

### Idaho Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>		
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported gap data for this indicator are 15.3%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 14.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of less than or equal to 14%.</p>	<p>OSEP's February 27, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR baseline data from 2004 (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005) and progress data from 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006). The State submitted the required data. OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported gap data for this indicator are .54%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of .84%.</p>	<p>OSEP's February 27, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the February 1, 2007 APR baseline data from 2004 (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005) and progress data from 2005 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006). The State submitted the required data.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 34.38%. This represents progress from FFY 2004 data of 29.58%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 35%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 99.7%. This represents slippage from FFY 2004 data of 99.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 99.8%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 50.4% in reading and 54.7% in math. The State met its FFY 2005 targets of 49.85% in reading and 46.58% in math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator is .87% unchanged from the FFY 2004 data of .87%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 0%.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State identified significant discrepancies in one district, but did not describe how the State reviewed, and if appropriate revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). In its FFY 2006 APR, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate revision, of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for: (1) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR; and (2) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR. (The review for LEAs identified in the FFY 2006 APR may occur either during or after the FFY 2006 reporting period, so long as the State describes that review in the FFY 2006 APR.)</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with</p>		<p>Based upon our preliminary review of all State submissions for Indicator 4B, it appears that the instructions for this indicator were not sufficiently clear and, as a result, confusion remains regarding the establishment of measurements and targets that are race-based and for which there is no finding that the significant discrepancy is</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>disabilities by race and ethnicity. [Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>based on inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As a result, use of these targets could raise Constitutional concerns. Therefore, OSEP has decided not to review this year's submissions for Indicator 4B for purposes of approval and will revise instructions for this indicator to clarify how this indicator will be used in the future. Based upon this, OSEP did not consider the submissions for Indicator 4B in making determinations under Section 616(d). It is also important that States immediately cease using Indicator 4B measurements and targets, unless they are based on a finding of inappropriate policies, procedures, or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>5A. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 63.8%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of greater than or equal to 59%. 5B. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 8%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of less than or equal to 8.8%. 5C. The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 1.6%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of less than or equal to 1.6%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 32.09%. The State met its FFY 2005 target of greater than 32%.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.  Please note that, due to changes in the 618 State-reported data collection, the measurement for this indicator will change for the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008. States will be required to describe how they will collect valid and reliable data to provide</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		baseline and targets in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	Entry data provided.	<p>The State revised the manner in which data will be collected. OSEP accepts these revisions. The State must add these revisions to its SPP.</p> <p>The State reported the required entry data and activities. The State must provide progress data and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>8. 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	The State's reported baseline data for this indicator are 26%.	OSEP's February 14, 2006 memorandum required the State to submit a revised sampling plan. The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities and a revised sampling plan in its APR. The sampling plan is technically sound. OSEP accepts the State's SPP for this indicator. The State must add these revisions to its SPP.
<b>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality</b>		
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	The State's reported FFY 2005 data are 16.1%.	<p>The State revised its improvement activities in the SPP. OSEP accepts these revisions. The State must add these revisions to its SPP.</p> <p>The State identified 16.1% of districts with disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification. Thus, the State identified noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.173. The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate full compliance with 34 CFR §300.173. Additionally, the State must include data and information that demonstrate that the LEAs identified in the FFY 2005 APR as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification are</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>OSEP notes that Idaho’s definition of “disproportionate representation” refers only to overrepresentation by race/ethnicity in special education and related services; however, the State’s data includes districts that are over and under-identifying racial and ethnic groups. OSEP strongly recommends that the State revise its definition to include the underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups, so that its definition is aligned with its practice.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State did not report baseline data using the proper measurement.</p> <p>Data not valid or reliable.</p>	<p>The State submitted targets and improvement activities for this indicator. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State was required to submit data on the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups that is the result of inappropriate identification. The State reported the percent of districts with disproportionate representation broken down by five disability categories and by race and ethnicity, but did not provide a total percent of districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>In addition, the State did not include data on all 6 disability categories as required by the indicator. The State did not provide data on “other health impairments” and “autism,” but provided data on “developmental delay.” While the State may examine data on other disability categories, it must examine data for the six disability categories in the instructions for Indicator 10.</p> <p>The State must recalculate its baseline for FFY 2005, by examining data for all six disability categories and calculate a total percent of districts with disproportionate representation in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State must submit the revised baseline data for this indicator with its FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>Despite the problems with the State’s data, the State identified noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.173. The State must review its</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate full compliance with 34 CFR §300.173. Additionally, the State must include data and information that demonstrate that the LEAs identified in the FFY 2005 APR as having disproportionate representation in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.
<b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision</b>		
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State did not provide timely data for this indicator in its FFY 2005 APR. Data not valid and reliable.</p>	<p>OSEP's February 27, 2006 SPP letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR data from FFY 2005 and instructed the State to describe how it selects LEAs for monitoring, if the State chose to use monitoring to collect data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State submitted baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator on March 13, 2007. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.. OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300. 301(c)(1), including data on the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported some FFY 2005 data for this indicator. Data not valid or reliable.</p>	<p>OSEP's February 27, 2006 SPP response letter required the State to include in the FFY 2005 APR both baseline data for FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005. The State did not provide this data. Rather, the State reported that 259 IEPs were not developed by the child's third birthday, but did not provide the percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, and who had an IEP implemented by their 3<sup>rd</sup> birthdays. Accordingly, OSEP has determined that the State is not in compliance with 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p> <p>The State must include baseline data for FFY 2004, and progress data for FFY 2005 and 2006, for this indicator in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. If the State cannot provide data from FFY 2004 or FFY 2005, it must explain why in its FFY 2006 APR and</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>provide data from FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with 34 CFR §300.124(b), including timely correction of any noncompliance identified by the State.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 17%.</p>	<p>The State provided targets and improvement activities. OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP's February 27, 2006 SPP response letter informed the State that data for this indicator is to be taken from the State monitoring or State data system. If the State uses its monitoring system, it must describe how it selects LEAs for monitoring. The State reported that it used its monitoring system to collect this data. However, the State did not describe how it selected the LEAs. In the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must include the method by which districts were selected for monitoring.</p> <p>The State noted in its analysis that there is a "significant need" for improvement under this indicator. The State notified those districts identified as noncompliant that the district must correct the noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b), including data demonstrating correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of post-secondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided a plan that describes how data will be collected.</p>	<p>The State must provide baseline data, targets, and improvement activities with the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008.</p> <p>The State did not submit definitions for "competitive employment" or "post-secondary" that were required by the instructions for the SPP/APR. The State must submit this information in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 93% of noncompliance identified in 2005-06</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>was corrected within one year. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State did not break down its data by indicator or substantive finding areas. IDE must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in 20 USC 1232d(b)(3)(E), and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In its response to Indicator 15 in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008, the State must disaggregate by APR indicator the status of timely correction of the noncompliance findings identified by the State during FFY 2005. In addition, the State must, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 96%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2004 reported data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2005 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The IDE revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The IDE reported that one complaint missed its due date by one day, the result of a scheduling conflict rather than a systemic issue. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable because the State reported no fully adjudicated due process hearing requests in FFY 2005.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 that demonstrate compliance.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable because the State reported fewer than 10 due process hearing requests that went to resolution received in FFY 2005.</p>	<p>The State is not required to meet targets until any FFY in which 10 or more due process hearing requests were resolved through resolution.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p>	<p>This indicator is not applicable because the State reported fewer than</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide or meet targets until any FFY in which the State receives 10 or more requests for mediation.</p>



Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	10 mediations requested in FFY 2005.	
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The IDE's FFY 2005 reported data for this indicator are 100% for timeliness and 98.9% for accuracy. The State did not meet its target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator. OSEP accepts those revisions. The State must add these improvement activities to the SPP. The State did not provide valid and reliable data for Indicators 10, 11 and 12 in the FFY 2005 APR. The State must review its improvement strategies and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to include data in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, that demonstrate compliance with the requirements in IDEA section 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>