Tracking Tool (CTT). LEAs were also required to submit additional student files subsequent to the notification of noncompliance, to demonstrate 100% compliance at the systems level and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. The department and Idaho SESTA reviewed improvement activities and implementation documentation to ensure the activities addressed contributing factors to the item(s) of noncompliance. The department verified that subsequent information provided through additional student files pulled after notification of noncompliance showed 100% compliance, indicating that the ten LEAs are implementing the regulatory requirements correctly. The review of additional files was tracked and documented in the CTT.

The department passed the two (2) verification tests, consistent with the requirements listed in OSEP Memo 09-02 which was the most current guidance available during the period that verification of correction of noncompliance occurred. Based on the department review of subsequent information, the department determined that all ten of the LEAs corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for Indicator 13 and correctly implemented the regulatory requirements.

After issuance of OSEP QA 23-01 the department implemented changes to its verification of the correction of noncompliance processes. These changes were to ensure that compliance monitoring processes appropriately apply regulatory requirements based on updated guidance provided in OSEP QA 23-01.

Within the ten LEAs the department identified noncompliance in twelve student files. The department verified the correction of noncompliance in the twelve student files through subsequent review of the individual student files. All of the instances of noncompliance were verified within 365 days of issuance of written notification of noncompliance. After the department issued notification of noncompliance, LEAs submitted student files showing subsequent correction of noncompliance at the student level. The department has verified that all student files where noncompliance was identified in FFY 2021 were corrected to 100% compliance. For a full list of GSFR processes, see the Idaho Training Clearinghouse RDA Monitoring System page at <https://idahotc.com/Topics/RDAMS?page13543=1&size13543=6> and select GSFR (General Supervision File Review).

### **13 - OSEP Response**

### **13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

#### II. Data Reporting

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

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school *must* be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	24.00%	24.50%	25.00%	15.75%	15.85%
A	15.75%	Data	17.58%	21.41%	20.41%	15.75%	17.87%
B	2020	Target >=	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	58.87%	59.27%
B	58.87%	Data	50.59%	55.31%	55.72%	58.87%	54.56%
C	2020	Target >=	79.00%	79.50%	80.00%	74.50%	75.39%
C	74.50%	Data	67.22%	69.38%	71.89%	74.50%	72.90%

### FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	15.95%	16.05%	16.15%	16.25%
Target B >=	59.67%	60.07%	60.47%	60.87%
Target C >=	76.29%	77.18%	78.08%	78.97%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho’s Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

Idaho Interagency Council on Secondary Transition (IICST) includes Division of Vocation Rehabilitation, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, University and College representatives, Disability Rights Idaho (Protection and Advocacy), Department of Health and Welfare, Idaho Assistive Technology Project, Idaho Parents Unlimited (Parent Training and Information), the three Centers for Independent Living, district and charter school



representatives, Idaho Division of Career Technical Education, and Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections. The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations. The department established targets for Indicator 14 in the winter of 2021 with input from educational partners. The department provided training on the indicator and target-setting methods to prepare for target setting. Through its parent center, Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL), the department also provided sections of the Serving on Groups training to improve educational partners' ability to serve on decision-making groups effectively. The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Discussions included:

Descriptions of the changes.

Anticipated impacts for the state.

An overview of state historical data.

The department provided opportunities for discussion in small and large groups. Each member participated in two small group sessions and provided feedback and a summary to the larger group to facilitate further discussions.

Based on small group discussions, educational partners recommended using the most current data available FFY 2020 as it best reflected current higher education and employment information. FFY 2020 data were the only data that captured information from the Office of the State Board of Education and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. Based on this change in collection methodology and the recommendations of educational partners, Idaho established the baseline for Indicator 14 using FFY 2020 data. Educational partners recommended an annual percentage point increase of 0.1 for Indicator 14A and 0.4 for Indicator 14B. Given Idaho's historical data, these small percentage point increases encourage rigorous yet achievable gains. As Idaho's current economy offers a wide range of job opportunities, educational partners recommended a more rigorous target for Indicator 14C to improve 6% over baseline, equaling a 0.89 percentage point increase annually.

Current Activities:

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

The department developed a two-page indicator summary for Indicator 14 per educational partner input. The summary briefly describes the indicator measurement, data source, why the indicator is important, and information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center reviewed a template draft in December of 2022. The department modified the template and layout based on feedback from educational partners and now has the information publicly available at:

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr-1-16/indicator-14/Indicator-Summary-Indicator-14-Post-School-Outcomes.pdf> .

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Measure	Count
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,712
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	882
Response Rate	51.52%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	147
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	324
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)	113
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).	68

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	147	882	17.87%	15.95%	16.67%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	471	882	54.56%	59.67%	53.40%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	652	882	72.90%	76.29%	73.92%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	In FFY 2022, Idaho, as shown in Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL) statistics, showed an increase in the unemployment rate. Job opportunities in the state continue to increase, but these are offset by substantial growth in the population from out-of-state, reducing the availability of competitive employment for Idahoans. The department is working to secure historical trend data from IDOL specific for youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school for further analysis. The Provide Additional Information section includes information on strategies the department is implementing to improve this outcome area.

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

**Response Rate**

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	49.62%	51.52%

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

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

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

Idaho analyzed race/ethnicity and disability category to determine if the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Based on the data analysis using a plus or minus three percentage point discrepancy, the department identified no differences by race/ethnicity or disability category.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

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

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

The department continues to work to expand the Indicator 14 LEA opt-in opportunity and encourages all LEAs to conduct initial survey attempts. In school year 2022-2023, (FFY 2022), the department again provided LEAs participating in the opt-in survey process access to additional funds through the Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Grant. In the 2022-23 collection, 49 LEAs representing more than 42% of LEAs with eligible past students participated in the opt-in survey collection. Training for opt-in LEAs included representation of the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C). The NTACT:C representative provided additional information on national trends and strategies to connect with hard-to-reach past students. The department strongly encouraged LEAs to have staff involved in past student education conduct surveys. LEAs were also encouraged to collaborate between programs, including special education, migrant, English Learner, and school counselors, to determine the best individuals to involve in the survey process. Future training of opt-in LEAs will further incorporate NTACT:C resources around improving response from hard-to-reach populations. The department anticipates these efforts will improve data quality and increase the response rate, particularly for past students who dropped out.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Idaho examined three criteria to determine nonresponse bias. The first criterion examined was the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the greater the population represented, and the less likely nonresponse bias occurred. Idaho's response rate is nearly 52%, which is a very high survey response rate. Over half of the individuals eligible to participate provided a survey response. Second, the department examined the representativeness of the responses. As described in the analysis for representativeness, using a plus or minus three percentage point discrepancy, the department found no significant differences by disability or race/ethnicity, thus minimizing the potential for nonresponse bias in the data with respect to these factors.". Third, the department compared the results of exiters who responded early to those who responded later in the process. This comparison focuses on the idea that individuals who did not immediately respond and need multiple prompts to respond are different in some meaningful way from those who respond immediately. The analysis showed no significant differences between the results of exiters who responded early and those who responded later. Based on these analyses Idaho did not identify nonresponse bias for the Indicator 14 survey data.

The department provides training for opt-in LEAs, annually prior to opening the survey collection. The 2022-2023 collection training included representation of the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C). The NTACT:C representative provided additional information on national trends, quality survey collection, and strategies to connect with hard-to-reach past students. The department strongly encouraged LEAs to have staff involved in past student education conduct surveys. LEAs were also encouraged to collaborate between programs, including special education, migrant, English Learner, and school counselors, to determine the best individuals to involve in the survey process. Future training of opt-in LEAs will further incorporate NTACT:C resources around improving response from hard-to-reach populations. The department anticipates these efforts will improve data quality and increase the response rate, particularly for past students who dropped out.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

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

The Secondary Special Education Coordinator participates as part of the annual data training, Data Drill Down, by providing training and information to LEAs on secondary data and indicators. The department's Secondary Special Education Coordinator also hosts monthly webinars on secondary transition topics for secondary transition staff.

Joint department and IDVR administrator training have resulted in LEA/IDVR funding partnerships to provide dedicated school-to-work counselors who are full-time or shared between smaller LEAs. Those LEAs engaged in this shared resource have begun to show an increase in their students connecting to pre-employment activities offered by IDVR.

In the summer of 2023, the department applied for and received a grant from the Rehabilitation Services Administration. The grant, the Disability Innovation Fund Pathways to Partnership Model Demonstration Project, is to support innovative activities aimed at increasing competitive integrated employment for youth and other individuals with disabilities. The purpose of the Pathways to Partnerships Model Demonstration project is to focus on the creation of systemic approaches to transition services for children and youth with disabilities. Ensuring that key agents of change and required partners, including State vocational rehabilitation agencies (SVRAs), State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), and federally funded Centers for Independent Living (CILs), are actively collaborating to support coordinated transition processes is critical to the success of children and youth with disabilities.

In the last year, the department and IDVR conducted two Transition surveys to gain additional information about the differences between the services accessed and what educators and counselors list as being available. One survey was sent to parents and families to learn what secondary transition services they know of and are accessing. The second was issued to educators and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors to identify the type and availability of secondary transition services for students ages 15-21 with disabilities in Idaho. Idaho continues to analyze results to determine if there are regions with lower access to secondary transition services or if improved messaging is needed to inform families of available services. The Secondary Special Education Coordinator has partnered with other state agencies to provide training and information to parents and LEAs about the availability of local resources and benefits. Partnering agencies include the IDVR, Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL), and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW). Idaho is currently working on expanding apprenticeship opportunities in the state. To help improve access to apprenticeship in the state for individuals with disabilities, IDVR has added an Apprenticeship Coordinator position.

Communication with parents frequently illuminates a concern that the employment of the exited student with disabilities will result in a loss of benefits and services. There is a need to keep families and secondary transition students informed, so the IDHW is making a concerted effort to provide training regarding benefits in multiple formats to address various learning types and accessibility needs.

The Transition Institute hosted in the fall of 2022 and 2023 returned to a face-to-face-only format which better encourages involvement in the institute. Lead state partner agencies included the IDVR, IDOL, ICDD, Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ICBVI), and Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL). The 2023 Transition Institute linked 56 LEA teams with higher education and other partnering Idaho agencies to improve transition resources and experiential offerings for students with disabilities. A total of 280 individuals participated in the institute representing staff from LEAs, IDVR, ICBVI, Career Technical Education (CTE), colleges and universities, and IPUL. During the Transition Institute, LEA teams met with staff from participating agencies to review secondary data, discuss root causes, and develop annual plans for improving transition practices, procedures, and collaboration among agencies. As a result of activities initiated at the Transition Institute, 40 of the participating LEAs have developed annual District Action Plans to improve transition at the local level. District Action Plans were turned in to the department for follow-up activities. Idaho intends to continue the Transition Institute and expects growth for students with disabilities in future Secondary Transition and Post School Outcomes data.

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

Idaho analyzed race/ethnicity and disability category to determine if the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Based on the data analysis using a plus or minus three percentage point discrepancy, the department identified no differences by race/ethnicity or disability category.

**14 - OSEP Response**

**14 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private school, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

Idaho's dispute resolution system, which includes various options for addressing disputes, was noted as an area of strength by educational partners; Idaho's dispute resolution data and processes have been stable and have not shown substantial shifts over time. States are not required to establish baseline or targets when the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. Educational partners chose not to pursue target setting for Indicator 15 until the count of resolution sessions reached the minimum of 10.

Current relevant dispute resolution information is provided to LEAs, parents, and educational partners in a variety of formats and locations. This is in an effort to ensure that all are aware that any of the dispute resolution options offered by the department may be initiated at any time and in any sequence, without prerequisite actions, and that more than one DR process (e.g., facilitation and complaint investigation) may be in effect at the same time. The DR office also presents regular updates to our educational partners, including SEAP, DAC, and parents in partnership with IPUL.

The department is developing two-page informational sheets for SPP/APR indicators per educational partner request. These information sheets briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, and why the indicator is important, and they provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A template draft was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December 2022. The department has released the majority of the SPP/APR Indicator Summaries to the public but is still in the process of releasing the layout for Indicator 15.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=					
Data	66.67%	0.00%	100.00%		

**Targets**

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=				

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

The DR office regularly includes information on trending issues as part of monthly webinars provided by the department’s state level special education staff to Idaho’s special education directors. Additionally, in collaboration with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA), Idaho’s special education training team, the DR office recommends and develops updated guidance for LEAs and resources for parents. The DR office also presents at annual administrative training including the New Superintendent Orientation and the IDEA and Federal Program Workshop, both sponsored by the department.

Resources developed by the DR office include but are not limited to:  
 Dispute Resolution Quick Guides – These convenient, easily-accessed, one-page guides provide current information about each dispute resolution process available through the DR office.  
 Parent’s Guide to Facilitation – This guide provides a brief overview of the role of the facilitator and offers parents several tips for preparing for a facilitated meeting.

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

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	15
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	14

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

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education (department) staff.

The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) also served as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensure representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of stakeholders for Native American populations.

Idaho's dispute resolution system, which includes various options for addressing disputes, was noted as an area of strength by educational partners. Idaho implemented changes to communication and processes regarding data collection responsibilities in FFY 2020. As a result of these changes in data collection methodology, Idaho reestablished the baseline, using FFY 2020 data, of 80%. Educational partners confirmed approval of the new baseline and encouraged the continued use of the 75%-85% target range.

Current relevant dispute resolution information is provided to LEAs, parents, and educational partners in a variety of formats and locations. This is in an effort to ensure that all are aware that any of the dispute resolution options offered by the department may be initiated at any time and in any sequence, without prerequisite actions, and that more than one DR process (e.g., facilitation and complaint investigation) may be in effect at the same time. The DR office also presents regular updates to our educational partners, including SEAP, DAC, and parents in partnership with IPUL. The department continues to provide information on progress toward targets through face-to-face and virtual meetings with educational partners no less than quarterly. As part of meetings, the department includes time for meeting members to discuss areas for improvement and specific issues facing the population and/or region they represent.

The department is developing two-page informational sheets for SPP/APR indicators per educational partner request. These information sheets briefly describe the indicator measurement, data source, and why the indicator is important, and they provide information on current targets and the state's progress toward those targets. A template draft was reviewed by SEAP members and the IDEA Data Center in December 2022. The department has released the majority of the SPP/APR Indicator Summaries to the public but is still in the process of releasing the layout for Indicator 16.

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	80.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%	75.00%-85.00%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	80.00%	66.67%

#### Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%	75.00%	85.00%

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	14	15	66.67%	75.00%	85.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

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

The DR office regularly includes information on trending issues as part of monthly webinars provided by the department's state-level special education staff to Idaho's special education directors. Additionally, in collaboration with Idaho Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA), Idaho's special education training team, the DR office recommends and develops updated guidance for LEAs and resources for parents. The DR office also presents at annual administrative training, including the New Superintendent Orientation and the IDEA and Federal Program Workshop, both sponsored by the department.

Resources developed by the DR office include but are not limited to:

- Dispute Resolution Quick Guides – These convenient, easily accessed, one-page guides provide current information about each dispute resolution process available through the DR office.
- Parent's Guide to Facilitation – This guide provides a brief overview of the role of the facilitator and offers parents several tips for preparing for a facilitated meeting.

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

#### 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 16 - OSEP Response

#### 16 - Required Actions

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

##### A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

##### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,



and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

**C. Stakeholder Engagement**

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

**17 - Indicator Data**

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

Increase the percent of fourth-grade students with disabilities in Idaho who will be proficient in literacy as measured on the state summative assessment, currently ISAT by Smarter Balanced.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

The subset of the population from the indicator are the LEAs participating in the SSIP professional development project, Cultivating Readers, during the 2022-23 school year. The LEAs included in the calculation are the following: Joint School District #2, Blackfoot, Boundary County, Filer, Future Public School, Inc., Gem Prep: Nampa, Gem Prep: Meridian, Gem Prep: Online, Gem Prep: Pocatello, Idaho Falls, Kuna, Lapwai, Minidoka County, Mullan, Notus, Preston, Project Impact STEM Academy, Ririe, Snake River, St. Maries, Sugar-Salem, Twin Falls, Wendell. These 23 LEAs represented 13% of the total number of LEAs in the state in FFY 2022 (23/172) and the number of students in this cohort made up 28% (789/2813) of the total target population of students. Idaho will measure the SiMR for this same cohort of LEAs from year to year. Idaho will calculate and report the SiMR data for 4th-grade students in this same cohort of LEAs each year in the SPP/APR submission. The LEAs were recruited based on their reading outcomes. LEAs with lower reading outcomes were prioritized as the districts to recruit first due to their low reading scores, focusing on those in need and likely to benefit from intensive literacy support.

**Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

<https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/Idaho-State-Systematic-Improvement-Plan-Theory-of-Action.pdf>

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).**

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	13.02%

**Targets**

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	14.30%	14.40%	14.60%	14.80%

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Number of 4th grade students with disabilities proficient on the ISAT in ELA	Total number of 4th grade students with disabilities who participated in the ISAT in ELA	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
119	847	16.10%	14.30%	14.05%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Idaho saw an overall performance decrease for 4th grade, which the department attributes to Idaho students participating in a longer ISAT rather than the shortened version used in 2021 and 2022. Evidence indicates that the lengthy assessment duration lead to lower scores based on testing fatigue. For a complete set of information, including year-to-year differences for all students, please see Idaho's news release at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/communications/files/news-releases/10-03-2023-Newly-Released-Test-Scores-Show-Significant-Gains-in-Early-Literacy-Losses-on-Idaho-Standards-Achievement-Test.pdf> .

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.**

The data for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 is derived from the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), administered by Smarter Balanced, serving as the state's summative assessment for English/Language Arts (ELA). Reporting occurs through the EDFacts file titled SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups – Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178). Idaho selectively utilizes data from this EDFacts file subset to compute the SiMR.

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

The Idaho Department of Education Assessment and Accountability Department received raw assessment data from Smarter Balanced. They cleaned the data and sent it to the SSIP internal evaluator for analysis. The SiMR calculation included fourth-grade students with disabilities in SSIP LEAs during the SY2022-23. SiMR was found by dividing the number of proficient or advanced fourth-grade students with disabilities in SSIP LEAs (based on the ISAT for ELA) by the total number of fourth-grade students with disabilities in SSIP LEAs who took the ISAT for ELA. Idaho aligned the SSIP baseline data and targets through 2025 with those of SPP/APR Indicator 3B for fourth-grade ELA, as SiMR is a subset of that indicator's data.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

In the pursuit of enhancing early reading outcomes, the SSIP State Leadership Team monitors monthly student outcomes using Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) data. IRI, an early reading screener for K-3 students, is analyzed by the Special Education Department to gauge LEA progress. The Fall 2022 Data Drill Down presented LEAs with IRI reports for the 2021-2022 school year, featuring charts and tables by demographics. LEAs use IRI for informal progress monitoring, with the SSIP internal evaluator aggregating uncleaned data monthly. This data helps the state assess LEA progress, inform state-level planning, and SiMR progress.

Though the ISAT covers broader ELA content, the State Leadership Team relies on IRI for progress monitoring. IRI's focus on reading aligns with SSIP goals. In FFY 2022, school-level reports aided mid-year needs assessment during the February 2023 In-District Visits. Similar reports for spring 2023 for the Spring Institute aided building teams in targeting student groups and reading skills for additional professional development.

The State Leadership Team is comprised of the SSIP Coordinator and the SPDG Project Director, and with the support of SPDG funding, Idaho was able to expand the State Leadership Team to include the state Special Education Director, Fiscal Coordinator, Fiscal Contract Specialist, and Data and Reporting Program Specialist. During this reporting period, an External Evaluator was also added to the State Leadership Team, with the support of SPDG funds.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

<https://sde.idaho.gov/sped/rda-monitoring-system/files/spp-apr17/State-Systematic-Improvement-Evaluation-Plan.pdf>

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

(1) Governance: Idaho's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), aligned with the Governor's and Superintendent of Instruction's literacy priorities, focuses on improving reading outcomes. The State Leadership Team, after analyzing Local Education Agency (LEA) reading scores, initiated targeted outreach to encourage SSIP participation. In adherence to local control principles, each LEA submits an annual Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan to the State Board of Education. Collaborative efforts ensure effective communication and resource-sharing between the State Leadership Team, LEA leadership, Idaho Department of Education departments, and community partners. The SSIP's collaborative priorities aim to address reading challenges and strategically leverage resources for improved statewide literacy. The infrastructure improvement strategy involves increasing LEA participation, particularly targeting those with lower student outcomes in reading. Despite the goal of recruiting 10 LEAs and 20 schools, the State Leadership Team recruited 7 LEAs with 8 schools, mainly from rural districts and small charter schools. This addition allowed Idaho to scale up SSIP activities, aiming to improve reading outcomes for students with disabilities.

(2) Finance: Idaho strategically utilized the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) from October 1, 2020, to reinforce the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), providing sub-awards to LEAs for tailored support. The established monitoring system, led by the Special Education fiscal team and SPDG project director, ensured fiscal responsibility through webinars and virtual meetings. Sustainable Mini Grants empowered LEAs to address specific reading instructional needs efficiently. The infrastructure improvement strategy included setting up a system for awarding, monitoring, and reimbursing SSIP LEAs, with 22 receiving sub-awards. SPDG funds supported sustained improvement, compensating staff or hiring substitutes. Achievement assessment involved tracking expenditures, quarterly fund drawdowns, and feedback. Communication efforts included emails, calls, and webinars for LEA Business Managers.

(3) Personnel/Workforce: Idaho's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) recognizes the crucial role educators play in reading instruction, investing

significantly in their professional development. This multifaceted approach includes leadership team meetings, training sessions, coaching calls, and continuous education activities, emphasizing evidence-based practices in literacy and technology use. The SSIP fosters a collaborative culture, enriching the overall quality of Local Education Agency (LEA) reading programs. During the reporting period, the SSIP focused on creating sustainable training materials for LEA personnel, including online courses on foundational skills, Science of Reading, data systems, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The State Leadership Team, with additional personnel support, implemented a fiscal monitoring process and developed materials to enhance project sustainability and scalability. The creation of online training materials and a designated website supports SSIP activities and increases the project's sustainability, as evidenced by increased website traffic and resource view.

(4) Data System: Idaho implemented a robust data collection and analysis system throughout the reporting period, supported by the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) for the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Collected data elements include post-training surveys, observations for training quality, fidelity of implementation, school infrastructure for Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading (MTSS-R), coaching metrics, and attendance/activity completion rates. The State Leadership Team, promoting a data-use culture, provides participants with data reports and training. The comprehensive data system allows for data-driven decisions, focusing on improving SSIP support and identifying specific areas for teacher improvement in reading instruction. Idaho aims to enhance SSIP activities using the collected data, leading to improved practices and subsequent gains in student reading outcomes. Achievement is assessed through survey response rates, timely data submissions, and qualitative data collection, communicated through monthly reminders, an incentive system, and an end-of-year video featuring success stories shared with SSIP participants.

(5) Professional Development: Effective reading instruction in Idaho is closely tied to educators' expertise, skills, and commitment. Idaho prioritizes professional development for administrators, instructional coaches, teachers, and support staff, incorporating dyslexia training for comprehensive literacy support. Led by qualified professionals, the training covers MTSS-R, evidence-based strategies, and foundational reading skills, offered both in-person and virtually. A dedicated website centralizes resources, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) facilitates collaboration, providing access to national literacy experts. Statewide professional development, comprising face-to-face and virtual sessions, is supported by a maintained website. Technical assistance, including onsite visits and virtual coaching, enhances instructional practices, teaching methods, and collaboration with parents. During the reporting period, Idaho continued developing online training to support instructional and coaching staff, aiming to increase video submissions and meaningful feedback. Idaho assesses achievement through tracking uploaded videos, submissions to coaches, mid-year survey data on the coaching platform's usability, and adjustments based on stakeholder feedback, ultimately contributing to SSIP sustainability and meeting targets.

(6) Accountability and Quality Improvement: The Idaho Department of Education (department) carried out monitoring and accountability activities, including the General Supervision File Review (GSFR), fiscal monitoring, and annual LEA Determinations. A specialized team within the department's Special Education staff refined the data calculation methodology for Idaho's LEA determinations, establishing a comprehensive monitoring system to identify LEAs requiring additional support and technical assistance (TA). The department then offered tailored support to these identified LEAs, aiming to enhance outcomes for students with disabilities. LEAs receiving a determination of "Needs Intervention" and identified as low performing in English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency were encouraged to participate in the SSIP. Additionally, the SSIP/SPDG team conducts an annual report on all districts' Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) proficiency rates, reaching out to districts with less than 50% proficiency among their general education students in kindergarten through third grade.

(7) Quality Standards: In the ongoing effort to uphold educational standards, Idaho has sustained its facilitation of the Idaho Professional Standards Commission. This commission plays a pivotal role in offering recommendations and making decisions that contribute to the cultivation of competent, qualified, and ethically committed educators. These professionals are dedicated to meeting rigorous standards and to fostering achievement from pre-K to 12th grade and enhancing their professional practices. A key expectation is that all teacher candidates meet the Idaho Core Teacher Standards along with the standards pertinent to their specific discipline area(s).

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

(1) Governance: Idaho pursued a focused Governance infrastructure improvement strategy to enhance the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and achieve the SiMR. This strategy aimed to increase LEA participation, specifically targeting those with lower reading outcomes. During the reporting period, applications were accepted for the 2023-24 school year, resulting in the recruitment of 7 LEAs with 8 schools, predominantly from rural and small charter districts. This addition allowed Idaho to scale up SSIP activities, benefiting students with disabilities. Successful recruitment was evident in the detailed application process and the State Leadership Team's comprehensive support, ensuring ongoing communication and engagement with educational partners throughout the year. Idaho assessed achievement by tracking applications and monitoring active LEA participation, ensuring the continued success and expansion of SSIP initiatives. Aligning with the priorities of the recently elected Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Special Education and Content Department collaborated to streamline literacy projects. This initiative focused on integrating professional development activities with both Idaho's Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART) Project and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). By fostering cohesion within LEAs where instructional staff participate in both projects, the SSIP aimed to maximize the overall effectiveness of professional development activities. This strategic alignment emphasized a commitment to a unified and impactful approach in advancing literacy education.

(2) Finance: Idaho's SiMR achievement is significantly driven by a strategic financial approach via the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) awarded on October 1, 2020. The infrastructure improvement strategy involved a meticulous system for awarding, monitoring, and reimbursing Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). With quarterly reimbursement submissions, 22 SSIP LEAs received subawards, showcasing meticulous expenditure monitoring. SPDG funds supported LEAs, enabling sustained improvement strategies, and engaging instructional staff and coaches. This financial backing ensured participation during off-contract times or hiring substitute teachers. Comprehensive assessment and communication involved efficient subaward setups, quarterly fund withdrawals, reminders, and webinars for LEA Business Managers. Idaho's evaluation included tracking expenditures, quarterly fund drawdown percentages, and valuable LEA feedback, emphasizing effective financial management integral to SSIP sustainability and success in Idaho.

(3) Personnel/Workforce: In the recent reporting period, Idaho's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) made notable progress in personnel/workforce development, aligned with the SiMR. The ongoing infrastructure improvement strategy emphasizes creating sustainable training materials for Local Education Agency (LEA) personnel, focusing on addressing dyslexia characteristics in line with state legislation. Virtual dyslexia training was provided, and existing PD and TA were updated to support instructional staff. The success of these efforts is evident in increased views on the SSIP website's resource page, showcasing the impact and engagement of these development initiatives. The incorporation of a designated website facilitates streamlined access to resources, supporting SSIP sustainability. An external evaluator's recent addition to the State Leadership Team enhances project activity analysis, strengthening continuous improvement efforts and benefiting from targeted support.

(4) Accountability/monitoring: The SSIP is a four-year project, and during the 4th year, LEAs are assisted in completing an Idaho SPDG Sustainability Assessment to determine if additional supports were needed to help with the sustainability of the evidence-based practices utilized throughout the project. The Sustainability Checklist has seven sections: Cost/benefit, funding stability, partnerships, organizational capacity, program evaluation, communication, and strategic planning. During the monthly Administrative Calls with Scale-Up Districts, staff are walked through the completion of the Sustainability Checklist. The information provided is evaluated by the State Leadership Team to identify if any additional support is needed and at what frequency and duration.

(5) Data System: The State Leadership Team plays a pivotal role in supporting a robust data system that encompasses the collection of both

implementation data and student outcomes through diverse instruments and surveys. The department cultivated a culture of data utilization for driving continuous improvement within the system. To enhance our analytical capabilities and strengthen the foundation for continuous improvement, the next phase of our infrastructure improvement strategy involved identifying and hiring an external evaluator. This strategic move aimed to augment the State Leadership Team's proficiency in analyzing project data and deriving valuable insights to make informed recommendations for further enhancing project outcomes. The new external evaluator will have the capability to conduct case study interviews, enhance surveys to better target specific areas, and perform additional analyses to enhance project goals and objectives. Idaho continues to utilize a virtual coaching platform for instructional staff and coaches. Twenty percent of instructional and coaching staff share their virtual instruction and coaching to external evaluators to measure fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices.

(6) Professional Development: Local Education Agencies (LEAs) received customized technical assistance (TA) tailored to their individual needs and project tenure, addressing diverse roles within the initiatives. To streamline this support system, the earlier phase of the identified infrastructure improvement strategy involved the introduction of monthly reminder newsletters for all participants, ensuring heightened awareness of upcoming activities and requirements. Additionally, monthly virtual calls for building administrators were facilitated, emphasizing training in Implementation Science, addressing barriers to implementation, and discussing project activities and timelines. Monthly cohort Collaboration Calls were orchestrated to provide training and technical assistance to instructional staff and LEA/school coaches on the project's evidence-based practices. These strategies yielded short-term and intermediate outcomes, including heightened participation and completion of activities, reduced project confusion, and enhanced implementation fidelity. The monthly reminder newsletters, administrative calls, and collaboration calls collectively contributed to nurturing a more informed and engaged participant base. Furthermore, the administrative and collaborative calls served as platforms for dispensing specific strategies related to the implementation of evidence-based and Implementation Science practices. This focused guidance resulted in improved implementation fidelity and, consequently, better student outcomes, underlining the ongoing commitment to achieving the SiMR. This integrated approach not only guaranteed the sustainability of system improvement efforts but also positioned the initiative for successful scale-up activities by refining and optimizing support mechanisms.

(7) Quality Standards: Idaho has made no changes to its quality standards since the last reporting period.

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

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.**

- a. Newly identified infrastructure improvement strategy: By hiring an external evaluator, ramp up the collection of pre and post data collection.
- b. Newly identified short-term or intermediate outcomes: create sustainable support for coaches and instructional staff centered more on their needs and skill development strengths and areas of improvement.
- c. Support change: Improvement activities will be supported through specialized training, regular assessment of data collection and methodologies, customized professional development based on pre and post data, improved support strategies based on participant feedback, analysis of resource utilization, and adjustments based on emerging needs.

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

(1) Governance: The State Leadership Team will conduct targeted outreach to encourage LEAs with below-average reading scores to apply to the SSIP, aiming to add ten new LEAs and 20 schools. The application period is from January 16 to March 31, 2024, with selected LEAs notified in mid-April 2024. This expansion aims to enhance evidence-based practices' fidelity by reaching more schools. Idaho Legislature's recently started funding optional full-day kindergarten and new dyslexia legislation requiring a continuing education professional development (PD) credit; the State Leadership Team will collaborate with LEAs to align SSIP activities to meet the legislative PD requirement.

- a. Next steps of identified infrastructure improvement strategy: To prepare for the 2023-24 participation in the SSIP, a comprehensive recruitment campaign will be initiated, targeting low-performing LEAs to encourage their application. Collaboration with the new Superintendent of Public Instruction and staff is integral to aligning SSIP activities with the Superintendent's priorities, ensuring a cohesive approach. Professional development activities will be strategically aligned with Idaho's Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART) Project and the Content Department initiative, providing a unified framework for LEAs with instructional staff involved in both projects. Furthermore, the SSIP will adapt its training and professional development opportunities to align with the new dyslexia legislation, reinforcing its commitment to staying abreast of and incorporating relevant educational priorities.
- b. Anticipated Outcomes: The expansion of the project for the upcoming phase involves the addition of new LEAs, strategically selected to benefit from project participation and contribute to increased reading proficiency for students with disabilities. Scaling up the project is a key objective, aiming to recruit 10 new LEAs and amplify its impact. The focus on enhancing instructional staff's delivery of explicit instruction in reading remains a priority, seeking to improve the quality of teaching practices. Simultaneously, building the capacity of LEAs to provide effective coaching for instructional staff is integral to the project's goals. Improving the implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for Reading (MTSS-R) in schools is another crucial component, ensuring a comprehensive approach to literacy education. Lastly, efforts are directed towards improving the abilities of LEA and school leaders to lead implementation teams effectively, fostering a culture of continuous improvement within the educational system.

**(2) Personnel/Workforce Improvement:**

- a. Next Steps of Identified Infrastructure Improvement Strategy: In fortifying personnel/workforce components, the SSIP's next steps involve creating sustainable materials for new and returning LEA coaches, ensuring consistent support for instructional staff. Concurrently, the introduction of an external evaluator marks a pivotal move to enhance analytical capabilities. Through pre and post data, the information collected will support tailored and specialized training.
- b. Identified Short-Term or Intermediate Outcomes: The coaching support materials, readily available on the SSIP website, are designed to assist LEA-identified coaches in supporting instructional staff. This has been strategically integrated into monthly instructional and coaching calls, fostering a continuous learning environment. Pre and post-data will be collected through major training to assess knowledge and skill. This information will be used to inform future training, support materials, and tailored professional development.

**(3) Accountability/Monitoring Enhancement:**

- a. Next Steps of Identified Infrastructure Improvement Strategy: The SSIP's ongoing commitment to accountability and monitoring involves Creating pre and post surveys to assess the effectiveness of trainings and implementation.
- b. Identified Short-Term or Intermediate Outcomes: Utilizing the survey data provides accountability and monitors participants learning outcomes on the major literacy components in the project. The pre and post surveys, depending on the event, will be tailored specifically to coaches or instructional staff to assess their understanding, skill and knowledge development, and probability of implementation of new materials.

**(4) Professional Development Enhancement:**

- a. Next Steps of Identified Infrastructure Improvement Strategy: For professional development, the SSIP plans to develop professional development centered around feedback from pre and post survey data. The surveys will be tailored towards the learning objectives and outcomes provided by the trainers to assess skill and knowledge understanding and growth from the beginning of the session to the end of the session.
- b. Identified Short-Term or Intermediate Outcomes: Aligning professional development with the data analyzed in the pre and post surveys will ensure that the SSIP activities are meeting participants needs and improving skills and knowledge development on coaching and instructional

components that are areas with room for improvement.

(5) Technical Assistance Enhancement:

a. Next Steps of Identified Infrastructure Improvement Strategy: Technical assistance is bolstered through monthly reminders, dedicated calls for building administrators, and collaboration calls. The proactive measures aim to ensure better implementation fidelity and improved student outcomes.

b. Identified Short-Term or Intermediate Outcomes: Regular communication via reminder emails and dedicated calls is expected to elevate participation and completion of activities, reducing project confusion. Specific strategies discussed during calls are poised to enhance implementation fidelity, contributing to improved student outcomes.

(6) Data Enhancement:

a. Next Steps of Identified Infrastructure Improvement Strategy: In the realm of data, the SSIP's next steps involve identifying and hiring an external evaluator to augment data analysis capabilities, and as mentioned, utilizing pre and post-survey data to assess the effectiveness of training and the improvement of skill and knowledge of literacy components, strategies, and implementation.

b. Identified Short-Term or Intermediate Outcomes: Leveraging the external evaluator's expertise is anticipated to provide deeper insights into project activities associated with improved outcomes. This additional analysis will inform adjustments for better alignment with desired project outcomes, provide feedback for improvements, and will help assess the effectiveness in training for growth and development.

(7) Quality Standards: No improvement strategy changes are identified for the next reporting period.

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

The department supported the implementation of five evidence-based practices:

- (1) Implementation Science Framework,
- (2) Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA),
- (3) IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide,
- (4) Instructional Coaching,
- (5) Explicit Instruction.

#### **Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

(1) Implementation Science Framework: Implementation science involves the utilization of methods or techniques to improve the adoption, implementation, and sustainability of a program or practice (Eccles & Mittman, 2006). The Implementation Science Framework, encompassing 161 Part B, offers methods and strategies designed to enhance the quality of implementation and the utilization of evidence-based practices. In this context, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leverages resources provided by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN), which is based at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

(2) Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): During the Readiness, Implementation, Sustainability, and Scale-Up phases (Cohorts in years 1, 2, 3, and 4), Local Education Agencies (LEAs) employ Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) within the framework of implementation science to emphasize improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle has been identified by the Project as the evidence-based practice serving as a catalyst for change within the LEA system.

(3) IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide: The Practice Guide titled "Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade," by the Institute of Education Sciences, presents four evidence-based recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills. Developed through rigorous research, the guide offers specific strategies for effective reading instruction. These evidence-based recommendations include: 1) Teaching students academic language skills, incorporating inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge; 2) Developing awareness of speech sound segments and their connection to letters; 3) Instructing students in decoding words, analyzing word parts, and both writing and recognizing words; and 4) Ensuring that each student engages with connected text daily to enhance reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

(4) Instructional Coaching: Staff identified by Local Education Agencies (LEAs) undergo coaching practices training to assist instructional staff with professional development and the implementation of explicit instruction. Instructional coaches provide classroom modeling, supportive feedback, and conduct observations focusing on specific teaching practices.

(5) Explicit Instruction: The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) instructional staff undergo training and receive support to employ explicit instruction strategies for delivering effective reading instruction to students with disabilities. Dr. Anita Archer and Dr. Charles Hughes define explicit instruction as a "systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented" form of instruction. The SSIP conducts training sessions for participating teachers and coaches, emphasizing the effective implementation of explicit instruction during the Fall Institute and during monthly instructional/coaching calls. Coaches receive additional training on explicit instruction components within the Comprehensive Decoding RESET Rubric, enabling them to support teachers in implementing evidence-based practices and assessing fidelity of implementation. Throughout the year, instructional staff implement and assess progress on each component, receiving coaching support to address identified weaknesses in instructional delivery. Expert technical assistance is provided by SSIP staff and contracted coaches during the Fall Institute, In-District Visits, and monthly calls with literacy experts, enhancing the understanding and implementation of explicit instruction practices.

#### **Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.**

(1) Implementation Science Framework: The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leverages the Implementation Science Framework, specifically the Implementation 161 Part B Science Framework, utilizing resources from the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. This strategic approach strengthens state-level infrastructure through the State Leadership Team, while Local Education Agencies (LEAs) implement Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) guided by the framework. LEA-level implementation involves dedicated teams receiving training through various activities like the Fall and Spring Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, and Administrator Calls. Tools such as NIRN Initiative Inventory, Communication Plan Template, Implementation Drivers, Action Plan, and Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA) are employed, with data collected on attendance, surveys, and training materials. The overall impact on the SiMR is reflected in LEAs' ability to assess and improve their reading programs using Implementation Science, enhancing outcomes for students.

(2) LEAs in the Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA) of years 2, 3, and 4 under the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) employ Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) within the implementation science framework, focusing on improvement cycles. The plan, do, study, act (PDSA) rapid improvement cycle serves as the identified EBP for driving change within both the LEA and building systems. Building teams complete the PDSA cycle annually following their MTSS-R review, with SSIP staff offering Technical Assistance (TA) during monthly administrator calls and In-District Visits to support understanding and effective implementation. Utilizing tools such as the Action Plan worksheet and collecting data on attendance, completed Action Plans, survey data, meeting minutes, and training materials, this approach contributes to the achievement of the SiMR. The continuous improvement cycle enables LEA and building leadership teams to monitor progress in implementing evidence-based practices, utilizing student data, enhancing explicit instruction delivery, aligning instruction across all tiers, and addressing LEA-identified priorities, collectively improving student outcomes.

(3) IES Foundational Skills Practice Guide: The Institute of Education Sciences Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in

Kindergarten through 3rd Grade outlines four recommendations for teaching foundational reading skills, including academic language skills, phonemic awareness, word decoding, and regular reading practice. SSIP instructional staff and coaches undergo annual training on these evidence-based practices (EBPs) during the Readiness year's Fall Institute. This training, delivered through a comprehensive online course, covers twenty modules, ensuring thorough knowledge and satisfaction. A hybrid version accommodates staff turnover, allowing new members to gain EBP knowledge. Subsequent years include PD specific to IES Practice Guide recommendations during the Fall Institute, In-District Visits, and Collaborative Calls. The SSIP employs various tools such as contracted reading specialists, synchronous/asynchronous training, and a dedicated website to ensure effective implementation. Data collected on attendance, surveys, and training materials contribute to SiMR impact by providing robust professional development and resources for improved EBP implementation in reading, skills, and abilities to deliver explicit instruction specific to the foundations of reading has a positive impact on student outcomes.

(4) Instructional Coaching: LEAs and schools strategically implement instructional coaching practices to foster classroom-level growth for students with disabilities. Instructional coaches undergo comprehensive training aimed at enhancing their expertise in both explicit instruction and instructional coaching. During the Fall Institute, LEA-identified coaches receive specialized training aligned with their project year, covering foundational reading skills, data decision-making, vocabulary instruction, and reading comprehension. Additionally, coaches engage in training on the RESET Comprehensive Decoding Rubric, a tool utilized by the SSIP to assess instructional staff's fidelity to explicit instruction. This training equips coaches with a deep understanding of high-quality explicit instruction practices, guiding their action planning and coaching with teachers. A three-year cycle of coaching-focused training, particularly on Jim Knight's coaching practices, is conducted annually in December. Various activities and strategies, such as the Fall and Spring Institute, Coaching PD, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, and Administrator Calls, complimented by tools like contracted consultants and online resources, contribute to impactful data collection, including attendance, survey data, and coaching platform metrics. This comprehensive approach significantly impacts the SiMR by providing valuable professional development and resources that empower instructional coaches to enhance teachers' reading instruction, ultimately improving student outcomes.

(5) Explicit Instruction: LEA instructional staff employ explicit instruction to deliver impactful reading education to students with disabilities. Coined by Dr. Anita Archer and Dr. Charles Hughes as "systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented" instruction, explicit instruction is a cornerstone of the Project's approach. Coaches and teachers undergo comprehensive training during the Fall Institute on the effective implementation of explicit instruction, with additional focus on the seven components outlined in the RESET Rubric. This targeted training empowers instructional staff to implement and assess progress on each component throughout the year. Coaching support is provided to address identified weaknesses in instructional delivery. Expert technical assistance is offered through various channels, including the Fall Institute, In-District Visits, LEA Leadership Calls, Administrator Calls, and monthly sessions with literacy experts. The multifaceted approach involves activities such as videotaping instruction, self-reflection using the RESET Rubric, and coaches assessing instructional delivery to guide coaching. The utilization of tools like contracted consultants, synchronous and asynchronous training, websites, the Fall Institute, RESET Rubric, and coaching platforms facilitates comprehensive data collection, including attendance, survey data, training materials, RESET Rubric data, instructional videos, and coaching platform metrics. This strategic investment in professional development significantly contributes to enhancing the knowledge, skills, and abilities of instructional staff and coaches, ensuring the delivery of explicit instruction with fidelity, and ultimately yielding positive impacts on student outcomes as reflected in the SiMR.

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

Idaho assesses the fidelity of implementation through various methods, spanning state, building, and classroom levels. The following outlines the instruments and processes employed for monitoring fidelity, along with a summary of the data collected in FFY 2022-2023.

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

As part of the SPDG grant, Idaho annually completes the SPDG Evidence-based Professional Development Components worksheet, a vital aspect of the annual performance report (APR) submitted in May. This worksheet functions as a comprehensive tool to monitor evidence-based practices' performance, detailing professional development initiatives implemented throughout the reporting year to achieve identified competencies. The SPDG State Leadership Team engaged in this task from January to April 2023, covering 16 components, including personnel selection, training quality, coaching, data systems, and systemic leadership support. To address implementation gaps, an action plan was formulated, ensuring continuous assessment and updates. In response to gaps identified in the 2022-2023 school year, intensified strategies were employed by national coaches, focusing on specific literacy components. The state team enhanced data collection by emphasizing more objective pre- and post-data, evaluating coaching log information, and improving the measurement of participants' use of new skills. This systematic approach represents an improvement on the previous year, showcasing advancements in meeting coaching and technical assistance needs. The consistent use of pre-and post-data in the 2022-23 SPG APR underscores improved alignment with trainers' and participants' needs, along with a more comprehensive assessment of new skill implementation effectiveness.

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

The MTSS-R Checklist, developed by the National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL), guides building leadership teams in annual evaluation, prioritization, and planning for school infrastructure supporting high-quality reading instruction. Employed for ongoing improvement through monthly leadership team meetings, the Checklist is used alongside a Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycle. The State Leadership Team monitors improvements at building, cohort, and project levels using the data generated. In its second year of implementation in FFY 2022, Idaho reported progress across five key elements, initiating the Checklist at the Fall Institute in August 2022.

Element 1: Core Reading Instruction and Intervention; 65.37% (5.37% increase)

Element 2: Data Use; 48.86% (7.86% increase)

Element 3: Professional Development and Coaching; 40.28% (7.28% increase)

Element 4: MTSS-R School Leadership; 58.50% (9.5% increase)

Element 5: Mutual Support Involving Families and the School; 44.90% (2.9% increase)

All five elements showed improvement from SY2021-22 to SY2022-23.

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

The RESET Rubric, developed under the U.S. Department of Education Institute for Education Sciences (IES) grant, assesses decoding lessons using explicit, systematic instruction. It comprises 7 components and 18 individual practices, focusing on sound-symbol correspondence, word reading, encoding, and reading connected text. In the SSIP project, instructional staff submit self-reflection videos via a virtual coaching platform to LEA coaches. Coaches assess fidelity, collaborate on action plans, and complete the RESET Rubric biannually. Challenges in data collection led to a virtual coaching platform collaboration in FFY 2022. In spring 2023, 82% (9/11) of teachers met implementation targets, as per the explicit fidelity rubric, and an End of Year Survey indicated perceived skill growth among instructional staff in delivering foundational reading skills instruction and using explicit strategies. There were 56 respondents, percentages indicated perceived skill level growth on objectives related to delivering instruction on Foundational Reading Skills and using explicit instruction strategies.

(1) delivering instruction on the Foundational Reading Skills

Beginning of the year – 1 12.5% Novice, 16.8% Advanced Beginner, 26.8% Competent, 32.1% Proficient, 1.8% Expert

End of the year – 1.8% Novice, 8.9% Advanced Beginner, 33.9% Competent, 42.9% Proficient, 12.5% Expert (55.4% proficient or above)

(2) using explicit instruction strategies when teaching reading

Beginning of the year – 10.7% Novice, 25% Advanced Beginner, 26.8% Competent, 35.7% Proficient, 1.8% Expert (37.5% proficient or above)  
 End of the year – 3.6% Novice, 5.4% Advanced Beginner, 41.1% Competent, 39.3% Proficient, 10.7% Expert (50% proficient or above)  
 Fidelity of coaching assessment using the Coaching Literacy Instruction Fidelity Tool (C-LIFT)  
 In FFY 2021, a rubric measuring the core components of instructional coaching that aligns with the training curriculum for our LEA coaches was developed and implemented in FFY 2022-2023 called the C-LIFT. The C-LIFT rubric assesses coaches' fidelity of coaching to their instructional staff. There was an improvement in the C-LIFT returned for analysis. Teachers achieved the target of 90% adherence in two of the three areas, with the third target area being missed by only two percentage points.  
 Observation: Fall- 84%; Spring 88%  
 Modeling: Fall- 70%; Spring: 53%  
 Performance Feedback: Fall 91%; Spring 93%  
 Alliance-Building Strategies: Fall 83%; Spring 90%  
 Training fidelity of implementation using the High-Quality Professional Development (HQPDP) Observation Checklist  
 The HQPDP Observation Checklist comprises 21 items addressing six domains found in high-quality professional development: Preparation, Introduction, Demonstration, Engagement, Evaluation/Reflection, and Mastery. In FFY 2022-2023, two evaluators individually observed each SSIP training, rated the HQPDP Observation Checklist, and then collaboratively calibrated their scores. For every training session, the internal evaluator generated a comprehensive summary report, outlining strengths and areas for improvement. Within three weeks of each session, the internal evaluator and SSIP Coordinator met with each trainer, presenting the summary report and engaging in discussions on enhancing future training. HQPDP Checklist scores were calculated as the percentage of items observed, with a target implementation rate of 90%. The results for FFY 2022-2023 training are as follows:  
 MTSS-R Training: 95% (5% increase)  
 Reading content training sessions: 95% (remained the same)  
 RESET Rubric sessions: 100% (1% increase)  
 Leading by Convening: 78% (16% increase)  
 Serving on Groups: 95% (30% increase)  
 Library training: 86% (4% decrease)  
 Coaching Training: 97.5% (11.5% increase)  
 The data indicates overall improvement in all high-quality professional development domains, except for reading content training standards remaining unchanged from SY2021-22, and library training experiencing a 4% decrease from SY2021-22 to SY2022-23. The decline in library training is attributed to certain components of the HQPDP Observation Checklist not being met, specifically in the areas of providing constructive feedback and engaging each participant in assessing knowledge/skill acquisition with corrective feedback under "Reflecting on Learning," and outlining criteria for a successful transfer of critical concepts to practice under "Transferring Learning to Practice." Feedback discussions with the trainer highlighted missed indicators, serving as a guide for implementing these components in the design and revision of professional development for SY2023-24.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

The State Leadership Team employs various data sources, including Student Progress Monitoring, SSIP Progress Monitoring, and surveys such as Post-Training, Coaching Training, Spring Institute, In-District Visit, Librarian Training, and End-of-Year Surveys, to monitor SSIP evidence-based practices and ensure continuous improvement.

**Student progress monitoring**  
**Idaho Reading Indicator**  
 The State Leadership Team monitored monthly student progress through the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI), analyzing data and providing detailed reports at the Fall 2022 Data Drill Down. These reports, focusing on overall literacy scores from SY2021-22 to SY2022-23, were further segregated by specific literacy components. The data informed areas of improvement and supported ongoing evidence-based practices, aligning with the goal of proficiency in literacy for 4th-grade students with disabilities. Disaggregated by demographics, the reports served as informal progress monitoring tools. The SSIP internal evaluator used uncleaned monthly data for state-level planning and SiMR progress estimation. Identifying literacy improvement areas, the State Leadership Team collaborated with SSIP Literacy Consultants to develop targeted training materials, utilizing school-level IRI reports for focused assistance during In-District visits in February 2023.

**SSIP participant progress monitoring**  
**Essential Components for Reading Instruction (ECRI) Part I & II online training modules**  
 SSIP's ECRI online modules enhance reading instruction skills for instructional staff and coaches. The State Leadership Team meticulously tracks progress through module completion and learning data. Post-module surveys evaluate training quality, participant satisfaction, and perceived improvements. The Team analyzes survey insights, collaborates with consultants, and promptly addresses reported issues for optimal training effectiveness. There were 124 participants utilizing the ECRI Modules in the FFY 2022-2023. 9 participants completed the ECRI Module 1; 20 participants completed the ECRI module 2; 1 participant submitted their final assignment for the ECRI 2. From the Readiness Cohort, 59% completed the segment (10 modules) or higher by the end of the school year (n=71). 44 participants started the modules. ECRI Part 1 (modules 1-10): 87% (n= 591) of Part 1 survey respondents reported satisfaction with the training modules. 30% (n=204) indicated their ability to teach proficiently the main strategy prior to the modules, while 59.2% (n=403) indicated their ability to teach proficiently the main strategy after the modules. 86.8% (n= 590) indicated that they would likely use the strategies presented in the modules. ECRI Part 2 (modules 11-20): 85.9% (n= 429) of Part 2 survey respondents reported satisfaction with the training modules. 28.5% (n=142) indicated their ability to teach proficiently the main strategy prior to the modules, while 63.7% (n=318) indicated their ability to teach the main strategy proficiently after the modules. 85.2% (n= 425) indicated that they would likely use the strategies presented in the modules.

**Post-training surveys**  
**Fall Institute Post-Training Survey**  
 The Fall Institute initiates SSIP training, immersing LEA and school participants in role-tailored evidence-based practices through in-person and virtual formats. The training includes the MTSS-R Checklist and role-specific sessions. Post-training, the State Leadership Team surveys participants to gauge satisfaction and perceived skill improvements, refining training for ongoing effectiveness. The subsequent section details survey responses, emphasizing participant satisfaction and self-perceived learning outcomes from Fall Institute sessions. The satisfaction percentages for each Fall Institute session are outlined below:

- MTSS-R: 14.3% extremely improved, 60.7% much improved, 21.4% somewhat improved, 3.6% little improved (84 participants total); Overall satisfaction: 81/84 (96.4%)
- Reading Content sessions: Foundational Skills (43/43, 100%), Data Based Decision Making (19/19, 100%), Academic Language and Vocabulary Instruction (44/44, 100%); Researched Based Practices to Support Comprehension (44/44, 100%)
- RESET sessions: Foundational Skills (7/8, 88%, 83%), Data Based Decision Making (13/14, 93%), Vocabulary (no responses)
- Leading by Convening: (9/9, 100%)
- Serving on Groups (4/4, 100%)

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

- MTSS-R (LT1 78/85, 92%; LT2 76/85, 89%; LT3 74/85, 87%; LT4 60/85, 70%; LT5 58/85, 68%; LT6 79/85, 93%)

- Reading Foundational Skills (LT1 42/43, 98%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 19/19, 100%; LT2 19/19, 100%), Academic Language and Vocabulary Instruction (LT1 44/44, 100%); Researched Based Practices to Support Comprehension (LT1 44/44, 100%)
- RESET sessions: Foundational Skills (LT1 8.8, 100%), Data Based Decision Making (LT1 14/14, 100%; LT2 13/14, 93%), Vocabulary (no responses)
- Leading by Convening (LT1 9/9, 100%; LT2 9/9, 100%; LT3 9/9, 100%, LT4 8/9, 89%, LT5 9/9, 100%)
- Serving on Groups (LT1 4/4, 100%; LT2 4/4, 100%; LT3 4/4, 100%; LT4 4/4, 100%)

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

#### Coaching Training Survey

The Coaching Training, convened in December 2022 for LEA coaches in years 2, 3, and 4 of SSIP, aimed to fortify their proficiency in instructional coaching practices. Post-training, a survey was disseminated to elicit feedback and insights from participants, shaping further refinements and addressing specific needs. 100% (n=13) of survey respondents were satisfied with the training and reported they improved their skills on the learning targets.

#### Spring Institute Post-Training Survey

The Spring Institute, a crucial annual data training for SSIP, occurred in May 2023, providing valuable insights. After the training, the Spring Institute Post-Training Survey was conducted, following a structure similar to other post-training surveys. This survey gathered participants' perspectives on the training's quality and overall satisfaction, contributing to ongoing improvement efforts. A notable 94.3% of respondents (n=45) reported satisfaction with the training.

#### In-District Visit Surveys

After fall and spring visits to each school, SSIP reading consultants engage in activities like observing instruction, offering feedback, and providing coaching. Following these visits, participants are asked to complete a post-In-District Visit survey. The feedback indicates that 89.9% (n=80) believe the support received will enhance their skills, and 95.5% (n=85) express satisfaction with the visit's quality.

#### Librarian Training Survey

Librarians from SSIP-participating schools, including public librarian counterparts, completed a training program designed to enhance their ability to support struggling readers in the library. The training, consisting of 4 hours of asynchronous virtual learning followed by a 1-hour live debrief session, saw participation from 26 librarians. Post-training, a survey was conducted, revealing that 100% of participants intend to apply what they learned, with 50% expressing overall satisfaction. Among the 8 attendees at the debrief, 100% plan to implement improvements in their library setting based on the training, and all found the training to be of high quality.

#### End-of-Year Survey

In June 2023, an end-of-year survey with role-specific questions was sent to all SSIP participants. Of the 91 respondents, 86.55% (n=78) expressed satisfaction with the overall support received throughout the year.

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

(1) Implementation Science Framework: The State Leadership Team intends to continue assisting the development of leadership teams to implement evidence-based practices. This involves ongoing efforts to review and refine the LEAs MTSS-R process while providing support to instructional and coaching staff in addressing the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.

(2) Continuous Improvement Cycle (PDSA): The State Leadership Team is committed to sustaining its support for building leadership teams in utilizing the MTSS-R process to pinpoint areas of need. They will further facilitate the creation and implementation of a continuous improvement cycle to aid administrators, coaches, and instructional staff in addressing and reducing the reading proficiency gap for students with disabilities.

a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:

1. Addition of a two calls, November and March, with schools and the National Center for Improving Literacy to monitor schools' Action Plans (PDSA).

(3) IES Foundational Skills Practice: The State Leadership Team plans to continue to support instructional staff to implement evidence-based instruction practices.

a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:

1. Integrated the Science of Reading into professional development (PD) and technical assistance (TA) focused on evidence-based instructional practices, aiming to reinforce the implementation of explicit and systematic instruction.

b. Anticipated Outcomes:

1. Enhance the ability of instructional and coaching staff to effectively implement explicit and systematic instruction.

2. To improve literacy outcomes for students by providing instructional and coaching staff with the knowledge and skills necessary to deliver instruction that aligns with the principles of the Science of Reading.

(4) Instructional Coaching:

a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR:

i. Coaches will be supported in their understanding of the Science of Reading with an emphasis on deeply understanding neuroscience and the science of how students learn to read.

b. Anticipated Outcomes

i. This knowledge will inform the clarity in which coaches provide feedback to teachers.

(5) Explicit Instruction:

a. New activities or strategies that support SiMR

i. Addition and update of explicit instructional routines to provide resources that model instruction.

b. Anticipated Outcomes

i. Instructional and coaching staff will have access to clear and well-defined models, aiding them in implementing instruction that is systematic, targeted, and aligned with evidence-based practices.

ii. Provides sustainable resources.

### **Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

### **If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.**

Additional activities and strategies are mentioned in previous sections. During FFY 2022 we continuously modified SSIP activities, strategies, and timelines based on quantitative and qualitative data we collected through our comprehensive data collection and analysis system. Information collected through our comprehensive data collection and analysis system resulted in making small adjustments to best meet the needs of LEAs and educational partners. The educational partners who provided information and data are listed in the next section.

This year there were no timeline changes, with a few changes to activities and strategies listed below.



## Activity Changes

1. Coordinated building visits with the SMART/Cultivating Readers coaches with the two participating LEAs in both projects.
2. Formalized an additional 30-minute coaching call monthly to align coaching to the Science of Reading.

### Justification for change

1. Ensuring the simultaneous presence of both SMART and Cultivating Readers coaches in the building helps foster a shared understanding of their respective roles, ultimately minimizing duplicative work between the two programs.
2. To ensure coaches have the knowledge and skills to support instructional staff to understand the Science of Reading and support strategies to support struggling students.

## Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

### Description of Stakeholder Input

#### 1) Special Education Advisory Groups

- a) Directors Advisory Council (DAC): The Directors Advisory Council (DAC) serves as an important educational partner group in discussions for target setting. DAC consists of at least 14 special education directors nominated by their peers, with two representatives per region. Membership criteria ensures representation of small, large, urban, rural, charter, and virtual charter LEAs to reflect the wide range of demographic groups across the state.
- b) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP): The Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) membership represents the following: parents of students with disabilities, higher education, juvenile corrections, LEA superintendents, adult corrections, special education directors, teachers, Idaho Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW), Idaho Parents Unlimited (IPUL) (Idaho's Parent Training and Information Center), charter schools, private schools, and Idaho Department of Education staff.

#### 2) SSIP participants

- a) Special education director meetings: In each Local Education Agency (LEA), a dedicated special education director actively engages in leading reading instructions through Special Education newsletters, attending webinars, participating in state-sponsored conferences, and joining other educational meetings. The primary focus of these activities is to provide robust support for teachers and students receiving special education services. Through continuous learning and collaboration, the special education director contributes to the enhancement of special education programs to support struggling readers.
- b) Parent group meetings: Parent group meetings serve as a vital component of Idaho's SSIP, where each Local Education Agency (LEA) designates at least one parent to bridge the connection between school and home. These parents undergo training during the Fall Institute and actively participate in monthly parent support calls and building leadership meetings. Through these engagements, parents receive guidance on how to effectively support students and families, fostering a collaborative and supportive environment that enhances the educational experience for everyone involved.
- c) District Leadership meetings: District Leadership meetings play a pivotal role in Idaho's SSIP, where each Local Education Agency (LEA) forms a building leadership team. This team is composed of parents, administrators, general and special education teachers, and a building-identified instructional coach, collectively working to enhance the quality of reading instruction. Through collaborative efforts in these meetings, the building leadership team ensures effective communication, alignment of instructional strategies, and support for the ongoing improvement of reading instruction within the educational partnership.
- d) Individual SSIP participants: Parents engage in monthly support calls, provide guidance, and stay informed and involved in their child's education. Administrators participate in monthly support calls, ensuring alignment between instructional strategies and overall school goals. Instructional staff benefit from monthly instructional meetings organized by cohort, fostering collaboration and sharing best practices. Additionally, instructional coaches provide valuable support through monthly calls organized by cohorts, contributing to the enhancement of reading instruction in participating buildings.

#### 3) Other SSIP partners

- a) Idaho Commission for Libraries: Collaborates with school librarians to implement tailored literacy programs, offering support and resources to reach struggling readers. Their commitment to fostering literacy extends to providing professional development opportunities, ensuring a collaborative approach to addressing the unique needs of learners facing reading difficulties.
- b) Boise State University: Collaborates with the Idaho Commission for Libraries to support the LEAs by offering specialized librarian training to enhance the proficiency of students in reading.
- c) Metis Education Consulting: state-contracted literacy coaches, play a pivotal role in closing the reading proficiency gap for ALL students by providing targeted support and professional development to instructional and coaching staff. Their expertise and guidance contribute to the implementation of evidence-based practices, ensuring a comprehensive approach that addresses diverse learning needs and fosters a more inclusive and proficient reading environment for students.
- d) Idaho Parents Unlimited: Actively supports parents and LEAs in addressing student reading needs by providing informative workshops, resources, and personalized guidance. Through collaborative initiatives, they empower parents to navigate and advocate for their children's literacy development, fostering a partnership between parents and LEAs to create an environment conducive to effective reading support.
- e) University of Idaho: Supports crucial evaluation activities for the SSIP, aiming to assess and improve the effectiveness of educational initiatives. By leveraging the University of Idaho's expertise, the state aims to ensure a comprehensive and data-driven evaluation process. This partnership underscores a commitment to continuous improvement in the education system, ultimately benefiting students and fostering positive outcomes in alignment with the goals of the SSIP.

f) Lee Pesky Learning Center: Idaho partners with the Lee Pesky Learning Center to bolster evidence-based literacy instruction. This collaboration supports instructional staff and coaches (years 2-4 of the project) in the effective utilization of the RESET rubric, ensuring a standardized and impactful approach to literacy education.

g) National Center on Improving Literacy: Valuable support to Idaho's Multi-System of Support for Reading by providing evidence-based resources, research, and professional development opportunities. Through collaborative efforts, they empower LEAs within the project, enhancing their capacity to implement effective literacy interventions and strategies that positively impact student reading outcomes.

#### 4) Department collaboration

- a) In FY2022-23, aligning with the priorities of the recently elected Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Special Education and Content Department collaborated to streamline literacy projects. This initiative focused on integrating professional development activities with both Idaho's Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART) Project and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

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

The SPP/APR instructions list these groups and other constituents as stakeholders. Idaho prefers to use the term educational partners because of the negative connotation of educational partners for Native American populations. Idaho actively involved a diverse array of educational partners, encompassing a broad spectrum of perspectives. The engagement of educational partners occurred at varying levels, dependent on their backgrounds and depth of knowledge regarding the SSIP work. These educational partners played a crucial role in providing insights and input to the SSIP State Leadership Team, contributing valuable suggestions on overcoming challenges, enhancing the implementation of evidence-based practices, refining evaluation processes, and addressing gaps within the SSIP project through the SPDG application. Notably, the State Leadership Team collaborated closely with educational partners possessing a more profound understanding and hands-on experience with the project, fostering a co-creation of content and project activities at a transformative level of engagement. The subsequent details outline the specific strategies employed by the State Leadership Team to engage each group of educational partners, with corresponding levels of engagement indicated for each set.

1) Special Education Advisory Groups - (Networking)

- a) DAC:
- b) SEAP:

Quarterly meetings between the State Leadership Team and special education advisory groups, facilitated by the Special Education Department, served as a platform for meaningful engagement. Employing a range of strategies, such as presenting project data to update on the ongoing work's status, highlighting barriers or challenges and seeking input for overcoming them, and sharing evaluation data from SSIP participants, the team actively elicited ideas for continuous improvement. These sessions provided a structured and collaborative forum for exchanging information, addressing challenges, and collectively enhancing the effectiveness of special education initiatives.

2) SSIP participants – (Collaborating and Transforming):

- a) Special education director meetings
- b) Parent group meetings
- c) District Leadership meetings
- d) Individual SSIP participants

Every month, either the State Leadership Team or SSIP partners convened with SSIP participants to conduct a comprehensive review of project data. These sessions involved in-depth discussions on the progress of building leadership team goals, addressing specific queries to identify areas of success and challenges. The focus extended to working through a continuous improvement cycle and evaluating the fidelity of implementing evidence-based practices. Throughout the year, SSIP participants received ongoing Professional Development (PD) and Technical Assistance (TA). After each PD or TA visit, a survey was distributed to gather feedback on improving activities within the SSIP. The State Leadership Team and SSIP partners meticulously examined survey data, subsequently devising an action plan to enhance the level of support provided.

3) SSIP partners (Collaborating and Transforming)

- a) Idaho Commission for Libraries
- b) Boise State University
- c) Metis Education Consulting
- d) Idaho Parents Unlimited
- e) University of Idaho
- f) Lee Pesky Learning Center
- g) National Center on Improving Literacy

SSIP partners, encompassing government agencies, universities, non-profits, and private companies, collaborate closely with the State Leadership Team to enhance and refine SSIP support. The State Leadership Team maintains regular one-on-one meetings, occurring at least quarterly, with each partner in the mentioned categories. These engagements involve collaborative efforts in crafting a comprehensive scope of work for the partner's activities throughout the year. Joint activities include post-training debriefing sessions, analyzing participant data gleaned from surveys and training observations to formulate improvement action plans. The meetings also encompass discussions on feedback collected by partners during events they facilitated, reaching consensus on addressing participant input. Also, project implementation and outcome data are reviewed to foster collaboration and strategic planning for the subsequent steps in the SSIP initiative.

4) Department collaboration (Informing to Transforming)

- a) Coordination with Idaho SMART project

The State Leadership Team actively collaborated across departments to stay abreast of other professional development initiatives within the department and foster coherence among them. The Content and Curriculum Department initiated the Striving to Meet Achievement in Reading Together (SMART) project for K-3 reading, coinciding with the inaugural K-3 Reading Summit. SMART, a multiyear cohort project, delivers training and coaching to K-3 educators statewide. In tandem, the SSIP State Leadership Team, in collaboration with the SMART Director, devised a plan to support SSIP schools whose teachers expressed interest in participating in the SMART project. This collaboration aims to provide instructional staff with additional avenues to enhance reading outcomes for students.

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

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

The State Leadership Team systematically collected educational partners' concerns through surveys, meetings, in-district visits, and various communication channels. The team approached challenges and concerns by distinguishing between "technical" and "adaptive" challenges. Technical challenges were effectively tackled through collaborative problem-solving and the shared experiences of SSIP project members. Implementing evidence-based reading instruction encounters challenges in areas such as providing effective professional development, ensuring alignment of instructional materials with research, addressing technology limitations, and establishing efficient systems for ongoing assessment and data analysis. Overcoming these challenges requires a comprehensive approach that includes teacher training, resource development, technological support, and a sustained commitment to evidence-based practices.

Implementing evidence-based reading instruction poses adaptive challenges, including fostering a culture of continuous learning among educators, overcoming resistance to change, and tailoring instruction to diverse student needs. Success hinges on effective leadership, ongoing support, and a systemic approach that encourages flexibility and collaboration in adapting to evolving educational landscapes. Addressing adaptive challenges required targeted meetings with specific groups, seeking consensus on acceptable solutions. Despite various challenges, staff turnover remained the most significant obstacle. The State Leadership Team tailored its approach to addressing staff turnover uniquely with each LEA. While some school teams, successfully leveraged SSIP-developed sustainable resources to train new staff, 5 LEAs, deeming the challenge insurmountable, opted not to progress to the next project year. This adaptive approach underscores the team's commitment to addressing a range of challenges and tailoring solutions based on the unique circumstances of each partner and school team. Moreover, collaborative endeavors between the Idaho SMART project and the SSIP have encountered several adaptive challenges related to the identification of willing coaches within the Idaho SMART project who can effectively implement SSIP objectives and navigate the new contractual processes in Idaho.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

All activities are addressed in previous sections.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

See previous sections.

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

**Barriers:**

The current SiMR measurement methodology involves tracking the same cohort of LEAs annually, with Idaho calculating and reporting SiMR data for 4th grade students in these LEAs for each year in the SPP/APR submission. However, this approach encompasses 23 LEAs, 10 of which haven't completed all four years of project activities. The current method inaccurately represents the population subset, reporting data for all elementary schools within the identified LEAs, despite only 30 out of 94 elementary schools actively participating on average (68% non-participation).

Idaho is actively engaged in the process of revising the subset of the population used to calculate the SiMR. Through presentations and input-gathering sessions with parents, participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs), and educational partners, Idaho aims to establish a new sampling methodology that better aligns with the accurate representation of the project's progress. Following the determination of the new methodology, if deemed appropriate, adjustments will be made to establish a new baseline and set yearly targets to reflect the project's evolving goals and objectives.

Staff turnover remains a significant challenge for all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) involved in the project, emerging as the primary reason for their withdrawal. The most recent reporting period witnessed the departure of five districts and nine schools from the program. Specifically, one LEA from the Readiness Cohort (Year 1), three LEAs from the Implementation Cohort (Year 2), and one LEA from the Sustainability Cohort (Year 3) withdrew. In each instance, conflicting priorities and challenges in staff retention were cited as the determining factors. Recognizing the impact of this attrition, proactive measures are planned for implementation during the application process and monthly administrative calls. The goal is to identify and address potential conflicts promptly, fostering a more resilient project structure and preventing future withdrawals.

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

See the current theory of action.

**17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**17 - OSEP Response**

**17 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

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

#### **Certify**

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

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

#### **Name:**

Chynna Hirasaki

#### **Title:**

Director, Special Education

#### **Email:**

chirasaki@sde.idaho.gov

#### **Phone:**

12083326806

#### **Submitted on:**

04/25/24 4:39:46 PM