

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**Idaho State Department of Education;
Written Findings and Compliance
Agreement**

AGENCY: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of written findings and compliance agreement.

SUMMARY: Section 457 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) authorizes the U.S. Department of Education to enter into a compliance agreement with a recipient that is failing to comply substantially with Federal program requirements. In order to enter into a compliance agreement, the Department must determine, in written findings, that the recipient cannot comply until a future date with the applicable program requirements and that a compliance agreement is a viable means of bringing about such compliance. On March 29, 2002, the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education Dr. Susan B. Neuman entered into a compliance agreement with the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE). Under section 457(b)(2) of GEPA, the written findings and compliance agreement must be published in the **Federal Register**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Zollie Stevenson, Jr., U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3W200, Washington, DC 20202. Telephone: (202) 260-1824.

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternate format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotope, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I), each State, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, was required to develop or adopt, by the 1997-98 school year, challenging content standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that describe what the State expects all students to know and be able to do. Each State also was required to develop or adopt performance standards, aligned with its

content standards, which describe three levels of proficiency to determine how well students are mastering the content standards. Finally, by the 2000-2001 school year, each State was required to develop or adopt a set of student assessments in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that would be used to determine the yearly performance of schools in enabling students to meet the State's performance standards.

ISDE submitted, and the Department approved, evidence that it has content standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics. In October 2000, ISDE submitted evidence of its final assessment system. The Department submitted that evidence to a panel of three assessment experts for peer review. Following that review, the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education Tom Corwin concluded that ISDE's proposed final assessment system did not meet a number of the Title I requirements.

Section 454 of GEPA, 20 U.S.C. 1234c, sets out the remedies available to the Department when it determines that a recipient "is failing to comply substantially with any requirement of law" applicable to Federal program funds the Department administers. Specifically, the Department is authorized to—

- (1) Withhold funds;
- (2) Obtain compliance through a cease and desist order;
- (3) Enter into a compliance agreement with the recipient; or
- (4) Take any other action authorized by law.

20 U.S.C. 1234c(a)(1) through (a)(4).

In a letter dated October 16, 2001 to Dr. Marilyn L. Howard, State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Idaho, the Assistant Secretary Dr. Susan B. Neuman notified the ISDE that, in order to remain eligible to receive Title I funds, it must enter into a compliance agreement with the Department. The purpose of a compliance agreement is "to bring the recipient into full compliance with the applicable requirements of law as soon as feasible and not to excuse or remedy past violations of such requirements." 20 U.S.C. 1234f(a). In order to enter into a compliance agreement with a recipient, the Department must determine, in written findings, that the recipient cannot comply until a future date with the applicable program requirements, and that a compliance agreement is a viable means for bringing about such compliance.

On March 29, 2002, the Assistant Secretary issued written findings, holding that compliance by ISDE with the Title I standards and assessment requirements is genuinely not feasible until a future date. Having submitted its assessment system for peer review in October 2000, ISDE was not able to make the significant changes to its system that the Department's review required in time to meet the spring 2001 statutory deadline to have approved assessments in place. As a result, ISDE administered its unapproved assessment system in 2001. The Assistant Secretary also determined that a compliance agreement represents a viable means of bringing about compliance because of the steps the ISDE has already taken to comply, its commitment of resources, and the plan it has developed for further action. The agreement sets out the action plan that ISDE must meet to come into compliance with the Title I requirements. This plan, coupled with specific reporting requirements, will allow the Assistant Secretary to monitor closely the ISDE's progress in meeting the terms of the compliance agreement. The Idaho State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Marilyn L. Howard, signed the agreement on March 22, 2002 and the Assistant Secretary signed it on March 29, 2002.

As required by section 457(b)(2) of GEPA, 20 U.S.C. 1234f(b)(2), the text of the Assistant Secretary's written findings is set forth as appendix A and the compliance agreement is set forth as appendix B of this notice.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in Text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF), on the Internet at the following site: <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister>.

To use PDF, you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) toll free, at 1-888-293-6498; or in the Washington, DC area at (202) 512-1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** is available on GPO access at: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1234c, 1234f, 6311)

Dated: February 13, 2003.

Eugene W. Hickok,

Under Secretary of Education.

Appendix A—Text of the Written Findings of the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education

I. Introduction

The Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education (Assistant Secretary) of the U.S. Department of Education (Department) has determined, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1234c and 1234f, that the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) has failed to comply substantially with certain requirements of Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I), 20 U.S.C. 6301 *et seq.*, and that it is not feasible for the ISDE to achieve full compliance immediately. Specifically, the Assistant Secretary has determined that ISDE failed to meet a number of the Title I requirements concerning the development of performance standards and an aligned assessment system within the statutory timeframe.

For the following reasons, the Assistant Secretary has concluded that it would be appropriate to enter into a compliance agreement with the ISDE to bring it into full compliance as soon as feasible. During the effective period of the compliance agreement, which ends three years from the date of these findings, the ISDE will be eligible to receive Title I funds as long as it complies with the terms and conditions of the agreement as well as the provisions of Title I, Part A and other applicable Federal statutory and regulatory requirements.

II. Relevant Statutory and Regulatory Provisions

A. Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I), 20 U.S.C. 6301 *et seq.*, provides financial assistance, through State educational agencies, to local educational agencies to provide services in high-poverty schools to students who are failing or at risk of failing to meet the State's student performance standards. Under Title I, each State, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, was required to develop or adopt, by the 1997–98 school year, challenging content standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that describe what the State expects all students to know and be able to do and performance standards, aligned with those content standards, that describe three levels of proficiency to determine

how well students are mastering the content standards.

By the 2000–2001 school year, Title I required each State to develop or adopt a set of student assessments in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that would be used to determine the yearly performance of schools and school districts in enabling students to meet the State's performance standards. These assessments must meet the following requirements:

- The assessments must be aligned to a State's content and performance standards.
- They must be administered annually to students in at least one grade in each of three grade ranges: Grades 3 through 5, grades 6 through 9, and grades 10 through 12.
- They must be valid and reliable for the purpose for which they are used and of high technical quality.
- They must involve multiple measures, including measures that assess higher-order thinking skills.
- They must provide for the inclusion of all students in the grades assessed, including students with disabilities and limited English proficient students.
- They must provide individual reports.
- Results from the assessments must be disaggregated and reported by major racial and ethnic groups and other categories.

20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3).¹

B. The General Education Provisions Act

The General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) provides a number of options when the Assistant Secretary determines a recipient of Department funds is “failing to comply substantially with any requirement of law applicable to such funds.” 20 U.S.C. 1234c. In such case, the Assistant Secretary is authorized to—

- (1) Withhold funds;

¹ On January 8, 2002, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) (Pub. L. 107–110). The NCLB made several significant changes to the Title I standards and assessment requirements. First, it requires that each State develop academic content and student achievement standards in science by the 2005–06 school year. Second, by the 2005–06 school year, it requires a system of aligned assessments in each of grades 3 through 8 and once during grades 10 through 12. Third, it requires science assessments in at least three grade spans by the 2007–08 school year. Fourth, the NCLB significantly changes the definition of adequate yearly progress each State must establish to hold schools and school districts accountable, based on data from the 2001–02 test administration. Finally, by the 2002–03 school year, the NCLB requires State and school district report cards that include, among other things, assessment results disaggregated by various subgroups, two-year trend data, and percent of students tested.

(2) Obtain compliance through a cease and desist order;

(3) Enter into a compliance agreement with the recipient; or

(4) Take any other action authorized by law. 20 U.S.C. 1234c(a)(1) through (a)(4).

Under section 457 of GEPA, the Assistant Secretary may enter into a compliance agreement with a recipient that is failing to comply substantially with specific program requirements. 20 U.S.C. 1234f. The purpose of a compliance agreement is “to bring the recipient into full compliance with the applicable requirements of the law as soon as feasible and not to excuse or remedy past violations of such requirements.” 20 U.S.C. 1234f(a). Before entering into a compliance agreement with a recipient, the Assistant Secretary must hold a hearing at which the recipient, affected students and parents or their representatives, and other interested parties are invited to participate. At that hearing, the recipient has the burden of persuading the Assistant Secretary that full compliance with the applicable requirements of law is not feasible until a future date and that a compliance agreement is a viable means for bringing about such compliance. 20 U.S.C. 1234f(b)(1). If, on the basis of all the available evidence, the Assistant Secretary determines that compliance until a future date is genuinely not feasible and that a compliance agreement is a viable means for bringing about such compliance, the Assistant Secretary must make written findings to that effect and publish those findings, together with the substance of any compliance agreement, in the **Federal Register**. 20 U.S.C. 1234f(b)(2).

A compliance agreement must set forth an expiration date, not later than three years from the date of these written findings, by which time the recipient must be in full compliance with all program requirements. 20 U.S.C. 1234f(c)(1). In addition, a compliance agreement must contain the terms and conditions with which the recipient must comply during the period that agreement is in effect. 20 U.S.C. 1234f(c)(2). If the recipient fails to comply with any of the terms and conditions of the compliance agreement, the Assistant Secretary may consider the agreement no longer in effect and may take any of the compliance actions described previously. 20 U.S.C. 1234f(d).

III. Analysis

A. Overview of Issues To Be Resolved in Determining Whether a Compliance Agreement Is Appropriate

In deciding whether a compliance agreement between the Assistant Secretary and the ISDE is appropriate, the Assistant Secretary must first determine whether compliance by the ISDE with the Title I standards and assessment requirements is genuinely not feasible until a future date. 20 U.S.C. 1234f(b). The second issue that the Assistant Secretary must resolve is whether the ISDE will be able, within a period of up to three years, to come into compliance with the Title I requirements. Not only must the ISDE come into full compliance by the end of the effective period of the compliance agreement, it must also make steady and measurable progress toward that objective while the compliance agreement is in effect. If such an outcome is not possible, then a compliance agreement between the Assistant Secretary and the ISED would not be appropriate.

B. The ISDE Has Failed To Comply Substantially With Title I Standards and Assessment Requirements

In October 2000, the ISDE submitted evidence of its final assessment system. The Assistant Secretary submitted that evidence to a panel of three assessment experts for peer review. Following that review, the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education Thomas Corwin concluded that ISDE's proposed final assessment system did not meet a number of the Title I requirements. Specifically, the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary determined that the ISDE must do the following:

- Provide information on Idaho's proposed standards based assessment system.
- Provide evidence that its accountability system will allow the results of the Idaho final assessment system, including local assessments where applicable, to be the primary indicators of adequate yearly progress.
- Provide evidence that performance standards have been developed and implemented and that they are aligned with Idaho's content standards and the Idaho assessment system that is being developed.
- Provide clear and concise information on the enrollment of limited English proficient students and students with disabilities in the State at the assessed grade levels and provide information on the number of limited English proficient students and students

with disabilities who take the standard form of the Idaho assessments and the Idaho assessments with accommodations, and the number of those students exempted or excluded from the Idaho assessment program.

- Provide a copy of its inclusion policy for limited English proficient students and provide documentation that the State Board of Education has approved it. Included in that policy should be information on accommodations for limited English proficient students. A plan for implementing the new inclusion policies and for monitoring LEA compliance with the new inclusion policies when they are approved should also be provided.
- Submit information on the technical quality of the Idaho alternate assessment for students with disabilities as well as information that indicates the extent to which accommodations associated with the norm-referenced tests and State-developed assessments yield valid results for students with disabilities, as well as information regarding any accommodations that are planned for the Direct Mathematics and Writing assessments and the technical quality of those accommodated assessments.
- Document how it will incorporate performance data for all Idaho students into its reporting of results for assessment and accountability purposes.
- Provide evidence regarding the extent to which the components of the Idaho Assessment Program are aligned with Idaho standards.
- Provide technical information on each of the components of the Idaho Assessment Program and information on how Idaho ensures the fairness of its assessments for all students.
- Provide evidence on how the multiple measures that have been incorporated in the Idaho Assessment Program affect the validity, reliability, and fairness of those assessments.
- Disaggregate student performance by gender, race/ethnicity, migrant status, disability (versus non-disability), economic disadvantage (versus non-disadvantaged), and limited English proficiency status at the LEA and school levels. In addition, Idaho must add economic disadvantage to the categories that are currently being disaggregated at the State level.
- Define for LEAs which students are to be included in determining adequate yearly progress (AYP) for schools and LEAs.
- Provide a plan for evaluating the AYP of its small schools and K-3 schools.

C. The ISDE Cannot Correct Immediately Its Noncompliance With the Title I Standards and Assessment Requirements

Under the Title I statute, ISDE was required to implement its final assessment system no later than the 2000-2001 school year. 20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(6). ISDE submitted evidence of its assessment system in October 2000, but the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary determined, on the basis of that evidence, that ISDE's system did not fully meet the Title I requirements. Due to the enormity and complexity of developing a new assessment system that addressed the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary's concerns, the ISDE was not able to complete that task between the time it submitted its system for review and the Idaho 2001 assessment window. Thus, in 2001, the ISDE administered assessments that the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary had determined did not meet the Title I requirements. As a result, the Assistant Secretary finds that it is not genuinely feasible for ISDE to come into compliance until a future date.

D. The ISDE Can Meet the Terms and Conditions of a Compliance Agreement and Come Into Full Compliance With the Requirements of Title I Within Three Years

At the public hearing, the ISDE presented evidence of its commitment and capability to come into compliance with the Title I standards and assessment requirements within three years. For example, Idaho entered into a contract to develop reading and mathematics assessments within one year at grades 4, 8 and 10. Idaho has established a process for developing performance descriptors and to define performance levels for its assessment system with broad based involvement of Idaho citizens and has established a timeline for approving the performance descriptors and performance levels. Idaho has also received approval from the Department for its academic content standards.

Finally, the ISDE has developed a comprehensive action plan, incorporated into the compliance agreement, that sets out a very specific schedule that the ISDE has agreed to meet during the next three years for attaining compliance with the Title I standards and assessment requirements. As a result, the ISDE is committed not only to coming into full compliance within three years, but to meeting a stringent, but reasonable, schedule for doing so. The action plan also demonstrates that the ISDE will be well

on its way to meeting the new standards and assessment requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The compliance agreement also sets out documentation and reporting procedures that the ISDE must follow. These provisions will allow the Assistant Secretary to ascertain promptly whether the ISDE is meeting each of its commitments under the compliance agreement and is on schedule to achieve full compliance within the effective period of the agreement.

The task of developing an assessment system that meets the Title I requirements is not a quick or easy one. However, the Assistant Secretary has determined that, given the commitment of the ISDE to comply with the terms and conditions of the compliance agreement, it is possible for the ISDE to come into full compliance with the Title I standards and assessment requirements within three years.

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Assistant Secretary finds the following: (1) That full compliance by the ISDE with the standards and assessment requirements of Title I is not feasible until a future date; and (2) that the ISDE can meet the terms and conditions of the attached compliance agreement and come into full compliance with the Title I standards and assessment requirements within three years of the date of these findings. Therefore, the Assistant Secretary has determined that it is appropriate to enter into a compliance agreement with the ISDE. Under the terms of 20 U.S.C. 1234f, that compliance agreement becomes effective on the date of these findings.

Dated: March 29, 2002.

Susan B. Neuman,

Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education.

Compliance Agreement Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Between the United States Department of Education and the Idaho State Department of Education

Introduction

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I) required each State, along with the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, to develop or adopt, by the 1997–98 school year, challenging content standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that describe what the State expects all students to know and be able to do. Title I also required each State to develop or adopt performance standards, aligned with its content

standards, that describe three levels of proficiency to determine how well students are mastering the content standards. Finally, by the 2000–2001 school year, Title I required each State to develop or adopt a set of student assessments in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that would be used to determine the yearly performance of schools in enabling students to meet the State's performance standards.

The Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) was not able to meet these requirements by the statutory deadlines. In order to be eligible to continue to receive Title I funds while working to comply with the statutory requirements, Dr. Marilyn Howard, Idaho's Superintendent of Public Instruction, indicated the Idaho SDE's interest in entering into a compliance agreement with the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) of the United States Department of Education. On December 13, 2001, OESE conducted a public hearing regarding Idaho SDE's ability to come into compliance with the Title I standards and assessment requirements within three years. Based on testimony at that hearing, the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education (Assistant Secretary) determined that compliance by Idaho SDE with the Title I standards and assessment requirements was genuinely not feasible until a future date because of the "magnitude and complexity of meeting those requirements." The Assistant Secretary also determined that a compliance agreement represents a viable means of bringing about compliance because of the steps Idaho SDE has already taken to address its noncompliance, its commitment of resources, and the plans it has developed for further action. These plans are summarized in the Commitments and Timetable below.

Pursuant to this Compliance Agreement under 20 V.S.C. sec. 1234f, Idaho SDE must be in full compliance with the requirements of Title I no later than three years from the date of the Assistant Secretary's written findings, a copy of which is attached to, and incorporated by reference into, this Agreement. Specifically, Idaho SDE must ensure and document that it will have met the following requirements:

1. Provide information on Idaho's proposed standards based assessment system. Provide a copy of the development contract for the new assessment system.
2. Provide evidence that performance standards have been developed and implemented and that they are aligned with Idaho's content standards.

3. Provide a copy of the Limited English Proficient student (LEP) inclusion policy and documentation of State approval. Include in the LEP policy information on accommodations for LEP students. Provide a plan for implementing the new LEP inclusion policies and for monitoring LEA compliance with the new inclusion policies when they are approved. Provide clear and concise information on the enrollment of LEP students and students with disabilities (SWD) in the state at the assessed grade levels and provide information on the number of LEP students and SWDs who take the standard form of the Idaho assessments and the Idaho assessments with accommodations, and the number of those students excluded from the Idaho assessment program.

4. Provide evidence that the components of the Idaho Assessment Program are aligned with Idaho standards. Provide evidence that Idaho assessments are cognitively complex. Identify gaps and weaknesses of the assessment system. Provide evidence on how the multiple measures incorporated in the Idaho Assessment Program affect the validity, reliability, and fairness of those assessments.

5. Provide technical information on each of the components of the Idaho Assessment Program. Provide information on how Idaho will ensure the fairness of its assessments for all students. Submit information on the technical quality of the Idaho alternate assessment for SWD as well as information that indicates the extent to which accommodations yield valid results for SWD.

6. Provide evidence that student performance will be disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, migrant status, disability (versus non-disability), economic disadvantage (versus non-disadvantaged), and limited English proficiency status at the school, district, and state levels.

7. Demonstrate that the Idaho SDE has developed or adopted a set of high-quality, yearly student assessments that will be used as the primary means of determining the yearly performance of each local educational agency and school served under Title I, Part A. Provide evidence that the accountability system will allow the results of the Idaho final assessment system to be the primary indicators of adequate yearly progress. Document the incorporation of performance data for SWD and LEP students into the reporting of results for assessment and accountability purposes.

8. Provide a plan for evaluating the adequate yearly progress of small schools and K–2 schools.

9. Describe plans to comply with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 assessment and accountability requirements.

During the period that this Compliance Agreement is in effect, Idaho SDE is eligible to receive Title I, Part A funds if it complies with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, as well as the provisions of Title I, Part A and other applicable federal statutory and regulatory requirements. Specifically, the Compliance Agreement sets forth below action steps Idaho SDE must meet to come into compliance with its Title I obligations.

Compliance Agreement, April 2002

U.S. Dept. of Education/Idaho State Dept. of Education

The action steps incorporated into this Compliance Agreement may be

amended by joint agreement of the parties, provided full compliance can still be accomplished by the expiration date of the Agreement.

In addition to all of the terms and conditions set forth above, Idaho agrees that its continued eligibility to receive Title I, Part A funds is predicated upon compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements of that program that have not been addressed by this Agreement, including the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

If the Idaho SDE fails to comply with any of the terms and conditions of this Compliance Agreement, including the action steps below, the U.S. Department of Education may consider the Agreement no longer in effect and may take any action authorized by law, including the withholding of funds or the issuance of a cease and desist order.

For Idaho's State Department of Education:
Dated: March 22, 2002.

Dr. Marilyn Howard,
Superintendent.

For the United States Department of Education:
Dated: March 22, 2002.

Susan B. Neuman,
Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Date this Compliance Agreement becomes effective (Date of Assistant Secretary's Written Decision and Findings): March 21, 2002.

Expiration Date of this Agreement: March 29, 2005.

Compliance Agreement, April 2002

U.S. Dept. of Education/Idaho State Dept. of Education

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

Idaho
Title I Compliance Agreement
Action Plan/Timeline

Goal 1: Provide information on Idaho's proposed standards based assessment system.

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
1.1	Develop a Memorandum of Understanding to secure services for test development, administration, scoring and reporting.	MOU signed by Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Board of Education, Committee Member Lists	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	April 30, 2002	State, Title I
1.2	Provide MOU to U.S. Department of Education.	MOU signed by Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Board of Education, Committee Member Lists	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	April 30, 2002	State, Title I
1.3	Negotiate and sign a contract for services needed to develop an assessment system.	Release of contract	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	April 30, 2002	State, Title II, Title VI, Special Education
1.4	Provide contract to U.S. Department of Education.	Signed contract	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	April 30, 2002	State, Title I
1.5	Grades 4 and 8: Complete detailed design, testing blueprint and implementation activities required to create test items and test forms adequate to serve the purposes specified in the State's assessment ensuring validity, reliability and fairness.	Test Design Document; Validity and Reliability Studies, Bias Review	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	August 31, 2002	State, Title III, Title VI, Title II, Special Education
1.6	Develop procedures for test administration, scoring, data analysis, and reporting to meet high technical standards.	Copies of protocol and procedures manual	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Special Education, Title I	Oct. 31, 2002 & on going	Title VI, Special Education, State
1.7	Develop reports that are technically adequate for school and district accountability.	Copies of reports and accountability standards	SDE, Bureau of Technology, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Special Education, Title I, Bureau of Federal Programs	Oct. 31, 2002 & on going	Title VI, Special Education, State
1.8	Administer pilot tests for grades 4, 8	Letter NWREL and Report re: Alignment Study	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	December 31, 2002	Title VI, State
1.9	Procedures for test administration, scoring, data analysis, and reporting to meet high technical standards sent to U.S. Department of Education.	Copies of protocol and procedures manual	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Special Education, Title I	Oct. 31, 2002	Title VI, Special Education, State
1.10	Final review for completeness of items and review for bias for grades 4 and 8.	Report from NWREL and NWEA	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	January 31, 2003	Title III, Title VI, State
1.11	Complete test items and review for bias to ensure that results measured the standards for students of diverse backgrounds.	Blueprints of Pilot Tests	SDE, State Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	October 31, 2002	Title VI, State, Title II, Title III

1.12	Grades: 4 and 8 Administer Grade 4 and 8 tests	Schedule for administration Written confirmation that the test was administered	SDE, Test Coordinator	May 31, 2003	Title I
1.13	Demonstrate that there will be no gaps in the assessment plan.	Copy of assessment plan for grades 4, 8, and 10 (as compared to previous plan) Reference State Board Rules on Thoroughness	SDE, State Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	April 30, 2003	Title II
1.14	Grade: 10 Complete detailed design, testing blueprint and implementation activities required to create test items and test forms adequate to serve the purposes specified in the State's assessment ensuring validity, reliability and fairness.	Test blueprint, Test design Document; Validity and Reliability Studies, Bias Review	State Board of Education	January 31, 2002	State Board of Education
1.15	Grade: 10 Complete test items and review for bias to ensure that results measured the standards for students of diverse backgrounds.	Test item specification document Reports of reviews	SDE, State Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I, State Board of Education	January 31, 2002	Title VI, State, Title II, Title III
1.16	Grade: 10 Administer field test of items to all 9 th graders and a representative sample of 10 th , 11 th , and 12 th graders.	Schedule for administration Written confirmation that the test was administered	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Title I, State Board of Education	April 30, 2002	State Board of Education
1.17	Grade: 10 Technical review of field-tested items.	Technical report of tested items (from NWEA)	State Board of Education, SDE, Test Coordinator	July 31, 2002	State Board of Education
1.18	Grade: 10 Pilot test	Schedule of pilot test dates Written confirmation that the test was administered	State Board of Education, SDE, Test Coordinator	October 31, 2002	State Board of Education
1.19	Grade: 10 Conduct an external alignment study of test to state standards.	Alignment study	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	January 31, 2003	Title II

1.20	Grade: 10 Final review for completeness of items and review for bias for grade 10.	Report from NWREL and NWEA	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	March 31, 2003	Title III, Title VI, State
1.21	Grade: 10 Administer Grade 10 ISAT.	Schedule for administration Written confirmation that the test was administered	State Board of Education, SDE, Test Coordinator	May 31, 2003	State Board of Education
1.22	Grades: 3,7 Complete detailed design, testing blueprint and implementation activities required to create test items and test forms adequate to serve the purposes specified in the State's assessment ensuring validity, reliability and fairness.	Test Design Document; Validity and Reliability Studies, Bias Review	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	Aug. 31, 2003	State, Title III, Title VI, Title II, Special Education
1.23	Complete test items and review for bias to ensure that results measured the standards for students of diverse backgrounds.	Blueprints of Pilot Tests	SDE, State Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	October 31, 2003	Title VI, State, Title II, Title III
1.24	Administer pilot tests for grades 3 and 7.	Letter NWREL and Report re: Alignment Study	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	December 31, 2003	Title VI, State
1.25	Conduct an external alignment study of test to state standards.	Alignment study	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	Jan. 31, 2004	Title VI
1.26	Final review for completeness of items and review for bias for grades 3 and 7.	Report from NWREL and NWEA	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	January 31, 2004	Title III, Title VI, State
1.27	Grades: 3 and 7 Administer Grade 3 and 7 tests	Schedule for administration Written confirmation that the test was administered	SDE, Test Coordinator	May 31, 2004	Title I
1.28	Demonstrate that there will be no gaps in the assessment plan.	Copy of assessment plan for grades 3,4,7,8, and 10 (as compared to previous plan) Reference State Board Rules on Thoroughness	SDE, State Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	April 30, 2004	Title VI
1.29	Grades: 5,6 Complete detailed design, testing blueprint and implementation activities required to create test items and test forms adequate to serve the purposes specified in the State's assessment ensuring validity, reliability and fairness.	Test Design Document; Validity and Reliability Studies, Bias Review	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	Aug. 31, 2004	State, Title III, Title VI, Title II, Special Education
1.30	Complete test items and review for bias to ensure that results measured the standards for students of diverse backgrounds.	Blueprints of Pilot Tests	SDE, State Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	October 31, 2004	Title VI, State, Title II, Title III

1.31	Administer pilot tests for grades 5 and 6.	Letter NWREL and Report re: Alignment Study	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	December 31, 2004	Title VI, State
1.32	Conduct an external alignment study of test to state standards.	Alignment study	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	Jan. 31, 2005	Title II
1.33	Final review for completeness of items and review for bias for grades 5 and 6.	Report from NWREL and NWEA	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	January 31, 2005	Title III, Title VI, State
1.34	Grades: 5 and 6 Administer Grade 5 and 6 tests	Schedule for administration Written confirmation that the test was administered	SDE, Test Coordinator	May 31, 2005	Title I
1.35	Demonstrate that there will be no gaps in the assessment plan.	Copy of assessment plan for grades 3,4,5, 6, 7,8, and 10 Reference State Board Rules on Thoroughness	SDE, State Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	April 30, 2005	Title VI
1.36	Administer tests.	Superintendent's letter with testing schedule	SDE, Test Coordinator	May 31, 2004	Title VI, Special Education, State

Goal 2: Provide evidence that performance standards have been developed and implemented and that they are aligned with Idaho's content standards and the Idaho assessment system that is being developed.

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
2.1	Establish a process for developing performance standards, including what processes will be involved in writing the descriptors e.g. reading/language arts and math with at least two performance levels, aligned with content standards, challenging for all, broad based involvement, and performance standards the same for all students.	Written narrative outlining the process Descriptor development agenda Power Point presentations by consultants Descriptor development routine	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Federal Programs	August 31, 2002	Title I, State, Title II
2.2	Determine performance levels that describe at least two levels of high performance: such as Proficient and Advanced, to determine how well students are mastering the material in Idaho's Content Standards and a third performance level: such as Partially Proficient, to provide complete information of lower performing students towards achieving the proficient and advanced levels of performance.	Copy of Performance Levels Description of Process	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Title I, Bureau of Federal Programs, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2002	Title I, State, Title II
2.3	Document involvement of a broad base of education stakeholders in the development of performance descriptors ensuring diversity in the composition of the group, especially in the areas of expertise in special education and limited English proficient expertise.	Committee Members Outline of work plan Meeting agendas	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Title I, Bureau of Special Education, LEP	August 31, 2002	Title I, State, Title II
2.4	Document that the State has formally approved the draft performance descriptors.	Letter from State Superintendent of Public Instruction	Federal Bureau Chief	August 31, 2002	Title I, State
2.5	Develop grades 4, 8, and 10 performance descriptors to be sent to U.S. Department of Education.	Written descriptors Written description of the process used to develop Letter from State Superintendent of Public Instruction	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Title I	August 31, 2002	Title I, State, Title II
2.6	Review and finalize performance descriptors based on pilot assessment results.	Finalized written descriptors Agenda	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and	December 31, 2002	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
2.7	Administer on grade level, state approved assessment for grades 4, 8, and 10, based on content standards and draft performance descriptors.	Committee Lists Test Blueprints, MOU, Copies of Reports	Accountability, Bureau of Special Education SDE, Test Coordinator	May 31, 2003	Title VI, State
2.8	Document involvement of a broad base of education stakeholders in the setting of cut scores ensuring diversity in the composition of the group, including expertise in the areas of special education and limited English proficiency.	Committee Lists Agenda	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2003	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.9	Set cut scores on assessments by selecting a process and finalize procedures.	Description of the process for setting cut scores Cut Score Recommendations determined from technical information Formulas for Standard and Alternate Assessment Alternate Assessment Portfolio and Administrator's Manual	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2003	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.10	Document that all students are included in the cut scores and that the cut scores are challenging for all students.	Summary of participation Testing Contractor NWREL Policy Governing Thoroughness and inclusion of all students	SDE, Test Coordinator Bureau of Federal Programs, NWEA	August 31, 2003	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.11	Document that the State has formally approved the performance standards.	Letter from State Superintendent of Public Instruction	Federal Bureau Chief	August 31, 2003	Title I, State
2.12	Document that the cut scores are aligned with the performance standards and the content standards.	Final Alignment Study Report	SDE, Test Coordinator Bureau of Federal Programs	August 31, 2003	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.13	Review and finalize performance standards based on assessment results that are aligned with the content standards for grades 4 and 8.	Finalized written descriptors Agenda Committee Lists	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	December 31, 2003	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
2.14	Send documentation to the U.S. Department of Education for formal peer review of performance cut scores.		SDE, Test Coordinator Bureau of Federal Programs	December 31, 2003	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.15	Grades 3 and 7: Develop Grades 3 and 7 performance descriptors to be sent to U.S. Department of Education.	Written descriptors Written description of the process used to develop Letter from State Superintendent of Public Instruction	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Title I	August 31, 2003	Title I, State, Title II
2.16	Review and finalize grades 3 and 7 performance descriptors based on pilot assessment results.	Finalized written descriptors Agenda Committee Lists	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	December 31, 2003	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.17	Administer developed assessments based on content standards and draft performance descriptors.	Test Blueprints, MOU, Copies of Reports	SDE, Test Coordinator	May 31, 2004	Title VI, State
2.18	Document involvement of a broad base of education stakeholders in the setting of cut scores ensuring diversity in the composition of the group, including expertise in the areas of special education and limited English proficiency.	Committee Lists Agenda	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.19	Set cut scores on assessments by selecting a process and finalize procedures.	Description of the process for setting cut scores Cut Score Recommendations determined from technical information Formulas for Standard and Alternate Assessment Alternate Assessment Portfolio and Administrator's Manual	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.20	Document that all students are included in the cut scores and that the cut scores are challenging for all students.	Summary of participation Testing Contractor NWREL Policy Governing Thoroughness and inclusion of all students	SDE, Test Coordinator Bureau of Federal Programs, NWEA	August 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
2.21	Document that the State has formally approved the performance standards.	Letter from State Superintendent of Public Instruction	Federal Bureau Chief	August 31, 2004	Title I, State
2.22	Document that the cut scores are aligned with the performance standards and the content standards.	Final Alignment Study Report	SDE, Test Coordinator Bureau of Federal Programs	August 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.23	Review and finalize performance standards based on assessment results that are aligned with the content standards for grades 4 and 8.	Finalized written descriptors Agenda Committee Lists	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	December 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.24	Send documentation to the U.S. Department of Education for formal peer review of performance cut scores.		SDE, Test Coordinator Bureau of Federal Programs	December 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.25	Grades 3 and 7: Develop Grades 3 and 7 performance descriptors to be sent to U.S. Department of Education.	Written descriptors Written description of the process used to develop	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Title I	August 31, 2003	Title I, State, Title II
2.26	Review and finalize grades 3 and 7 performance descriptors based on pilot assessment results.	Letter from State Superintendent of Public Instruction Finalized written descriptors Agenda Committee Lists	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	December 31, 2003	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.27	Administer developed assessments based on content standards and draft performance descriptors.	Test Blueprints, MOU, Copies of Reports	SDE, Test Coordinator	May 31, 2004	Title VI, State
2.28	Document involvement of a broad base of education stakeholders in the setting of cut scores ensuring diversity in the composition of the group, including expertise in the areas of special education and limited English proficiency.	Committee Lists Agenda	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.29	Set cut scores on assessments by selecting a process and finalize procedures.	Description of the process for setting cut scores Cut Score Recommendations determined from technical information Formulas for Standard and Alternate Assessment	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State

Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
2.30	Document that all students are included in the cut scores and that the cut scores are challenging for all students.	Alternate Assessment Portfolio and Administrator's Manual Summary of participation Testing Contractor NWREL Policy Governing Thoroughness and inclusion of all students	August 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.31	Document that the State has formally approved the performance standards.	Letter from State Superintendent of Public Instruction	August 31, 2004	Title I, State
2.32	Document that the cut scores are aligned with the performance standards and the content standards.	Final Alignment Study Report	August 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.33	Review and finalize performance standards based on assessment results that are aligned with the content standards for grades 4 and 8.	Finalized written descriptors Agenda Committee Lists	December 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.34	Send documentation to the U.S. Department of Education for formal peer review of performance cut scores.	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	December 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.35	Grades 5 and 6: Develop Grades 5 and 6 performance descriptors to be sent to U.S. Department of Education.	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Title I	August 31, 2004	Title I, State, Title II
2.36	Review and finalize grades 5 and 6 performance descriptors based on pilot assessment results.	Letter from State Superintendent of Public Instruction Finalized written descriptors Agenda Committee Lists	December 31, 2004	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.37	Administer developed assessments based on content standards and draft performance descriptors.	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	May 31, 2005	Title VI, State
2.38	Document involvement of a broad base of education stakeholders in the setting of cut scores ensuring diversity in the composition of the group, including expertise in the areas of special education and limited English proficiency.	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2005	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
2.39	Set cut scores on assessments by selecting a process and finalize procedures.	Description of the process for setting cut scores Cut Score Recommendations determined from technical information Formulas for Standard and Alternate Assessment Alternate Assessment Portfolio and Administrator's Manual	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2005	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.40	Document that all students are included in the cut scores and that the cut scores are challenging for all students.	Summary of participation Testing Contractor NWREL	SDE, Test Coordinator Bureau of Federal Programs, NWEA	August 31, 2005	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.41	Document that the State has formally approved the performance standards.	Policy Governing Thoroughness and inclusion of all students Letter from State Superintendent of Public Instruction	Federal Bureau Chief	August 31, 2005	Title I, State
2.42	Document that the cut scores are aligned with the performance standards and the content standards.	Final Alignment Study Report	SDE, Test Coordinator Bureau of Federal Programs	August 31, 2005	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.43	Review and finalize performance standards based on assessment results that are aligned with the content standards for grades 4 and 8.	Finalized written descriptors Agenda Committee Lists	SDE, Bureau of Federal Programs, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	December 31, 2005	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State
2.44	Send documentation to the U.S. Department of Education for formal peer review of performance cut scores.		SDE, Test Coordinator Bureau of Federal Programs	December 31, 2005	Title I, Title VI, Special Education State

Goal 3: Provide a copy of the LEP and SWD inclusion policy and provide documentation showing it has been approved by the State Board of Education. Idaho will provide clear and concise information on the enrollment of LEP students and SWD in the State at the assessed grade levels and the number of those students who take the standard form of the Idaho assessment, the Idaho Assessment with accommodations, and the number of students excluded from the Idaho assessment program.

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
3.1	Develop consistent coding assignments on student protocols for statewide assessments.	Coding assignments will be implemented for all state assessments.	Bureau of Special Education, Bureau of Curriculum & Accountability	June 30, 2002	Special Education, State
3.2	Modify LEP and SWD policy that includes information on accommodations for LEP and SWD students.	Copy of Policy and Rules governing Thoroughness: 111- Assessments in Public Schools; 04- Testing Populations	SDE, Title I, LEP, Bureau of Special Education, SBOE	August 31, 2002	Title III, Title I,
3.3	Provide clear and concise information on the enrollment of LEP and SWD students in the State at the assessed grade levels	Copies of Disaggregated Test Reports School Profiles Annual LEP Child Count December 1 Annual Child Count information (Child count procedure are included) and performance Report Annual Legislative Report Special study commissioned by legislature (HCR 54) Test Guidelines and Manual	SDE, LEP, Bureau of Special Education, State Test Coordinator, Title I	August 31, 2002	State, Title III, Title VI, Special Education
3.4	Investigate the accommodations and/or adaptations for LEP and SWD taking the tests under development with NWEA.		SDE, Test Coordinator, LEP, Bureau of Special Education	December 31, 2002	State, Title III, Title II, Special Education

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
3.5	Develop a plan to modify, based on new assessments, Idaho's inclusion policy, to include accommodations or adaptations for LEP students and SWD.	Copy of new guidelines and policy Superintendent of Public Instructions approval letter	SDE, Test Coordinator, LEP, Bureau of Special Education	January 31, 2003	State, Title III, Special Education Title II
3.6	Develop a plan for implementing the LEP and SWD inclusion policies and for monitoring LEA compliance with the inclusion policies.	Dissemination of plan to LEAs and public Agenda on community meetings	SDE, Test Coordinator, LEP, Bureau of Special Education	January 31, 2003	State, Title III, Special Education
3.7	All LEP and SWD will be required to take state assessments (with or without accommodations/adaptations) and the results will be included in the state's accountability reports.	State's Accountability Reports	SDE, Test Coordinator, LEP, Bureau of Special Education, Contractor NWEA	May 31, 2003	State, Title III, Special Education Title II
3.8	Provide information on the number of LEP and SWD students who take the standard form of the Idaho assessments.	Copy of Disaggregated Testing data	SDE, Test Coordinator, LEP, Bureau of Special Education, Contractor NWEA	July 31, 2003	State, Special Education
3.9	Provide complete participation data for students with disabilities and LEP students so that the State's inclusion policies relating to assessment, reporting, and accountability can be evaluated and submit to U.S. Department of Education	Participation Report	Office of Technology and Information Services SDE, Test Coordinator, LEP, Bureau of Special Education, Contractor NWEA	August 31, 2003	State, Special Education
3.10	Provide the number of LEP and SWD students excluded from the Idaho assessment program.	Annual Testing Reports and test manual	SDE, Test Coordinator, LEP, Bureau of Special Education, Contractor NWEA	August 31, 2003	State, Special Education
3.11	Ensure consistent implementation of standards and assessment with regard to students with disabilities.	Bureau of Special Education Implementation Manual, September 2002 Idaho Alternate Assessment Administration Manual, 2001 Training modules on IEP assessment decisions	Bureau of Special Education	April 30, 2002	Bureau of Special Education, State
3.12	Document all districts in Idaho currently use the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IAA) for students who are not able to participate in the general statewide assessments.	Participation data reported on state and district data reports. Results from 2001-2002 IAA will be evaluated by an outside contractor	Bureau of Special Education	April 30, 2002	

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
3.13	Ensure broad based participation in the development and piloting of the IAA.	Final report from Dr. Stephen Elliott on the 2000-2001 evaluation of the Idaho Alternate Assessment	Bureau of Special Education	April 30, 2002	
3.14	Provide disaggregated assessment performance data on students with disabilities.	Annual district data reports Bureau of Special Education monitoring system Title I Annual Performance Report	Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2003	Special Education

Goal 4: Provide evidence that the components of the Idaho assessment program are aligned with Idaho standards. Provide evidence that Idaho assessments are cognitively complex. Identify gaps and weaknesses of the assessment system. Provide evidence on how the multiple measures incorporated in the Idaho assessment program affect the validity, reliability, and fairness of those assessments.

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
4.1	Develop a process to ensure alignment of content standards for grades 4, 8, and 10, with the assessment. Consider validity, reliability and cognitive complexity.	Agreement with NWREL detailing services	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	August 31, 2002	Title I, Title VI, State Title II
4.2	Idaho will contract with experts to conduct studies with regard to new assessment system to assure that it is aligned with Idaho content and performance standards.	Test Contractor Report NWREL contract for alignment study Alternate Assessment alignment study by Dr. Stephen Elliott	SDE, Test Coordinator Title I, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2002	Title I Title II State Special Education
4.3	Document how performance descriptors are aligned with the content standards.	NWREL Alignment Report	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Title I	August 31, 2003	Title I, State, Title II
4.4	Complete an analysis of the alignment of the assessment and standards identifying any gaps and weaknesses in the alignment.	NWREL Alignment Report	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	August 31, 2003	Title II, Title I, Title VI, State
4.5	Complete any needed adjustments in the test forms for grades 4, 8, 10.	NWREL Alignment Report NWEA technical report	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs	December 31, 2003	Title VI, Special Education, State
4.6	Results of alignment study sent to U.S. Department of Education.	Alignment Study	SDE, Test Coordinator	March 31, 2004	Title VI, Special Education, State

Goal 5: Provide technical information on each of the components of the Idaho Assessment Program. Provide information on how Idaho will ensure the fairness of its assessments for all students. Submit information on the technical quality of Idaho's alternate assessments for SWD as well as information that indicates the extent to which accommodations yield valid results for SWD.

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
5.1	Establish external technical advisory team to review technical quality of the Idaho assessment system.	List of team members Vitea of team members Minutes from quarterly meetings	State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Test Coordinator,	April 31, 2002	Title II
5.2	Complete detailed design, testing blueprint and implementation activities required to create test items and test forms adequate to serve the purposes specified in the State's assessment ensuring validity, reliability and fairness for grades 4, 8, and 10.	Test Design Document; Validity and Reliability Studies, Bias Review	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Federal Programs, Title I	August 31, 2002	State, Title III, Title VI, Title II, Special Education
5.3	Provide evidence that Idaho assessments possess cognitive complexity.	Test Contractor Report NWREL Alignment Study	SDE, Test Coordinator Title I, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability	January 31, 2003	Title I Title II State
5.4	Identify gaps and weaknesses of the assessment system.	Test Blueprints Test Contractor Report	SDE, Test Coordinator Title I, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability	January 31, 2003	Title I Title II State
5.5	Provide evidence on how the multiple measures that have been incorporated in the Idaho Assessment Program affect the validity, reliability, equity, lack of bias, and fairness of those assessments.	NWREL Alignment Study Test Contractor Report NWREL Alignment Study	SDE, Test Coordinator Title I, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability	January 31, 2003	Title I Title II State
5.6	Review of technical quality sent to U.S. Department of Education.	Technical Quality Reports	SDE, Test Coordinator	August 31, 2003	Title VI, Special Education, State
5.7	Develop technical manuals that contain such information as validity, reliability, fairness/accessibility, cognitive complexity, and comparability of results.	Technical Manuals	SDE, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Special Education, Title I	August 31, 2003	Title VI, Special Education, State

Goal 6: Provide evidence that student performance will be disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, migrant status, disability (versus non-disability), economic disadvantage (versus non-disadvantaged), and limited English proficiency status at the school, district, and state level.

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
6.1	Describe procedures for annually reporting results.	Annual School, District, and State Accountability Report Cards	SDE Continuous School Improvement Team and Bureau of Technology	August 31, 2002	State, Title I, Title VI
6.2	Provide a workplan and timeline for the development and dissemination of these performance profiles for every district and school.	Workplan and Timeline	SDE Continuous School Improvement Team and Bureau of Technology	August 31, 2002	State, Title I, Title VI
6.3	Document that all students are included in school profiles.	Annual School, District, and State Accountability Report Cards	SDE Continuous School Improvement Team and Bureau of Technology	August 31, 2002	State, Title I, Title VI
6.4	Develop template for Continuous School Improvement Profile and Processes.	Minutes of Workgroup Meetings	SDE Continuous School Improvement Team and Bureau of Technology	August 31, 2002	State, Title I, Title VI
6.5	Implement data collection system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statewide training of teachers and stakeholders • Redesign assessment answer sheets • Establish a uniform code for information about the participation of sub-population groups 	Workplan and Timeline Agenda Minutes of Meetings Power Point Presentations	SDE Continuous School Improvement Team and Bureau of Technology	August 31, 2002	State, Title I, Title VI
6.6	Design a reporting template that has all reporting categories of disaggregated student achievement by student performance levels.	Reporting Template SDE Web Site	SDE Continuous School Improvement Team and Bureau of Technology	August 31, 2002	State, Title I, Title VI

Goal 7: Demonstrate that the State has developed or adopted a set of high-quality, yearly student assessments that will be used as the primary means of determining the yearly performance of each local educational agency and school served under Title I, Part A. Provide evidence that the accountability system will allow the results of the Idaho final assessment system to be the primary indicator of adequate yearly progress. Document the incorporation of performance data for SWD and LEP students into the reporting of results for assessment and accountability purposes.

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
7.1	Describe the plan to include only State level tests, as outlined in our assessment plan and compliance agreement to be used as the academic measures of progress in the accountability system will allow the results of the Idaho final assessment system, and to be the primary indicators of adequate yearly progress.	Copy of proposed state assessment plan for the next five years State Board of Education Rules Governing Thoroughness Memorandum of Understanding with NWEA	SDE, Test Coordinator, Title I, State Superintendent of Public Instruction	June 30, 2002	Title I, State, Title II
7.2	Idaho will develop a definition of adequate yearly progress that requires continuous improvement towards goal of having all students reaching proficiency.	AYP guide 2003 Consolidated State Plan	Test Coordinator, Title I, Federal Bureau Chief	August 31, 2002	Title I, State, Title II

Goal 8: Provide a plan for evaluating the AYP of its small schools and K-2 schools.

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
8.1	Research various strategies for evaluating AYP in small schools and K-2 schools.	Samples from other states	SDE, Title I, State, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2002	Title I, Title II
8.2	Design a plan that will include performance of multiple grades for evaluating AYP of small schools and K-2 schools incorporating assessment data from state assessments.	Copy of plan and description of process	SDE, Title I, State, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Special Education	June 30, 2002	Title I, Title II

Goal 9: Comply with the NCLB Act of 2001 assessment and accountability requirements.

	Component or Measurable Outcome	Documentation	Office Responsible	Date	Fiscal Resources
9.1	Compliance agreement will have until 6 months from the date of the agreement or 30 days after publication of final regulations (whichever comes first) to determine the specific tasks and dates required to satisfy each goal of NCLB.	Documented in Consolidated Application	Title I	Oct. 31, 2002	State and Title II
9.2	Technical assistance pending from US Department of Education.	Documented in Consolidated Application Letter requesting USDE assistance	US Dept of Ed	March 31, 2002 and ongoing	US Department of Education
9.3	Participation in the National Assessment of Educational Progress in 2003 and 2005 and, if selected, participation in the field test in off years.	Documented in Consolidated Application	Federal Programs and Test Coordinator	March 31, 2002 and ongoing	NAEP
9.4	Content standards in science: Distributed for stakeholder review and comment Completed and adopted by Board of Education	List of participants involved in developing and reviewing MCREL Summary Report Administrative Rules of State Board of Education Idaho Achievement Standards approved by Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, August 2001	Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability	April 8, 2001	State Resources

9.5	<p>Develop standards-based assessments in remaining grades 3-8</p> <p>Complete test blueprint</p> <p>Develop & field test items</p> <p>Pilot assessments in the grades not tested in 2004</p>	<p>Test blueprint</p> <p>Field test data</p> <p>Pilot administration manual</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding with Contractor, SDE, and SBOE</p>	<p>LEP, Title I, Bureau of Special Education, Test Coordinator, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability</p>	<p>Fall 2003</p> <p>Spring 2004</p> <p>Spring 2005</p>	<p>State and Title VI</p>
9.6	<p>Distribution of an itemized score analysis to support instructional improvement.</p>	<p>Sample report based on test administered in 2001-02</p>	<p>SDE, Test Coordinator, NWEA</p>	<p>August 31, 2003</p>	<p>State and Title VI</p>
9.7	<p>Implementation of the English language proficiency testing required under Title I and Title III</p> <p>Identify test that will be used</p> <p>Administer to all LEP students</p> <p>Define annual measurable objectives for gains in English proficiency as required in Sec. 3122</p> <p>Report results as required by NCLB</p> <p>Language proficiency must be assessed two years after exiting program.</p>	<p>Instructions to schools, test administration manuals, sample reports</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding with Contractor</p>	<p>LEP, Title I, Bureau of Special Education, Test Coordinator</p>	<p>2002-03 and Annually thereafter</p>	<p>Title III, Title II, Title VI, and Special Education</p>
9.8	<p>Distribution of a state report card as required under Section 1111 of Title I. State report card must include the following assessment components by dates shown</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disaggregated student achievement results by performance level by August 31, 2002 Percent of students not tested, disaggregated by August 31, 2002 Comparison between annual objectives and actual performance for each student group by August 31, 2004 <p>All other report card requirements must be met as quickly as possible, consistent with implementation of final assessments.</p>	<p>Copy of state report card</p>	<p>Test Coordinator, Bureau of Special Education, Title I</p>	<p>August 2002 and ongoing</p>	<p>State, Title VI, Special Education</p>
9.9	<p>Continued identification of schools in need of improvement, based on data from the current assessment(s) for all children in the grades assessed and, to also include:</p>	<p>Description of school accountability system, to include the data source (assessments) and formula or decision sequence used to</p>	<p>Test Coordinator, Bureau of Special Education, Title I</p>	<p>August 31, 2002 and ongoing</p>	<p>State, Title V, Special Education</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance of subgroups (of statistically reliable size) • Application of the 95% participation rule • HS graduation and the other indicators required by NCLB 	<p>determine school classifications.</p> <p>List of schools & districts identified for improvement</p>			
9.10	<p>Establish AYP baseline, based on data from the new assessment(s) for all children in the grades assessed</p> <p>Use transitional rules under NCLB, Sec. 1116 to identify schools in need of improvement</p>	<p>Communication of baseline values and AYP design to schools and districts</p> <p>List of schools & districts identified for improvement</p>	Title I, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2003	State, Title I, Special Education
9.11	<p>Annual report to the Secretary as described in Section 1111(h)(4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on State progress in developing all required academic assessments (2002-03) • Student achievement data, disaggregated (2002-03) • Data on acquisition of English proficiency by LEP (2002-03) • Number and names of schools identified for school improvement, the reason for identification, and measures taken to address achievement problems • Number of students and schools that participated in public school choice and supplemental services • Information on quality of teachers and percent of classes taught by highly qualified (2002-03) 	<p>Data will be reported as part of the Annual Title I Performance Report</p>	Title I, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2002 and Annually thereafter	State, Title I, Special Education
9.12	<p>All other requirements of NCLB pertaining to schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring during the period of the compliance agreement</p>	<p>Implementation and documentation of choice, supplemental services, corrective actions, as appropriate</p>	Title I, Bureau of Curriculum and Accountability, Bureau of Special Education	August 31, 2002 and ongoing	State, Title I, Special Education