

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator. OSEP accepts the revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 72.3%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 74.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of a 1% increase (to 75.4%).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator. OSEP accepts the revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.97%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 2.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 2.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State established a new baseline in its APR because the State has adopted a new assessment system.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.62%.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its assessment and reported that the data provided for FFY 2006 and the data provided for FFY 2005 are not comparable.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 41%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.8% for reading and 98.7% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 99.8%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>against 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 established a new baseline in its APR because the State has adopted a new assessment system.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 41.7% for reading and 41.2% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 53.09% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 48.18% for math.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its measurement tool and reported that the data provided for FFY 2006 and the data provided for FFY 2005 are not comparable.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of .87%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for districts identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 with significant discrepancies. The State provided the required information for districts identified in FFY 2005.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition,</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
		<p>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 the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</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 disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>													
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts these revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1219 1455 1495"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>63.8%</td> <td>61.8%</td> <td>>=60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>8%</td> <td>8.7%</td> <td><=8.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	63.8%	61.8%	>=60%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	8%	8.7%	<=8.6%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target											
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	63.8%	61.8%	>=60%											
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	8%	8.7%	<=8.6%											

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.6%	1.8%	<=1.6%																									
<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>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																												
<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>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 906 1419 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 906 1062 1081">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 906 1178 1081">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1178 906 1297 1081">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1297 906 1419 1081">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1081 1062 1149">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1081 1178 1149">0.6%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1081 1297 1149">0</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1081 1419 1149">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1149 1062 1287">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1149 1178 1287">9.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1149 1297 1287">10.8%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1149 1419 1287">11.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1287 1062 1386">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1287 1178 1386">43.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1287 1297 1386">49.4%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1287 1419 1386">26.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1386 1062 1485">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1386 1178 1485">29.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1386 1297 1485">31%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1386 1419 1485">33.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1485 1062 1521">e. % of preschoolers who maintained</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1485 1178 1521">16.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1485 1297 1521">8.9%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1485 1419 1521">28.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	0.6%	0	0	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	9.5%	10.8%	11.4%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	43.7%	49.4%	26.6%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	29.7%	31%	33.5%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained	16.5%	8.9%	28.5%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009 and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																										
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	0.6%	0	0																										
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	9.5%	10.8%	11.4%																										
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	43.7%	49.4%	26.6%																										
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	29.7%	31%	33.5%																										
e. % of preschoolers who maintained	16.5%	8.9%	28.5%																										

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 238 1419 305"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 238 1060 305">functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1060 238 1180 305"></td> <td data-bbox="1180 238 1299 305"></td> <td data-bbox="1299 238 1419 305"></td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="548 326 1419 391">The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>	functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.				
functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.						
<p data-bbox="92 425 520 621">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 data-bbox="92 643 312 672">[Results Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 425 1362 488">The State revised the improvement activities and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p data-bbox="548 509 1419 573">The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 26%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 26%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 594 1045 623">The State met its FFY 2006 target of 26%.</p>	<p data-bbox="1465 425 2028 488">OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>				
<p data-bbox="92 709 499 906">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 data-bbox="92 927 369 956">[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 709 1394 773">The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p data-bbox="548 794 1430 857">The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 5.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 16.1%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 878 1136 907">The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 928 1352 1057">The State reported the actual number of districts determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1078 1400 1239">OSEP could not determine if the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1260 1425 1523">The State reported in Indicator 9 that 2 districts identified with "disproportionality" "did not achieve compliance within a year." It is unclear whether the State is referring to districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification or districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, or districts identified with significant</p>	<p data-bbox="1465 709 2039 1179">OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, 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 in compliance with the child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State did not submit the required information. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2005 was corrected.</p> <p data-bbox="1465 1200 2045 1523">The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate</p>				

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>disproportionality, or a combination of these districts.</p>	<p>identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must also describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 data, that were reviewed for compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, and that were also identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; and, if so, whether those changes comply with requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State provided its definition for determining if significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity is occurring in LEAs. The State's definition includes a review of the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices to verify inappropriate identification. This represents noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), which requires that if the State determines that</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>significant disproportionality is occurring in an LEA, the State must require the LEA to reserve the maximum amount for early intervening services, regardless of the result of the review of the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures. Because the State provided information in its FFY 2006 APR that indicates noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), the State must demonstrate in its FFY 2007 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected. The State must provide information in its 2007 APR that it has corrected its definition of significant disproportionality, and that the State requires an LEA to reserve the maximum amount of its Part B allocation for early intervening services when it is determined that significant disproportionality is occurring in the LEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2).</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided a baseline of 10.4% in its FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State's baseline data is from FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>Although the State is using FFY 2006 data as its baseline, the State identified districts in FFY 2005 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. OSEP could not determine if the LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State reported</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a recalculated 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 did not provide the required information for FFY 2005. Rather, the State provided data for FFY 2006 that meets the measurement for this indicator, and that data is the State's baseline for this indicator.</p> <p>Although the State did not use the proper measurement for this indicator for FFY 2005, the State identified districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>in Indicator 10 that the information on correction of noncompliance reported in Indicator 9 was applicable to Indicator 10. However, in Indicator 9, the State reported that two districts identified with “disproportionality” “did not achieve compliance within a year.” It is unclear whether the State is referring to districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification for Indicator 9, or districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification for Indicator 10, or districts identified with significant disproportionality, or a combination of these districts.</p>	<p>that is the result of inappropriate identification. Accordingly, the State was also required to include data and information in its FFY 2006 APR 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. The State did not submit the required information. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance from FFY 2005 was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must also describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For districts</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 data, that were reviewed for compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, and that were also identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; and, if so, whether those changes comply with requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 91.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays for children who were not evaluated within 60 days.</p>	<p>The State did not submit data regarding range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays. The State reported that it provided an approximate total number of eligible students with parental consent for initial evaluation and was unable to provide data on the number of children not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days. The State reported that it is unable to provide this data for FFY 2006. The State also reported that it will be collecting census data for this indicator starting in April 2008 and will be reporting that data in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must provide all the required data for this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</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's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 83%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 59%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 30 of 56 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. The State did not provide program specific activities regarding the remaining 26 LEAs.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data for FFY 2004 and progress data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for this indicator. The State did not submit baseline data for FFY 2004 because it did not collect data for that year. The State provided baseline data for FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate in FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 47%. These data</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 17%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 8 of 18 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that its efforts to correct the noncompliance include regional small group training, State regional consultants working 1-1 with teachers, and accessing materials through the Idaho Training Clearinghouse for local training. LEAs with continued noncompliance receive a notice that includes instructions regarding technical assistance options. This information is recorded and used in making LEA determinations.</p>	<p>the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the method by which districts were selected for monitoring. The State provided this information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</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 postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, definitions for "competitive employment" and "post-secondary." The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 86.8%. This represents slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 93%.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must demonstrate that any noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2006 data that was not corrected in a timely manner has been corrected, including when the</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with (Part B) 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>OSEP notes that the State provided additional information in its FFY 2006 APR for Indicator 15 in April 2008 in order to clarify that the State's data represented timely correction. However, the State did not delete portions of its FFY 2006 APR on pages 57 and 58 that conflict with the updated information. In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must ensure that its APR, even after any clarification, is internally consistent.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 89%. These data are based on nine complaints. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 96%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure that they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one hearing. The State reported no hearings for FFY 2005; therefore there is no FFY 2005 data on which to determine progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and added targets for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 80%. This data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its target and OSEP accepts these revisions. The State reported that the one mediation held resulted in a mediation agreement. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100% for timeliness and 99% for accuracy. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 91%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>