

**How the Idaho State Department of Education Made Local Determinations
FFY 2015 SY 2015-2016 issued July 2017**

Overview

Idaho is required, under Section 616(a)(1)(C)(i) and 300.600(a) of IDEA 2004, to make annual determinations on the performance of each Local Education Agency (LEA) with regard to the provision of special education and related services. These determinations designate LEAs into one of the following four categories, as outlined in Section 616 (d) of IDEA 2004:

- Meets Requirements
- Needs Assistance
- Needs Intervention
- Needs Substantial Intervention

States are required to make determinations based on indicators identified by the federal government and are delineated in the Idaho State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR). The SPP/APR contains 16 data-based indicators which are separated into compliance indicators (which measure compliance with the IDEA regulations) and results indicators (which measure outcomes for students with disabilities) as shown below.

States may consider LEA performance on results and compliance indicators, however for local determinations based on 2015-2016 school year data, states are only required to include information submitted by LEAs on the compliance indicators.

For more information regarding specific compliance and results indicators, please see the Idaho State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) available at <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/public-reporting/>.

Idaho State Performance Plan	
Compliance Indicators	Results Indicators
Discipline Rates by Race/Ethnicity (4B) Disproportionality (9 & 10) Initial Eligibility Timelines (11) Early Childhood Transition (12) Secondary Transition Plans (13) Complaints (15) Due Process (16) Fiscal Audit	Graduation (1) Dropout (2) Assessment (3) Discipline Rates (4A) LRE Ages 6-21 (5) LRE Ages 3-5 (6) Early Childhood Outcomes (7) Parent Involvement (8) Post-School Outcomes (14)

**How the Idaho State Department of Education Made Local Determinations
FFY 2015 SY 2015-2016 issued July 2017**

Indicator Descriptions and Scoring Criteria

Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs and policies, procedures and/or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.	
Measurement	<p>1. Significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; AND</p> <p>2. As a result of SDE investigation was found to have policies, procedures, and/or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
Data Sources	ISEE Discipline Report
Points	Criteria
4	LEA does not have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days by race/ethnicity for children with IEPs.
1	LEA has a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days by race/ethnicity for children with IEPs.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that are a result of inappropriate identification.	
Measurement	<p>1. The LEA has disproportionate representation in at least one racial/ethnic group in special education overall, AND</p> <p>2. As a result of SDE investigation, the LEA was found to have this disproportionate representation due to inappropriate policies, practices, and/or procedures regarding the identification of students as needing special education and related services.</p>
Data Sources	Child Count Fall Enrollment Data
Points	Criteria
4	LEA does not have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification in any racial/ethnic group receiving special education or related services.
1	LEA has disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification for a particular racial/ethnic group receiving special education or related services.

**How the Idaho State Department of Education Made Local Determinations
FFY 2015 SY 2015-2016 issued July 2017**

Indicator Descriptions and Scoring Criteria

Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is a result of inappropriate identification.	
Measurement	<p>1. The LEA has disproportionate representation in at least one racial/ethnic group of students with specific learning disabilities, cognitive disabilities, emotional disabilities, speech/language impairments, other health impairments, or autism, AND</p> <p>2. As a result of SDE investigation, the LEA was found to have this disproportionate representation due to inappropriate policies, practices, and procedures related to the identification of students as needing special education and related services.</p>
Data Sources	Child Count Fall Enrollment Data
Points	Criteria
4	LEA does not have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification in any racial/ethnic group in specific disability categories.
1	LEA has disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification for a particular racial/ethnic group in a particular disability category.

Indicator 11: The percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within the 60 school day timeline.	
Measurement	<p>A. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.</p> <p>B. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 school days (or State established timeline)</p> <p>C. # of children included in (A), but not included in (B) (A-B).</p> <p>Percent = (B divided by A) times 100.</p> <p>Per 34 CFR 300.301(d), the following exceptions have been completely factored out of A, and B, and C in the Indicator 11 calculation:</p> <p>The parent of the child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation, OR</p> <p>The child is enrolled in a school of another public agency after the relevant timeframe had begun and prior to the determination by the child's previous public agency.</p>
Data Source	ISEE Child Find (60-day Timeline) Report
Points	Criteria
4	100%
3	50 - 99%
2	1 - 49%
1	<1%

**How the Idaho State Department of Education Made Local Determinations
FFY 2015 SY 2015-2016 issued July 2017
Indicator Descriptions and Scoring Criteria**

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.	
Measurement	<p>A. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.</p> <p>B. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthday.</p> <p>C. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.</p> <p>D. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.</p> <p>E. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthday.</p> <p>Percent = C divided by (A - B - D - E) times 100</p> <p>Per 34 CFR 300.301(d), the following exceptions have been completely factored out of A, B, C, and D in the Indicator 12 calculation: The parent of the child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation, OR The child is enrolled in a school of another public agency after the relevant timeframe had begun and prior to the determination by the child's previous public agency.</p>
Data Sources	Department of Health & Human Services data sharing agreement LEA Early Childhood Transition Tracking Report
Points	Criteria
4	100% or higher
3	50 - 99%
2	1 - 49%
1	<1%

**How the Idaho State Department of Education Made Local Determinations
FFY 2015 SY 2015-2016 issued July 2017**

Indicator Descriptions and Scoring Criteria

Indicator 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.	
Measurement	For 2015-2016, Based on SAM and CCV file reviews: A. # of youth with disabilities 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 B. # of youth with an IEP age 16 and above Percent = (A divided by B) times 100
Data Sources	General Supervision File Reviews
Points	Criteria
4	100% or higher
3	50 – 99%
2	1 – 49%
1	<1%

Indicator 15: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.	
Measurement	A. Written settlement agreements reached B. Total Resolution Meetings Percent = (A divided by B) times 100
Data Sources	Data collected under IDEA section 618.
Points	Criteria
4	Data submitted are timely and valid
3	1 report is not timely,
2	2 or more reports are not timely OR data submitted are not valid
1	Data submitted are neither timely nor valid

**How the Idaho State Department of Education Made Local Determinations
FFY 2015 SY 2015-2016 issued July 2017**

Indicator Descriptions and Scoring Criteria

Indicator 16: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.	
Measurement	A. Mediation agreements related to due process complaints B. Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints C. Mediations held Percent = ((A + B) divided by C) times 100
Data Sources	Data collected under IDEA section 618.
Points	Criteria
4	Data submitted are timely and valid
3	1 report is not timely,
2	2 or more reports are not timely OR data submitted are not valid
1	Data submitted are neither timely nor valid

IDEA Fiscal Audit Findings	
Data Sources	Audit Findings
Points	Criteria
4	No Audit Findings
3	Minor monitoring and/or reporting issues which can be easily remedied.
2	Moderate documentation and/or reporting issues which would require revision of internal financial processes. (e.g. Salaries that were split between departments and/or funding sources were not accurately documented.) OR a new moderate/ minor issue is found if the LEA had audit findings last year.
1	Major financial tracking issues which would require the initiation of appropriate financial and accounting procedures. (e.g. The Administrative Agent does not maintain an adequate set of financial records.) OR LEA has the same finding for at least two consecutive years.

**How the Idaho State Department of Education Made Local Determinations
FFY 2015 SY 2015-2016 issued July 2017**

LEA Determination Level

The total number of points received will be divided by the total points possible to determine the LEA's Determination Level. Categories that are "Not Applicable" for a particular LEA will not count against the LEA. For example, Indicator 12 – Early Childhood Transition will be "Not Applicable" for High School LEAs since they do not serve children turning 3 years of age.

LEA Determination Level		
Monitoring Activities	Technical Assistance (SDE)	Incentives or Actions
Meets Requirements: Determination Percentage is greater than or equal to 95%.		
No changes to compliance monitoring schedule	LEA will have available technical assistance (TA) in general areas of need.	LEA may receive recommendations for improvement activities in areas of need.
Needs Assistance: Determination Percentage is less than 95% but greater than or equal to 75%.		
No changes to compliance monitoring schedule LEA may receive focused monitoring on the indicators that resulted in this determination.	LEA will choose from TA in areas it did not meet state targets. TA may be in various formats (conferences, calls, workshops, training, resources) and from various sources (state, LEAs, other).	LEA may request assistance in data analysis and defining improvement strategies and evaluation procedures in areas of need. This assistance may come from Idaho SESTA and/or SDE. LEA may receive recommendations for improvement activities in areas of need.
Needs Intervention: Determination Percentage is less than 75% but greater than or equal to 50%.		
LEA will receive focused monitoring on the indicators that resulted in this determination.	LEA will receive TA directed towards the areas that it did not meet state targets. TA may be in various formats (conferences, calls, workshops, training, resources) and from various sources (state, LEAs, other).	LEA will receive assistance in data analysis and defining improvement strategies and evaluation procedures in areas of need. This assistance may come from Idaho SESTA and/or SDE. A formal Improvement Plan in the areas of need will be developed with assistance from Idaho SESTA and evaluated by the SDE for approval.
Needs Substantial Intervention: Determination Percentage is less than 50%.		
LEA will receive on-site Focused Monitoring on the indicators that resulted in the determination.	LEA will be required to participate in TA specifically in the areas that it did not meet the state targets. TA may be in various formats (conferences, calls, workshops, training, resources) and from various sources (state, LEAs, other).	LEA will receive assistance from the SDE in data analysis and defining improvement strategies and evaluation procedures in areas of need. A formal Improvement Plan in the areas of need will be developed with assistance from Idaho SESTA and evaluated by the SDE for approval.