CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16

PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION

SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (*ESEA*), as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies–State, local, and Federal–is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2015-16 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013 -14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005 -06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED*Facts* submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2015-16 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2015-16 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

	OMB Number: 1810-0724
	Expiration Date: 5/31/2018

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2015-16 ___Part II, 2015-16

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Idaho State Board of Education

Address:
650 W. State Street, Room 307
Boise, ID 83702

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Alison Henken

Telephone: 208-332-1579

Fax: 208-334-2632

e-mail: alison.henken@osbe.idaho.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Idaho State Board of Education

_____ __Tuesday, April 11, 2017, 4:45:38 PM__
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2015-16

PART I DUE DECEMBER 15, 2016
5PM EST

1.1 Standards and Assessment Development

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA),* as amended, academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

Response	Options
	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	N/A	N/A	SY 2017-18

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

There have been no substantial revisions to Idaho's content standards. The state is planning to revise the K-12 science standards. The Idaho State Board of Education will be considering a temporary rule to adjust the standards at its December 2016 meeting. If the Board approves the rule, the standards will go into effect in 2017-2018, pending legislative approval. Since the Idaho Legislature must confirm agency rules, including those to adjust academic standards, it is possible that the standards could be confirmed during the 2017 session (implementation 2017-2018) or that they could be delayed until the 2018 session (implementation 2018-2019) or later.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

Response	Options
State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	**Mathematics**	**Reading/Language Arts**	**Science**
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

The state is planning to revise the K-12 science standards. The Idaho State Board of Education will be considering a temporary rule to adjust the standards at its December 2016 meeting. If the Board approves the rule, the standards will go into effect in 2017-2018, pending legislative approval. Since the Idaho Legislature must confirm agency rules, including those to adjust academic standards, it is possible that the standards could be confirmed during the 2017 session (implementation 2017-18) or that they could be delayed until the 2018 session (implementation 2018-19) or later. Once the Board approves new standards and those standards are confirmed by the legislature, the state will begin the process of developing new assessments (and alternate assessment, as needed) to align to the new science standards. Because the latest option offered above 2017-18 and it is unlikely that new science assessments would be implemented prior to 2018-19, we have marked N/A above.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the States academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the States academic assessments were most recently approved through ED"s peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA.*

Response	Options
No Revisions or changes	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2015-16) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

We cannot plan to revise the science assessments until the Idaho Legislature approves adoption of revised science standards. While the legislature will be presented with the option to do so during the 2017 legislative session, it is possible the legislature will delay consideration / adoption to 2018 or later. Once the Idaho Legislature approves adoption of new standards, the state will begin working to develop new assessments aligned to those standards. The earliest possible year for implementation of new science assessments would be 2018-2019.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2015-16, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	10.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	90.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Nearly all grant funds received for state assessments were paid towards the administration of the assessments.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2015-16 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by Section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by Section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	No
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (*IDEA*) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 Participation in State Assessment [2]

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

[2] The " Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *ESEA*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973*.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	154,733	98.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,825	99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	2,419	99
Asian	S	1,944	99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	475	99
Black or African American	S	1,572	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	27,806	99.1
White	S	117,365	98.2
Two or more races	S	3,746	98.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	16,253	97.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,116	98.9
Economically disadvantaged students	S	77,015	98.6
Migratory students	S	1,669	99
Male	S	79,588	98.4
Female	S	75,145	98.4

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.For the current report, we identified migrant status in a different manner than we have in previous years (and the same as was done for CSPR section 2.3), making it bound by dates through our migrant student data system, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files have been updated and resubmitted to reflect this change. The latest SY1415 C188 shows 1488 students enrolled. This results in an increase of 13%, which contradicts the error displayed above.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities *(IDEA)* in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities *(IDEA)* participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities *(IDEA)* who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities *(IDEA)* participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities *(IDEA)*. Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973*.

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,447	70.43
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,002	18.47
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,804	11.10
Total	16,253	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	154,907	98.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,824	99
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	2,413	99
Asian	S	1,940	99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	473	98
Black or African American	S	1,558	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	27,823	99.2
White	S	117,536	98.4
Two or more races	S	3,753	99.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	16,280	97.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	6,079	98.4
Economically disadvantaged students	S	77,090	98.7
Migratory students	S	1,662	99
Male	S	79,685	98.5
Female	S	75,222	98.5

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.For the current report, we identified migrant status in a different manner than we have in previous years (and the same as was done for CSPR section 2.3), making it bound by dates through our migrant student data system, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files have been updated and resubmitted to reflect this change. The latest SY1415 C188 shows 1488 students enrolled. This results in an increase of 13%, which contradicts the error displayed above.

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	199

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities *(IDEA)* in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973*.
Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities *(IDEA)* who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,151	43.93
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,321	44.97
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,807	11.10
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	1	0.01
Total	16,280	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	67,078	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	758	98
Asian or Pacific Islander	S	1,112	>=99
Asian	S	918	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	194	>=95
Black or African American	S	712	99
Hispanic or Latino	S	11,692	99.0
White	S	51,253	98.7
Two or more races	S	1,551	99
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	6,458	97.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	2,242	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	31,170	98.6
Migratory students	S	668	97
Male	S	34,485	98.7
Female	S	32,593	98.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities *(IDEA)* in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973*.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,127	32.94
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,603	55.79
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	728	11.27
Total	6,458	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.3 Student Academic Achievement [3]

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities *(IDEA)*. The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the States reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the States reading/language arts assesment. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the States science assessment administered at least once in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

[3] The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	23,020	S	52.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	251	S	25
Asian or Pacific Islander	332	S	61
Asian	273	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	46
Black or African American	242	S	27
Hispanic or Latino	4,395	S	31.7
White	17,207	S	57.7
Two or more races	593	S	56
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,595	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,358	S	14
Economically disadvantaged students	12,677	S	42.0
Migratory students	299	S	25
Male	11,858	S	53.3
Female	11,162	S	50.8
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Academic achievement numbers and percentages include students participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.			

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,995	S	49.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	251	S	27
Asian or Pacific Islander	331	S	56
Asian	272	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	44
Black or African American	231	S	28
Hispanic or Latino	4,379	S	29.4
White	17,210	S	54.6
Two or more races	593	S	55
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,598	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,320	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	12,650	S	39.2
Migratory students	289	S	19
Male	11,844	S	45.8
Female	11,151	S	52.9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Academic achievement numbers and percentages include students participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.The statewide science assessment is not administered in grade 3.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,522	S	47.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	276	S	24
Asian or Pacific Islander	295	S	52
Asian	234	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	61	S	28
Black or African American	194	S	21
Hispanic or Latino	4,134	S	25.4
White	17,011	S	53.0
Two or more races	612	S	45
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,561	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,091	S	7
Economically disadvantaged students	12,137	S	35.8
Migratory students	261	S	18
Male	11,525	S	48.9
Female	10,997	S	45.2
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Academic achievement numbers and percentages include students participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.			

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,513	S	49.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	274	S	29
Asian or Pacific Islander	290	S	55
Asian	229	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	61	S	43
Black or African American	186	S	28
Hispanic or Latino	4,125	S	28.6
White	17,026	S	55.4
Two or more races	612	S	51
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,562	S	18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,060	S	7
Economically disadvantaged students	12,127	S	38.3
Migratory students	256	S	18
Male	11,524	S	46.2
Female	10,989	S	53.6
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Academic achievement numbers and percentages include students participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.The statewide science assessment is not administered in grade 4.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,684	S	40.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	18
Asian or Pacific Islander	362	S	49
Asian	306	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	56	S	29
Black or African American	262	S	21
Hispanic or Latino	4,238	S	20.1
White	16,999	S	45.5
Two or more races	548	S	38
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,580	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,062	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	11,902	S	29.0
Migratory students	271	S	10
Male	11,710	S	42.1
Female	10,974	S	37.8

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

Based on our analysis, Idaho believes the reported numbers for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are accurate and that the increase in the number of reported students is due to an increasing English Learning population in the state and districts more accurately reporting and coding English Learners in their data (the state has provided training in recent years).

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,673	S	53.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	29
Asian or Pacific Islander	356	S	62
Asian	301	S	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	55	S	49
Black or African American	252	S	38
Hispanic or Latino	4,226	S	33.1
White	17,014	S	59.4
Two or more races	550	S	55
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,581	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,027	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	11,890	S	42.4
Migratory students	265	S	21
Male	11,704	S	48.2
Female	10,969	S	59.9

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

Based on our analysis, Idaho believes the reported numbers for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are accurate and that the increase in the number of reported students is due to an increasing English Learning population in the state and districts more accurately reporting and coding English Learners in their data (the state has provided training in recent years).

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,626	S	63.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	37
Asian or Pacific Islander	360	S	68
Asian	304	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	56	S	54
Black or African American	263	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	4,219	S	39.0
White	16,963	S	69.6
Two or more races	546	S	65
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,552	S	28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,054	S	12
Economically disadvantaged students	11,868	S	51.7
Migratory students	267	S	21
Male	11,671	S	62.7
Female	10,955	S	63.3

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

Based on our analysis, Idaho believes the reported numbers for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are accurate and that the increase in the number of reported students is due to an increasing English Learning population in the state and districts more accurately reporting and coding English Learners in their data (the state has provided training in recent years).

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,236	S	39.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	298	S	16
Asian or Pacific Islander	342	S	52
Asian	266	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	76	S	32
Black or African American	206	S	23
Hispanic or Latino	3,995	S	20.0
White	16,871	S	44.7
Two or more races	524	S	43
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,409	S	12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	755	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	11,234	S	27.1
Migratory students	234	S	12
Male	11,447	S	39.4
Female	10,789	S	40.1

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,235	S	50.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	298	S	25
Asian or Pacific Islander	340	S	62
Asian	264	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	76	S	46
Black or African American	193	S	34
Hispanic or Latino	3,981	S	32.3
White	16,897	S	55.1
Two or more races	526	S	53
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,410	S	11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	719	S	5
Economically disadvantaged students	11,216	S	37.4
Migratory students	228	S	23
Male	11,451	S	44.3
Female	10,784	S	57.0

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.The statewide science assessment is not administered in grade 6.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,927	S	41.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	269	S	19
Asian or Pacific Islander	336	S	53
Asian	277	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	39
Black or African American	222	S	20
Hispanic or Latino	3,783	S	22.4
White	16,790	S	46.6
Two or more races	527	S	40
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,252	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	642	S	7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,373	S	28.7
Migratory students	206	S	12
Male	11,298	S	42.4
Female	10,629	S	41.0

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,931	S	52.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	S	30
Asian or Pacific Islander	330	S	60
Asian	271	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	41
Black or African American	212	S	33
Hispanic or Latino	3,763	S	34.2
White	16,827	S	57.2
Two or more races	529	S	54
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,257	S	13
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	598	S	7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,357	S	39.8
Migratory students	201	S	19
Male	11,299	S	46.4
Female	10,632	S	59.3

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,855	S	53.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	268	S	31
Asian or Pacific Islander	335	S	60
Asian	276	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	59	S	34
Black or African American	216	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	3,750	S	30.7
White	16,762	S	59.6
Two or more races	524	S	56
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,224	S	20
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	625	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	10,313	S	41.0
Migratory students	202	S	16
Male	11,248	S	56.1
Female	10,607	S	51.7

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,725	S	38.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	262	S	16
Asian or Pacific Islander	373	S	50
Asian	284	S	54
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	89	S	36
Black or African American	229	S	20
Hispanic or Latino	3,767	S	18.7
White	16,601	S	43.3
Two or more races	493	S	38
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,142	S	11
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	646	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	10,151	S	25.5
Migratory students	215	S	15
Male	11,133	S	37.7
Female	10,592	S	39.3
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Academic achievement numbers and percentages include students participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.			

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,727	S	53.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	262	S	31
Asian or Pacific Islander	370	S	63
Asian	282	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	88	S	49
Black or African American	224	S	33
Hispanic or Latino	3,753	S	35.7
White	16,626	S	58.3
Two or more races	492	S	53
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,153	S	12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	612	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	10,142	S	41.2
Migratory students	208	S	24
Male	11,130	S	46.7
Female	10,597	S	61.1
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Academic achievement numbers and percentages include students participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.The statewide science assessment is not administered in grade 8.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,619	S	30.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	S	15
Asian or Pacific Islander	379	S	46
Asian	304	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	75	S	25
Black or African American	217	S	16
Hispanic or Latino	3,494	S	12.8
White	15,886	S	34.9
Two or more races	449	S	30
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,714	S	8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	562	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	8,541	S	18.2
Migratory students	183	S	5
Male	10,617	S	31.1
Female	10,002	S	30.7

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Academic achievement numbers and percentages include students participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. Regarding the differences in the numbers of students reported (Asian, White, and Female) with a valid score on the Math test versus the numbers of students reported for the Science tests, these are not comparable because they are different types of tests and represent different populations of students. Idaho uses the Idaho Standards Achievement Test by Smarter Balanced for Math and ELA. We use end of course exams in biology and chemistry for high school science. Students are expected to take the Math and ELA tests in 10th grade and their 10th grade scores are reported. Students are allowed to take the high school science test in 10th, 11th, or 12th grade and their scores are reported in the year they take the test.

We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,634	S	61.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	S	48
Asian or Pacific Islander	378	S	67
Asian	303	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	75	S	55
Black or African American	214	S	40
Hispanic or Latino	3,489	S	43.3
White	15,908	S	66.1
Two or more races	451	S	62
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,718	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	544	S	6
Economically disadvantaged students	8,544	S	47.6
Migratory students	177	S	25
Male	10,640	S	55.3
Female	9,994	S	68.6

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Academic achievement numbers and percentages include students participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	22,597	S	65.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	215	S	45
Asian or Pacific Islander	417	S	64
Asian	338	S	67
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	79	S	51
Black or African American	233	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	3,723	S	43.0
White	17,528	S	71.3
Two or more races	481	S	69
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,682	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	563	S	9
Economically disadvantaged students	8,989	S	52.7
Migratory students	199	S	30
Male	11,566	S	65.3
Female	11,031	S	66.7

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Academic achievement numbers and percentages include students participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. Regarding the differences in the numbers of students reported (Asian, White, and Female) with a valid score on the Math test versus the numbers of students reported for the Science tests, these are not comparable because they are different types of tests and represent different populations of students. Idaho uses the Idaho Standards Achievement Test by Smarter Balanced for Math and ELA. We use end of course exams in biology and chemistry for high school science. Students are expected to take the Math and ELA tests in 10th grade and their 10th grade scores are reported. Students are allowed to take the high school science test in 10th, 11th, or 12th grade and their scores are reported in the year they take the test.

We identified special education status in a different manner (and the same as was done for SPED APR), making it bound by IEP dates, rather than using a simple flag collected through our longitudinal data system. Both SY1415 and SY1516 files were updated and resubmitted.

We believe the year-over-year change in the special education data may be due to an increase in our effort in working with school districts to improve participation rate. We released a Youtube video that promotes student participation and sent a letter to school districts that did not meet the 95% participation rate in SY1415. School districts were also required to submit a plan to us outlining their plan on meeting the federal requirement. For example, we also observed 17.5% increase in participation rate for students with disabilities in 4th grade; however, this was not flagged because it did not meet the threshold of 20%.

1.4 School and District Accountability

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

Per the *Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required:
http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf

For and SEA that has not received *ESEA* flexibility, or an SEA that received availability without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:
In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2015-16	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2015-16
Schools			
Districts			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Idaho was an approved flexibility state. Under the ESSA transition, states are not required to submit 2015-2016 AYP data.See C-11 of the February 26, 2016 FAQs.			

For an SEA with an approved *ESEA* flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator [4] based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
Schools			
Districts			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Idaho was an approved flexibility state. Under the ESSA transition, states are not required to submit 2015-2016 AMO data.See C-11 of the February 26, 2016 FAQs.			

[4] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required:
http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf
For an SEA that has not received *ESEA* flexibility, or an SEA that received *ESEA* flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2015-16. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2015-16
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Idaho was an approved flexibility state. Under the ESSA transition, states are not required to submit 2015-2016 AYP data.See C-11 of the February 26, 2016 FAQs.			

For an SEA with an approved *ESEA* flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator [5] based on data for SY 2015-16. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Idaho was an approved flexibility state. Under the ESSA transition, states are not required to submit 2015-2016 AMO data.See C-11 of the February 26, 2016 FAQs.			

[5] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, some data in this section are no longer required: http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf

For an SEA that has not received *ESEA* flexibility, or an SEA that received *ESEA* flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2015-16	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2015-16
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Idaho was an approved flexibility state. Under the ESSA transition, states are not required to submit 2015-2016 AYP data.See C-11 of the February 26, 2016 FAQs.		

For an SEA with an approved *ESEA* flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator[6] based on data for SY 2015-16. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2015-16	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2015-16
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Idaho was an approved flexibility state. Under the ESSA transition, states are not required to submit 2015-2016 AMO data.See C-11 of the February 26, 2016 FAQs.		

[6] For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2015-16
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2015-16 (based on SY 2014-15 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2015-16
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2014-15 and beginning of SY 2015-16 as a corrective action)	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2015-16 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2015-16 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2015-16 data was complete	

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* .

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2015 (SY 2015-16) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.The State reserved 4% of the FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocation.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

The data for this question are reported through ED*Facts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the ED*Facts* Reporting System (ERS). The ED*Facts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2015-16.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Activities funded through Section 1003(g) funds for administration included Instructional Core Focus Visits, the Idaho Superintendents Network (ISN), the Idaho Principals Network (IPN), and the Idaho Capacity Building (ICB)project.

To determine capacity and needs, Idaho uses the Instructional Core Focus Visit process. Focus Visits collects evidence of practices associated with substantial school improvement. Data are collected by an external team of reviewers with expertise in the characteristics of effective schools. The external team observes 100 percent of the teachers, including teachers of special populations. Observational data are collected for a sub-set of the indicators that coincide with our statewide teacher evaluation. A protocol linked to indicators of successful schools is used to interview individuals (at least 60 percent of the certified teaching staff and all administrators) and identify recurring themes. Focus groups are conducted in each school for parents, students, non-certified staff (e.g., cooks, custodians, paraprofessionals), and teachers. All data are then analyzed and triangulated to describe the practices of the system. Resulting recommendations are made to district leadership regarding appropriate next steps, especially in the area of leadership capacity and the turnaround principles. Focus Visits occur once a year for three years to maintain a balance of positive support and pressure and to help determine further state supports and/or interventions. Since the protocol is linked to the state approved school improvement plan, recommendations directly tie back to school and district improvement plans and processes, which enhance ongoing assistance efforts. Recommendations will also include connections to programs, technical assistance, and training opportunities that match the needs of the school or district.

The ISN is designed to provide a network through which superintendents, especially those in rural district, can receive professional development specifically designed for LEA leadership.

The IPN is designed to provide specific professional development to principals and other school leaders. All principals are encouraged to attend but priority and funding are given to those principals working in schools that are in school improvement.

The ICB project is a group of former educators that provide technical assistance and capacity building to districts, schools, principals and staff that are in schools and districts that are in school improvement.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2015-16 that were supported by **funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Sections 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In addition to using 1003(g) funds, state funds were used to support the following school improvement activities: the Idaho Superintendents Network (ISN), the Idaho Principals Network (IPN), and the Idaho Capacity Building (ICB) project.

The ISN is designed to provide a network through which superintendents, especially those in rural district, can receive professional development specifically designed for LEA leadership.

The IPN is designed to provide specific professional development to principals and other school leaders. All principals are encouraged to attend but priority and funding are given to those principals working in schools that are in school improvement.

The ICB project is a group of former educators that provide technical assistance and capacity building to districts, schools, principals and staff that are in schools and districts that are in school improvement.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide:

The number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

   For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	

FAQs about public school choice:

a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other school choice programs?* For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
   - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
   - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
   - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

   In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.[7]Adapted from Public School Choice Non-Regulatory Guidance, Available at: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolchoiceguid.doc
b. *How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice?* In the count of LEAS that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

   For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.No applicable services based on the state's ESEA waiver; we do not offer supplemental educational services.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 Teacher Quality

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	68,974	67,410	97.73	1,564	2.27
All elementary classes	25,422	25,190	99.09	232	0.91
All secondary classes	43,552	42,220	96.94	1,332	3.06

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in core academic subjects.	Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state reports elementary classes so that a full -day self-contained classroom equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	57.89
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	2.64
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	39.47
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	31.65
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	9.20
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	59.15
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that *for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles*, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High-poverty elementary schools	8,745	8,649	98.90
Low-poverty elementary schools	5,615	5,573	99.25
Secondary Schools			
High-poverty secondary schools	6,695	6,502	97.12
Low-poverty secondary schools	17,737	17,311	97.60

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	**Low-Poverty Schools** (less than what %)
Elementary schools	69.20	41.20
Poverty metric used	Idaho uses the Title I-A district reported poverty rates.	
Secondary schools	61.50	35.90
Poverty metric used	Idaho uses the Title I-A district reported poverty rates.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.

d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 Title III and Language Instructional Programs

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III program.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational program implemented in the State, as defined under Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs =** Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.us/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish, Mandarin Chinese
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Mandarin Chinese
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	//
Yes	Structured English immersion	//
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	//
Yes	Content-based ESL	//
Yes	Pull-out ESL	//
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	//

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In addition to the programs listed above, districts are also implementing co-teaching, extended day ELD support, and push-in ELD suppport.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	13,469
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	12,174
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.This reflects an increase of 25 LEAs participating in the Title III Consortium in school year 2015 - 2016, for a total of 45 participating LEAs.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	11,124
Arabic	389
Swahili	196
Somali	148
Chinese	133

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	12,429
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	724
Total	13,153
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.The total ELP students reported is based on an October 1st reporting time period. The students tested are based upon this initial early fall report. The test window occurs after this fall report, and students may exit the ELP program or withdraw/un-enroll from their school prior to the test window opening, resulting in lower ELP enrollment.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	S
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	0.5
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.There was a significant decrease in proficiency attainment due to the ELP assessment changing (now WIDA ACCESS 2.0). 2016 was the first year it was administered, as well as the first year WIDA administered the ACCESS assessment online. This first online administration created similar decreases across all consortium states.	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	11,331
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	561
Total	11,892
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Similar to 1.6.3.1.1 comment, the total number of Title III ELP above is based upon October 1 reporting period. Some students unenroll, or in some cases return to their school or another school after the test window has passed.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	2,372

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) =** State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Attained Proficiency =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	S	<=0.1		
Attained proficiency	S	0.6		

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Regarding 1.6.3.2.1 and First Time Tested students (2,372): WIDA's suite of assessments, includes a new screener tool which Idaho adopted along with their summative ELP assessment. The screener is used to identify and code English language learners. The use of the new screener coupled with additional trainings on correct coding of ELL's explain the count.

Re: 1.6.3.2.2: There was a significant decrease in proficiency attainment due to the ELP assessment changing (now WIDA ACCESS 2.0). 2016 was the first year it was administered, as well as the first year WIDA administered the ACCESS assessment online. This first online administration created similar decreases across all consortium states.

We did not set and are not reporting targets for 2015-2016 due to the accountability system being on hold and because it was year one of a new assessment.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

Native Language Testing	Yes/No
State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Idaho has implemented the Smarter Balanced tests in ELA and Math. Smarter Balanced assessments are built on the design for Universal Supports for learning, and recognize the unique and diverse characteristics and needs of students who participate in the assessments. English learners are supported in the state content assessments, by designated supports offered as embedded or non-embedded tools.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Math: Translated test directions (in many languages) are available as an embedded designated support. Translated glossaries are provided for selected construct-irrelevant terms for math. Stacked translations are available for English learners and provide the full translation of each item above the original item in English.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.All students enrolled in grades 3 -8 and 10 are required to participate in the ELA assessment except English language learners, who are enrolled in their first year in a U.S. school. These students instead, participate in the state's required English language proficiency assessment. A bilingual/dual language word-to-word dictionary can be provided as a non-embedded support for the performance task portion of the ELA assessment in the student's appropriate language.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.A bilingual/dual language word -to-word dictionary can be provided as a non-embedded support in the student's appropriate language. Beginning with 2017 test administration, Spanish translation will be available for the science assessment.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One =** Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two =** Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total =** Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1,744	1,567	3,311
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,844	S	23	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,842	S	29	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
598	S	30	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, this section is no longer required:http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	35
//	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	
//	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	
//	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2014 -15 and 2015-16)	
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2015-16 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16)	

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1. If applicable, also please note if this method is the same or different from the previous year.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.During school year 15 -16 one LEA no longer qualified while 3 additional LEAs qualified for their own Title III allocation.

Per the ESSA FAQs located at the following link, this section is no longer required:http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Termination of Title III Programs	Yes/No
Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled =** Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program =** Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants =** Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,159	207	3

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho Title III department has done extensive technical assistance training to LEAs to improve the immigrant status and data collection reporting to more accurately reflect Idaho's immigrant population.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term ‘ Language instruction educational program ’ means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	169
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	161

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Numbers of certified licensed staff is pulled from teacher assignment codes in Idaho's statewide data collections system. This number does not reflect a significant number of teachers (an additional 89 teachers) who are licensed and certified in LEAs who are implementing co-teaching.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics =** Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees =** Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.1).
3. **Total Number of Participants =** Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total =** Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	62
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	59
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	58
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	37
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	53
Other (Explain in comment box)	51

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	65	6,414
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	57	646
PD provided to principals	59	318
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	54	78
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	58	1,040
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	463
Total	//	8,959

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Idaho State EL and Title III has done extensive outreach to districts in professional development trainings (onsite and virtual). There has been an significant increase of EL professional development as Idaho has fully adopted the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 last year with our first administration of the new online assessment and a great deal of training around the administration and the interpretation for instruction of those assessments results for all Idaho educators of ELs.

Number of subgrantees - includes Title III Consortium

Additional PD opportunities report by LEAs include: WIDA standards, WIDA assessment training, WIDA score for instruction training, co-teaching, Teaching for Excellence, SLIFE training, content based, Imagine Learning, SIOP, various conferences, data management, English learners and Special Education, GLAD, and various district initiatives focused.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation =** Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from U.S. Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees =** Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/$$ Distribution =** Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2015-16 funds July 1, 2015, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2015, for SY 2015-16 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/1/2015	7/1/2015	30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.The Title III Department reserves up to 30 days to review and approve Title III plans. Funding is released to districts that have approved plans within 30 days.		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Idaho Title III Department provides workshops in April for sub-grantees to receive Title III plan writing assistance. Topics include: supplement, not supplant; calculating carryover; and sharing of best practices for English Learners. Districts are required to submit their plan on or before June 30th. These workshops have improved the process for approving plans, thus distributing funds to sub-grantees in a timely fashion.

1.7 Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program

This section collects data on homeless children and youth and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	151	151
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	159	159
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youth in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	35	42
K	286	358
1	304	376
2	302	373
3	307	380
4	288	328
5	280	315
6	298	309
7	221	264
8	236	251
9	224	284
10	161	197
11	208	203
12	278	264
Ungraded		
Total	3,428	3,944
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	222	355
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,910	3,197
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	141	132
Hotels/Motels	155	260
Total	3,428	3,944
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students enrolled during the regular school year.

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	360	536
Migratory children/youth	179	137
Children with disabilities *(IDEA)*	660	753
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	308	366
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The great than 20% increase in unaccompanied homeless youth is projected to be do to increased training and TA to LEA's and liaisons on the definition, and identification. The SDE has held regional face to face meetings as well as webinars. This increase is a great step forward for us.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	306
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	186
K	347
1	382
2	365
3	388
4	331
5	325
6	319
7	264
8	255
9	286
10	211
11	211
12	273
Ungraded	56
Total	4,505
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	565
Migratory children/youth	141
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	622
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	334
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youth.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State reading/language arts assessment and the number and percentage of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	216	S	32	285	S	28
4	209	S	36	248	S	23
5	202	S	33	230	S	30
6	206	S	21	235	S	22
7	154	S	22	204	S	29
8	175	S	31	184	S	38
High School	117	S	40	137	S	37
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	216	S	32	289	S	31
4	209	S	25	249	S	23
5	203	S	17	234	S	19
6	204	S	13	239	S	15
7	155	S	13	206	S	18
8	180	S	19	188	S	20
High School	117	S	13	138	S	15
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.						

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	200	S	38	233	S	37
6						
7	154	S	26	200	S	32
8						
High School	129	S	43	136	S	43
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.Idaho only administers statewide science tests in grades 5, 7, and High School.						