

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 72.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 72.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75.7%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.59%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 2.97%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 2.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 14%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 4.62%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 41%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are less rigorous than the previously-established targets. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.0% for reading and 98.8% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 98.8% for reading</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>against alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 98.7% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 99.9%.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 44.9% for reading and 40.6% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 41.7% for reading. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 49.8% for reading and did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 56.3% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 2.4%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State, in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, to describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007, and to describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State provided the required information relating to the examination of data from FFY 2007. The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise) the LEA's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure compliance with IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.530 relating to procedural safeguards, and in 34 CFR §300.324(a)(2)(i) relating to use of positive behavioral interventions was corrected in a timely manner. As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.																					
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 899 1467 1416"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td align="center">61.8</td> <td align="center">62.5</td> <td align="center">61</td> <td align="center">0.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">8.7</td> <td align="center">9.4</td> <td align="center">8.4</td> <td align="center">- 0.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">1.8</td> <td align="center">2.0</td> <td align="center">1.5</td> <td align="center">- 0.20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and slippage for 5B and 5C from the</p>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	61.8	62.5	61	0.70%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	8.7	9.4	8.4	- 0.70%	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.8	2.0	1.5	- 0.20%	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress																		
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	61.8	62.5	61	0.70%																		
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	8.7	9.4	8.4	- 0.70%																		
C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.8	2.0	1.5	- 0.20%																		

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
	FFY 2006 data. The State met its FFY 2007 target for 5A and did not meet its targets for 5B and 5C.																	
6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator]	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 865 1419 1440"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 865 1060 1040">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1060 865 1182 1040">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1182 865 1299 1040">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1299 865 1419 1040">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1040 1060 1141">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1040 1182 1141">1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1040 1299 1141">1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1040 1419 1141">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1141 1060 1308">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1141 1182 1308">5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1141 1299 1308">5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1141 1419 1308">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1308 1060 1440">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1308 1182 1440">36</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1182 1308 1299 1440">41</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1299 1308 1419 1440">26</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1	1	1	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5	5	5	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	36	41	26	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior															
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1	1	1															
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	5	5	5															
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	36	41	26															

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	45	45	49	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	14	8	19	
	Total (approx. 100%)	101.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 25%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 27%.</p>				<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 2.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 5.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State's definition of "disproportionate representation" includes districts where the State has identified over- and underrepresentation by using the E-Formula and where the State has reviewed policies, practices and procedures and found them to be inappropriate. However, the State reported on page 50 of its FFY 2007 APR that it uses a proper two step process to identify a district as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate</p>				<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected in a timely manner, and that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected.</p> <p>In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must revise its definition of "disproportionate representation" to clarify that it does not include a review of policies, procedures, and practices.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>identification. The State first identifies districts as having disproportionate representation using the E-Formula and then determines whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification by examining the district's policies, practices and procedures.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of seven LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, that findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected. The State reported that 13 of 19 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and the remaining six findings subsequently were corrected by February 2, 2009.</p> <p>Additionally, OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to provide information in the FFY 2007 APR, that it has corrected its definition of significant disproportionality, and that the State requires the LEA to reserve the maximum amount of its Part B allocation for early intervening services when it is determined that significant disproportionality is occurring in the LEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2). The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance from FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 4.65%. These data</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 10.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 0%. The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State’s definition of “disproportionate representation” includes districts where the State has identified over- and underrepresentation by using the E-Formula and where the State has reviewed policies, practices and procedures and found them to be inappropriate. However, the State reported on page 56 of its FFY 2007 APR that it uses a proper two step process to identify a district to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. The State first identifies districts as having disproportionate representation using the E-Formula and then determines whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification by examining the district’s policies, practices and procedures. OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, that findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 were corrected. The State reported that four of 19 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and the remaining 15 findings were subsequently corrected by February 2, 2009. The State reported that 13 of 13 LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the</p>	<p>300.311 was corrected in a timely manner, and that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must revise its definition of “disproportionate representation” to clarify that it does not include a review of policies, procedures, and practices. OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that demonstrate that the State has in effect the policies and procedures required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2007 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected, by reporting that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance from FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	State took as a result of that technical assistance.	activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 92.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 54 districts with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s); and (2) has completed the initial evaluation although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 90.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 83%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 35 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected. The State reported that the remaining 26 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 subsequently were corrected by February 2, 2009.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner, and that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 54%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 47%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 85 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 that the uncorrected</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
	<p>noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected. The State reported that the remaining 165 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were subsequently corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>§300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each individual case unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>																
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 69%.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1032 1480 1472"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006</th> <th>FFY 2007</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are competitively employed.</td> <td align="center">58</td> <td align="center">50</td> <td align="center">-8.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td align="center">10</td> <td align="center">9</td> <td align="center">-1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.</td> <td align="center">12</td> <td align="center">10</td> <td align="center">-2.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2006	FFY 2007	Progress	Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	58	50	-8.00%	Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	10	9	-1.00%	Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	12	10	-2.00%	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006	FFY 2007	Progress															
Percent of youth who are competitively employed.	58	50	-8.00%															
Percent of youth who are in some type of postsecondary school.	10	9	-1.00%															
Percent of youth who are both competitively employed and in some type of postsecondary school.	12	10	-2.00%															

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State did not reach its target of 81%.</p>	
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the corrected FFY 2006 data of 87.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 558 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that any noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2006 data that was not corrected in a timely manner has been corrected, including when the noncompliance was corrected. The State reported that all 49 findings of noncompliance from FFY 2005 and all 12 findings of noncompliance from FFY 2004 subsequently were corrected by February 2, 2009.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP's February 27, 2009 verification letter required the State to submit by April 28, 2009 documentation that, consistent with sections 616(a) and 616(e) of IDEA, its procedures for making future annual determinations on the performance of its LEAs includes consideration of an LEA's performance on all SPP compliance indicators, whether an LEA submitted valid and reliable data for each indicator, LEA specific audit findings, and any uncorrected noncompliance from any source. On March 27, 2009, the State provided OSEP with an electronic copy of a memorandum dated March 26, 2009 that the State sent to the LEAs and included the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e).</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s), consistent with</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 93.75%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 89%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 85.71%.</p> <p>The State reported that six of seven resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>

Idaho Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State reported that six of six mediations resulted in mediation agreements. The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 91%. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>