

# State of Idaho

## *Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook*

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and  
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

U. S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Washington, D.C. 20202



Idaho State Board of Education  
650 West State Street  
Boise, Idaho 83720-0037  
June 2006

# PART I: Summary of Required Elements for the State Accountability Systems

## Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

Status	Idaho Statewide Assessment and Accountability Plan Element	Page
<b>Principle 1: All Schools</b>		
F	1.1 Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> .	1
F	1.2 Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> .	2
F	1.3 Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> .	4
F	1.4 Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .	5
F	1.5 Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .	6
F	1.6 Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .	11
<b>Principle 2: All Students</b>		
F	2.1 The accountability system includes <i>all students</i> .	13
F	2.2 The accountability system has a consistent definition of full academic year.	15
F	2.3 The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> .	16
<b>Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations</b>		
F	3.1 Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> .	17
F	3.2 Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made Adequate Yearly Progress</i> .	19
F	3.2a Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> .	22
F	3.2b Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> .	24
F	3.2c Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> .	25
<b>Principle 4: Annual Decisions</b>		
F	4.1 The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.	26

### **STATUS Legend**

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting Idaho State Board of Education approval

W – Working to formulate policy

Status	State Accountability System Element	Page
<b>Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability</b>		
F	5.1 The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups.</i>	28
F	5.2 The accountability system <i>holds schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups.</i>	30
F	5.3 The accountability system <i>includes students with disabilities.</i>	31
F	5.4 The accountability system <i>includes limited English proficient students.</i>	32
F	5.5 The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.	34
F	5.6 The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.	36
<b>Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments</b>		
F	6.1 Accountability Plan is based primarily on academic assessments.	37
<b>Principle 7: Additional Indicators</b>		
F	7.1 Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools.</i>	39
F	7.2 Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</i>	41
F	7.3 Additional indicators are valid and reliable.	43
<b>Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading and Mathematics</b>		
F	8.1 Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading and mathematics.</i>	44
<b>Principle 9 Plan Validity and Reliability</b>		
F	9.1 Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions.</i>	45
F	9.2 Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions.</i>	46
F	9.3 State has a plan for addressing changes in assessment and student population.	47
<b>Principle 10: Participation Rate</b>		
F	10.1 Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.	48
F	10.2 Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.</i>	49

**STATUS Legend**

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting Idaho State Board of Education approval

W – Working to formulate policy

State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application – Accountability Workbook

---

**LEGEND**

---

Assessment	Reference to both the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests and the Idaho Alternative Assessment Test
ADA	Average Daily Attendance
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
Board	Idaho State Board of Education
FERPA	Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
IDAPA	Rules adopted under the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act; rules are enforceable as law in the state.
Indicators	Assessment, participation rate, graduation rate, proficiency rate, additional academic indicator
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individualized Education Program
ISDE	Idaho State Department of Education
LEA	Local Education Agency (local school district)
LEP	Limited English Proficiency
NCES	National Center for Educational Statistics
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
NWEA	Northwest Evaluation Association
NWREL	Northwest Regional Education Laboratory
Plan	Idaho Statewide Assessment and Accountability Plan
SEA	State Education Agency

**PART II: State Response and activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements**

**PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.**

**1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?**

Each Idaho public school and Local Education Agency (LEA) is required to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and is included in the Idaho Statewide Assessment and Accountability Plan (Plan). The Idaho State Board of Education (Board) created a citizen commission that has received public and professional input for the past two years for the purpose of creating the Plan. The requirement to participate is specified in the Board approved Plan incorporated into Idaho Administrative Code (IDAPA) 08.02.03. AYP determinations for all public schools and districts have been made since summer 2003 based on the spring Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) test scores.

For the purpose of determining AYP, Idaho public schools are defined as those elementary and secondary schools established and maintained at public expense through the total basic foundation program/state aid formula described in Idaho Code §33-1002 and governed by the Idaho State Board of Education described in Idaho Code §33-116. Schools that are accredited will receive an AYP determination. Programs not accredited will be included with the sponsoring accredited school. For the purposes of AYP determination, an elementary school is one that has a grade configuration that may include grades K-4 but does not contain grade 8 or higher. A middle school is a school that does not meet the definition of an elementary school and contains grade 8 but does not contain grade 12. A high school is any school that contains grade 12. The LEA is defined as the local school district or a public charter school designated as an LEA.

The accountability of public schools without grades assessed by this system (i.e., K-2 schools) will be based on the third grade test scores of the students who previously attended the associated feeder school.

Within Idaho there are approximately 51 small schools that do not have a total of 34 students in the tested class levels. For those small schools, the Board and the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) will determine AYP using the total subgroup only and averaging the current year's Idaho State Achievement Test (ISAT) test scores plus scores from the previous two years to obtain a more consistent and reliable AYP decision.

**Evidence:**

Idaho Code §§33-116 and 33-1002

**1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?**

Idaho is a Title I Compliance Agreement state. As part of the Compliance Agreement, the Board created, approved, and implemented an Idaho Statewide Assessment and Accountability Plan that served as the basis for development of annual measurable objectives determined by the computations for AYP. The baseline for AYP was calculated using scores from the spring 2003 administration of the ISAT. Achievement tests for grades 4, 8, and 10 were introduced in Spring 2003. Achievement tests for grades 3 and 7 were introduced in 2004. Tests for grades 5 and 6 are being introduced in 2005. The system of assessment is defined in IDAPA 08.02.03.111, Rules Governing Thoroughness, State Board of Education.

The rule includes the state assessment procedure, participation rate requirements, a graduation rate for high schools, and a third indicator for elementary and middle schools. Under direction of the Board, ISDE uses the Plan to identify schools in need of improvement. In terms of accountability, the Board-approved Plan leads to AYP determination based on:

- An incremental increase of students in the aggregate and each subgroup scoring at proficiency. Scores from the spring 2003 ISAT test determined the baseline.
- A minimum of ninety-five percent (95%) of all students and each subgroup at the time of test-taking participating in the statewide assessment (ISAT and the Alternate Assessment or a three-year average of rates of participation.)
- A student performance rate for elementary and middle schools determined by the Board that indicates improvement by students over the rate from the preceding year. See Section 7.2.
- The Board has adopted a student graduation rate target of 90% by 2012-13 for high schools with an annual rate improvement from present through 2013. For 2004-2005 the proxy for disaggregation of high school subgroups will be based on the individual district's choice of third academic indicator for elementary and middle schools; graduation rate disaggregation will not be available until the 2006-2007 school year.

All Idaho public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.

For the purpose of determining AYP, Idaho public schools are defined as those elementary and secondary schools established and maintained at public expense through the total basic foundation program/state aid formula described in Idaho Code §33-1002 and governed by the Idaho State Board of Education (Idaho Code §33-116). For the purposes of AYP determination, an elementary school is one that has a grade configuration that may include grades K-4 but does not contain grade 8 or higher. A

State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application – Accountability Workbook

---

middle school is a school that does not meet the definition of an elementary school and contains grade 8 but does not contain grade 12. A high school is any school that contains grade 12. The LEA is defined as the local school district or public charter school designated as an LEA.

The accountability of public schools without grades assessed by this system (i.e., K-2 schools) will be based on the third grade test scores of the students who previously attended that feeder school.

All students with disabilities in Idaho public schools as defined under Section 602(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) will participate in the Plan. The Individualized Education Program (IEP) team will determine how students with disabilities will participate in the Plan. The Idaho Alternate Assessment will yield reading and mathematics assessment results for inclusion in AYP determination.

Students' scores from the Idaho Alternate Assessment are aggregated with those from the ISAT for all students and each subgroup. See Section 5.3 for a description of the process that was developed to aggregate the scores from the Idaho Alternate Assessment with those from the ISAT for the school, LEA, and state results.

Idaho has identified four performance levels (See Section 1.3) for the ISAT. ISAT is comprised of custom-developed, computer-adaptive assessments that include multiple measures in the areas of reading and mathematics. The ISAT tests were first administered in grades 4, 8, and 10 in 2003. Similar grade-level appropriate tests will be introduced in grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. For purposes of determining AYP, only the grade-level tests are used.

All of the required subgroups, including students with disabilities and LEP students, who are enrolled in a public school for a full academic year will be included in the performance measures that determine AYP and accreditation status of schools. LEP students who are enrolled in their first year of school in the United States may take the English Proficiency test in lieu of the reading/language usage ISAT but will still be required to take the math ISAT with accommodations or adaptations as determined by the English Language Proficiency and language proficiency score.

**Evidence:**

Idaho Code §§33-116 and 33-1002  
Idaho's Title I Compliance Agreement  
IDAPA 08.02.03

**1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of *basic, proficient, and advanced* student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?**

Idaho has defined four levels of student achievement for the ISAT: Advanced, Proficient\*\*, Basic, and Below Basic. A general description of each of the levels is listed below:

- **Advanced** Student demonstrates thorough knowledge and mastery of skills that allows him/her to function independently above his/her current educational level.
- **Proficient** Student demonstrates thorough knowledge and mastery of skills that allows him/her to function independently on all major concepts and skills at his/her educational level.
- **Basic** Student demonstrates basic knowledge and skills usage but cannot operate independently on concepts and skills at his/her educational level. Requires remediation and assistance to complete tasks without significant errors.
- **Below Basic** Student demonstrates a significant lack of knowledge and skills and is unable to complete basic skills or knowledge sets without significant remediation.

For each of the content standards in reading and mathematics, four levels of performance descriptors have been developed. Idaho will include student scores in the proficient and advanced categories for federal proficiency reporting.

All of the ISAT assessments will be aligned to the content standards and descriptors. Proficiency scores for each performance level at each grade level have been established and approved by the Board. These scores will be applied uniformly for all students in public schools, as outlined in this plan.

\*\*Idaho has identified the proficient level as meeting the proficient level specified in *No Child Left Behind*.

**Evidence:**

Idaho State Board of Education action March 2003  
IDAPA 08.02.03.111



State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application – Accountability Workbook

---

**1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly decisions and information in a timely manner?**

Idaho will provide decisions about AYP in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions of *No Child Left Behind* before the beginning of the subsequent academic year.

For the purpose of determining AYP, the State Board will ensure that results of the state academic assessment will be available to the LEAs in a timely manner. (See Chart 1.)

**Chart 1. Timeline**

Timeline	Activity
Mid-April to Mid-May Test Administration Window (annually)	Statewide assessment administration
Throughout the testing window (annually)	Collection of information on students enrolled for full academic year
Six to eight weeks from Assessment Administration	Assessment vendor required to provide assessment results to the Board
June (annually)	Schools receive aggregate assessment results
July (annually)	Schools will be notified of preliminary AYP status
Before the first day of school	LEA notification to parents regarding school choice and supplemental services
No later than thirty days after preliminary identification of schools/LEAs not meeting AYP (annually)	School/LEA appeals process begins Challenged agency renders final determination in response to appeal

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03.112

**1.5 Does the Idaho State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?**

Yes. The Idaho State Department of Education produces an annual School Report Card that includes the required state information and also information on every LEA and school. LEAs are required to complete LEA report cards and ensure school-level report cards are produced. To aid LEAs and schools, the department provides templates to assist in meeting the required report card elements.

The state releases accountability reports, assessment data, graduation, and other information as it becomes available for the state, districts, and schools and then incorporates that information into the single State Report Card format in the fall of each year.

The State and LEA School Report Cards include the required assessment, accountability, and teacher quality data as outlined below:

**Assessment Data**

The State School Report Card includes detailed assessment reports for the state, all LEAs, and all schools from the Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) in reading, math, and language taken by students each spring.

The state phased in its assessments required under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) over a three year period. The 2004-05 Report Cards includes the full range of assessments in grades 3-8 and 10<sup>th</sup> grade. The 2007-08 Report Card will include results from the science assessment.

The assessment reports are different from the accountability reports in several ways:

1. The minimum “n” for reporting results is 10 for all students and subgroups.
2. The reports are by grade level.
3. The reports include all students tested, not just those enrolled for a full academic year.

For each grade and subject tested, the State School Report Card includes --

1. Information on the percentage of students tested. This information is disaggregated by the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Migrant

State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application – Accountability Workbook

---

Gender

2. Information on student achievement at each proficiency level. In Idaho, the proficiency levels are: advanced, proficient, basic, below basic; the data is disaggregated by the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Migrant
- Gender

3. The assessment data include the most recent 2-year trend data in student achievement for each subject and for each grade it is available.

**Accountability Data**

The state Report Card includes required accountability data for the state, its LEAs, and all schools, including a comparison between student achievement levels and the state's annual measurable objectives in reading and math, and data on student performance on the state's additional academic indicators used in making adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations, and information on districts and schools making AYP.

Specifically, the State Report Card includes:

1. A comparison between the actual achievement levels and the State's annual measurable objectives in reading and mathematics for the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic Groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged

2. A comparison between the actual participation rate and the State's annual measurable objective of 95 percent tested for the following subgroups:

- All Students
- Major Racial & Ethnic Groups
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged

State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application – Accountability Workbook

---

3. Information on the third academic indicator used by the State for AYP determinations. (See Sections 7.1 and 7.2 for descriptions.) The information is disaggregated for the following subgroups:

All Students  
Major Racial & Ethnic Groups  
Students with Disabilities  
Limited English Proficient  
Economically Disadvantaged

The state does report aggregate graduation and drop out rates for the State, its LEAs that graduate students, and all high schools. The department is in the process of changing its collection system to report disaggregated information for the following groups:

All Students  
Major Racial & Ethnic Groups  
Students with Disabilities  
Limited English Proficient  
Economically Disadvantaged

4. The State Report Card also includes the following accountability information:
- Adequate Yearly Progress determinations for each LEA and school.
  - A list of schools identified for improvement and the sanctions each faces
  - A list of LEAs identified for improvement and the sanctions each faces
5. The state Report Card goes beyond the federal requirements and includes important student safety information for the state, its LEAs and all schools. Those indicators include the number of incidents of:
- Substance (Tobacco, Alcohol, Other Drugs) Distribution, Use, and Possession on campuses
  - In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions
  - Truancies, Expulsions, and Fights on campuses
  - Insubordination, Harassment, Bullying, and Vandalism on campuses
  - Weapons, and non-firearm weapons on campuses
  - Data on violent crimes that committed on their campuses used to identify “persistently dangerous” schools.

### **Teacher Quality Data**

The Idaho State Report Card includes Teacher Quality Data in three areas:

1. The professional qualifications of all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State, as defined by the State;

2. The percentage of all public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials; and
3. The percentage of classes in the State taught by highly qualified teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

## **Dissemination**

### **State dissemination**

The ISDE produces two forms of its State School Report Card. The first is an interactive web-based version and the second is a more traditional paper version, which is posted on the ISDE website. In addition, the ISDE publishes its State Report Card in its quarterly newsletter, which is mailed to approximately 16,000 policy makers, teachers, administrators, school board members, and parents. The 2004-2005 newsletter included the state's reading and math results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress. The quarterly report is also posted on the ISDE's website at: <http://www.sde.state.id.us/mediacenter/quarterlyreports/documents/05Winter.pdf>.

The State School Report Card web version is available in Spanish.

### **LEA dissemination**

The State Department of Education publishes web-based assessment and accountability reports for each LEA and every school. The department also provides templates to assist districts in meeting the federal reporting requirements.

The templates available for LEA and school use are available at: <http://www.sde.state.id.us/dept/administrators.asp#School> and include:

#### **District Report Card Templates**

Cover Page (Word)  
AYP Indicator Report (WORD)  
AYP Assessment Report (EXCEL)

#### **Elementary Report Card Templates**

Cover Page (Word)  
AYP Indicator Report (WORD)  
AYP Assessment Report (EXCEL)

#### **Middle/Junior High Report Card Templates**

State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application – Accountability Workbook

---

Cover Page (Word)  
AYP Indicator Report (WORD)  
AYP Assessment Report (EXCEL)

**High School Report Card Templates**

Cover Page (WORD)  
AYP Indicator Report (WORD)  
AYP Assessment Report (EXCEL)

The report card requirement for LEAs and schools also has been incorporated into the state's accreditation system and is monitored through that program starting with the 2004-05 data.

The templates available for LEA and school use are available at:  
<http://www.sde.state.id.us/dept/administrators.asp#School> and include:

**District Report Card Templates**

Cover Page  
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Indicator Report  
AYP Assessment Report

**Elementary Report Card Templates**

Cover Page  
AYP Indicator Report  
AYP Assessment Report

**Middle/Junior High Report Card Templates**

Cover Page  
AYP Indicator Report  
AYP Assessment Report

**High School Report Card Templates**

Cover Page  
AYP Indicator Report  
AYP Assessment Report

**Evidence:** The Idaho State Report Card with accountability and assessment information for the state, its LEAs, and all schools is available at  
<http://www.sde.state.id.us/ipd/reportcard/SchoolReportCard.asp>.

The requirement for LEA and school report cards is identified in the accreditation procedures provided to districts and schools in Fall 2005 and available at:  
<http://www.sde.state.id.us/accreditation/docs/Comparison.pdf>

**1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?**

Idaho developed annual measurable objectives determined by the computations for AYP during the transition period of 2002-03. Beginning in 2002-2003, Idaho administered the ISAT assessments to determine AYP for Idaho school systems. The system of assessment is defined in IDAPA 08.02.03.111, Rules Governing Thoroughness, State Board of Education.

Idaho’s current Statewide Assessment and Accountability Plan is reflected in a state accountability system that includes rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs. The Board approved the plan in 2003 and the State Legislature approved it in 2004. The plan prescribes consequences for schools/LEAs that do not meet accreditation standards. These consequences range from development of a School Improvement Plan to possible state takeover of the school or LEA. In addition, all Idaho Title I public schools and Idaho Title 1 districts are subject to the requirements of Section 1116 of NCLB. (See Chart 2: Idaho School and LEA Sanctions)

**Chart 2: Idaho School and LEA Sanctions**

Not Meeting AYP After	Schools	LEAs
Year 1 & 2	Identified as not achieving AYP	Identified as not achieving AYP
Year 3	School Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Assistance from LEA</li> <li>• Choice</li> <li>• Intervention School Improvement Planning</li> <li>• Supplemental Services for eligible students in reading and math if choice not available</li> </ul>	LEA Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Assistance from SDE</li> <li>• Develop an Intervention Improvement Plan</li> </ul>
Year 4	School Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Choice</li> <li>• Supplemental Services</li> <li>• Previous year sanctions plus</li> <li>• Implementation of Intervention School Improvement Plan</li> </ul>	LEA Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Assistance</li> <li>• Implement the Intervention Improvement Plan</li> </ul>
Year 5	School Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous year sanctions plus</li> <li>• Corrective Action</li> </ul>	Corrective Action Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Assistance from SDE</li> </ul>
Year 6	School Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue previous sanctions</li> <li>• Develop a Restructuring Plan</li> </ul>	Corrective Action Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Assistance from SDE</li> </ul>
Year 7	School Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue previous sanctions</li> <li>• Implement Alternative Governance</li> </ul>	

## Rewards

**Distinguished Schools.** The State Board of Education may recognize as “Distinguished Schools,” the top five percent (5%) of schools exceeding the Idaho Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) intermediate targets listed in Subsection 112.02 and significantly reducing the gaps between subgroups listed in Subsection 112.03.d.

**Additional Yearly Growth (AYG) Award.** Schools demonstrating improved proficiency levels of subpopulations or in the aggregate by greater than ten percent (10%) will be considered to have achieved AYG. The school must have achieved Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) to be eligible for this award.

## Evidence:

IDAPA 08.02.03, Section 113  
Idaho Request for Proposal for Supplemental Services Providers  
State of Idaho - Approved List of Supplemental Services Providers



**PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.**

**2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?**

All Idaho public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination using data collected through the test enrollment process by the technical vendor overseen by ISBE.

The state contractor will use a web-based data collection system to collect data for all subpopulations included in NCLB requirements. This data will be included in reports prepared by Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) and the Bureau of Technology Services, to create reports for the schools, LEAs, and state for AYP determination.

For the purpose of determining AYP, Idaho public schools are defined as those elementary and secondary schools established and maintained at public expense through the total basic foundation program/state aid formula outlined in Idaho Code §33-1002 and governed by the Idaho State Board of Education (Idaho Code §33-116). For the purposes of AYP determination, an elementary school is one that has a grade configuration that may include grades K-4 but does not contain grade 8 or higher. A middle school is a school that does not meet the definition of an elementary school and contains grade 8 but does not contain grade 12. A high school is any school that contains grade 12. The LEA is defined as the local school district or a public charter school designated as an LEA.

The accountability of public schools without grades assessed (i.e., K-2 schools) will be based on the third grade test scores of the students who previously attended the associated feeder school.

All Idaho school students with disabilities as defined under section 602(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) amendments of 1997 and Board policy will participate in the Plan. The Individualized Education Program (IEP) team will determine how students with disabilities will participate in the Plan (i.e., ISAT or Idaho Alternate Assessment Program) as defined in Board policy. The Idaho Alternate Assessment will yield reading and mathematics assessment results for inclusion in AYP determination.

Idaho's assessment window includes six calendar weeks. The first five weeks of the testing window are considered the test administration window and the sixth week is considered the make-up window.

All LEP students in Idaho public schools are required to participate in the Plan. LEP, when used with reference to individuals, denotes:

- Individuals whose native language is a language other than English.

State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook

---

- Individuals who come from environments where a language other than English is dominant.
- Individuals who are American Indian and Alaskan natives and who come from environments where a language other than English has had a significant impact on their level of English language proficiency, and who, by reason thereof, have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language to deny such individuals the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms, where the language of instruction is English.

For accountability purposes, all LEP students are included. LEP students, who receive a score in the low range on the State Board of Education approved language acquisition proficiency test and have an Education Learning Plan (ELP), shall be given the ISAT with accommodations or adaptations as outlined in the ELP. For AYP purposes students can be categorized as LEP students for two (2) years after testing proficient on the language proficiency test and exiting the LEP program. LEP students who do not have an ELP or a language acquisition score will be given the regular ISAT without accommodations or adaptations. LEP students who are enrolled in their first year of school in the United States may take the English Proficiency test in lieu of the reading/language usage ISAT but will still be required to take the math ISAT with accommodations or adaptations as determined by the ELP and language proficiency score. Their participation will count positively in the 95% participation requirement for both the reading and math assessment. However, neither the math nor reading scores will be counted in the proficiency calculations.

All of the required subgroups, including students with disabilities and LEP students, who are enrolled in an Idaho public school for a full academic year, will be included in the performance level measures that determine AYP and accountability status of schools.

**Evidence:**

Idaho Code §§33-116 and 33-1002  
IDAPA 08.02.03

**2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?**

As defined in Board Rule, the following students are to be included in the Plan through the completion of a full academic year.

For inclusion in AYP determination

A student who is enrolled continuously in the same public school from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the spring testing administration period will be included in the calculation to determine if the school achieved AYP. A student is continuously enrolled if s/he has not transferred or dropped-out of the public school. Students who are serving suspensions/expulsions are still considered to be enrolled students. A student who is enrolled continuously in the LEA from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the spring testing administration period will be included when determining if the LEA has achieved AYP. A student who is enrolled continuously in a public school within Idaho from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the spring testing administration period will be included when determining if the state has achieved AYP.

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03, Section 112.03

### **2.3 How does the State determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?**

The following definition of students to be included in the Plan through the completion of a full academic year has been developed by a statewide citizen committee appointed by the Board and will be included in the Plan.

#### For inclusion in AYP determination

All of the following student subgroups are held accountable to the AYP indicators:

- A student who is enrolled continuously in the same public school from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the spring testing administration period will be included in the calculation to determine if the school achieved AYP. A student is continuously enrolled if he/she has not transferred or dropped-out of the public school. Students who are serving suspensions are still considered to be enrolled students. Students who are expelled but return to another school in the same district are considered continuously enrolled to determine the district AYP.
- A student who is enrolled continuously in the LEA from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the spring testing administration period will be included in the calculation to determine if the LEA achieved AYP.
- A student who is enrolled continuously in the state from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the spring testing administration period will be included in the calculation to determine if the state achieved AYP.

#### **Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03

**PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading and mathematics by no later than 2013-2014.**

**3.1 How does the state’s definition of Adequate Yearly Progress require all students to be proficient in reading and mathematics by the 2013-2014 school year?**

Idaho’s definition of AYP requires all students to be proficient in reading and mathematics by the end of the 2012-13 school year. It also requires all students and each subgroup to be held accountable to meet all of the academic indicators used to measure AYP (percent proficient in reading and mathematics; percent of participation in the assessments). Graduation rate for secondary schools and an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools will also be used to determine if a school has made AYP. (See Chart 3.) For 2005-2006 the proxy for disaggregation of high school subgroups will be based on the individual district’s choice of third academic indicator for elementary and middle schools; graduation rate disaggregation will not be available until the 2006-2007 school year.

**Chart 3. Accountability Subgroups and Academic Indicators**

	Academic Indicators		Participation Rate		Graduation / Additional Academic Indicator *
	Reading % Meeting Standard	Mathematics % Meeting Standard	Reading	Mathematics	
All Students					
Economically Disadvantaged					
American Indian/Alaskan Native					
Asian					
Black/African American					
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander					
White					
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity					
Students with Disabilities					
LEP Students					

\* The school and LEA will not be required to disaggregate graduation rate and the additional academic indicator data into the subgroups for accountability unless the school and LEA are using the “Safe Harbor” provision to achieve AYP.

All subgroups identified in Chart 4 will be held accountable for the academic indicators of reading and mathematics participation rate. In 2003-2004 the language usage test will serve as a proxy for the graduation rate and as an additional academic indicator

State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook

---

used to determine AYP. Idaho uses spring 2002-2003 ISAT scores as the baseline for calculating AYP. A timeline has been established for public schools to reach the goal of 100% of students proficient in reading and mathematics by the end of the 2012-13 school year. Annual intermediate goals have been established beginning in the 2004-05 school year with subsequent goals in 2006-07, 2008-09 and 2010-11 to assure increases in the percent of students proficient in reading and mathematics.

The first increase is expected in 2004-05, followed by incremental increases to assure that Idaho public schools and LEAs meet the goal of 100% proficiency in 2013-14. Setting 2004-05 as the date for the first expected increase corresponds with the expected impact of current state interventions at the elementary level using research-based reading strategies and professional development initiatives. By 2004-05, Idaho expects assessment results, especially at grade levels 3 and 4, to begin to reflect the successful implementation of these initiatives.

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
<b>Reading</b>											
Annual Goals (recommended)		3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Intermediate Goals	66%	66%	72%	72%	76%	78%	84%	84%	92%	92%	100%
	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
<b>Math</b>											
Annual Goals (recommended)	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Intermediate Goals	51%	51%	60%	60%	70%	70%	80%	80%	90%	90%	100%

**GROWTH OBJECTIVE (“Safe Harbor” Provision)**

If any student subgroups do not meet or exceed the Idaho’s annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have achieved AYP if the percent of students in the non-proficient subgroup:

1. Decreased by 10% from the preceding school year on the reading and mathematics indicators, as applicable,
2. Made progress on one or more of the other indicators, or is at/above the target goal for that indicator, and
3. Attained a 95% participation rate

**Evidence:** Board action August 15, 2003

**3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school, and LEA achieves AYP?**

The Plan bases the annual determination of whether each subgroup, public school, and LEA achieves AYP on the achievement of all students, including the following subgroups:

1. Economically disadvantaged
2. Racial/ethnic
3. Students with disabilities
4. Limited English Proficient

Idaho's AYP calculation also incorporates additional academic indicators of graduation rate (for secondary schools) and for elementary and middle schools beginning in the 2004-2005 school year the third indicator described in Section 7.2. Beginning in 2004-2005 the proxy for disaggregation of high school subgroups will be based on the individual district's choice of third academic indicator for elementary and middle schools; graduation rate disaggregation will be available for AYP determination in the 2006-2007 school year. (See Chart 4.)

(NOTE: For accountability purposes, the public school or LEA will not be required to disaggregate graduation rate and growth index data into the subgroups unless the public school or LEA is using the "Safe Harbor" provision to achieve AYP.)

Idaho will use a decreasing trend calculation under the "Safe Harbor" provision to identify schools that failed to achieve AYP by the method outlined in Chart 4. An Idaho public school or LEA may be considered to have achieved AYP if the percent of students in the non-proficient subgroup:

Part 1: Decreased by 10% from the preceding school year,

Part 2: Made progress on the additional academic indicators, or is at/above the target for that academic indicator, and

Part 3: Attained a 95% participation rate

An LEA is identified for improvement when it misses AYP in the same subject and same grade span for two consecutive years, or misses the other academic indicator in the same grade span for two consecutive years.

Beginning in 2002-2003 Idaho introduced the ISAT in grades 4, 8, and 10. With this phased-in introduction, many subgroups did not appear to have missed a target in

State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook

---

reading or math because there were less than 34 students (see section 5.5). With the introduction of more grades, more subgroups now have 34 or more students. To avoid the over-identification of schools and districts in “need of improvement,” Idaho will apply safe harbor (the reduction of not proficient students by 10%) to subgroups’ results from 2003 even when the “n” is less than 34.

- The safe harbor formula used is  

$$\frac{\% \text{ of not proficient students, year 1} - \% \text{ of not proficient students, year 2}}{\% \text{ of not proficient students, year 1}}$$
- Idaho will use the % of not proficient students in year 1 even when “n” is less than 34
- The “n” for year 2 data must be equal to or greater than 34

Completion of the introduction of the ISAT in grades 3-8 and 10 will significantly reduce the use of data from groups less than 34 to apply Part 1 of safe harbor.

For 2004 the number of schools identified for school improvement reduced by approximately 3.5% with the use of the above provisions.

**Chart 4. “Safe Harbor” Provision for AYP Determination with Accountability Subgroups and Indicators**

	Academic Indicators		Participation Rate		Graduation / Additional Academic Indicator*
	Reading % Meeting Standard	Mathematics % Meeting Standard	Reading	Mathematics	
	Decrease by 10% that percent of students not proficient from the preceding year in the school	Decrease by 10% that percent of students not proficient from the preceding year in the school	Attained a 95% Participation Rate	Attained a 95% Participation Rate	Meets or shows progress toward this indicator by that subgroup
All Students					
Economically Disadvantaged					
American Indian/Alaskan Native					
Asian					
Black/African American					
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander					
White					
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity					
Students with Disabilities					
LEP Students					



State of Idaho  
Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook

---

- \* The public school and LEA will not be required to disaggregate graduation rate and additional academic indicator data into the subgroups for accountability unless the public school and LEA is using the “Safe Harbor” provision to achieve AYP.

The state contractor, NWEA, will employ its current web-based system to collect and report data for all subgroups.

**Evidence:**

Board action August 15, 2003  
IDAPA 08.02.03, §114.07

### **3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?**

Idaho used student scores from the Spring 2002-2003 school year ISAT test for the starting point to calculate AYP. Based on those scores, Idaho set separate starting points for reading and mathematics for public schools with the goal of having a common starting point statewide for all public schools with similar grade configurations based on the ISAT. These averages were used to determine intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives.

#### **Calculating the Starting Point for AYP**

Because it provided the higher starting point of two options, the following method was used for establishing the starting point for AYP.

- Rank all Idaho public schools in order according to the percent of students who scored at the proficient level or above in reading in Spring 2003. The same process is used to calculate the starting point for mathematics. (In Steps 1 through 5, references are made to Chart 5, Example A, found on the following page.)
  1. In a chart similar to Example A, record the total students in the enrollment records for each school after they have been ordered based on the percent of students who scored at the proficient level or above.
  2. Beginning with the school with the smallest percent of proficient students in reading, calculate the cumulative enrollment. Referring to Example A, the cumulative enrollment for School X is 397 {200 (School Z) + 65 (School Y) + 132 (School X)}.
  3. Multiply the total student enrollment for Idaho public schools (top cumulative enrollment number) by 20 percent (.20) to find 20 percent of the total student enrollment. In the example, 20 percent of 1619 is 323.8. Rounding yields 324.
  4. Count up from the school with the smallest percent of students proficient in reading to identify the public schools whose combined school populations represent 20 percent of the total student enrollment (cumulative enrollment). From Example A, 20 percent of the total student enrollment is 324. To reach this number, the student populations from School X, School Y, and School Z are combined.
  5. Use the percent of students who scored at the proficient level in reading and mathematics from the public schools identified in Step 4. This percent is the minimum starting point for reading and mathematics. In Chart 5, Example A, the minimum starting point is 30 percent (the percent of proficient students at School X).

**Chart 5. Example**

School Name	Percent of Students Proficient in Reading and Math	Total students in enrollment records	Cumulative enrollment
School A	54 %	235	1619 (1384 + 235)
School B	40 %	400	1384 (984 + 400)
School W	38 %	587	984 (397 + 587)
School X	30 %	132	397 (265 + 132)
School Y	29 %	65	265 (200 + 65)
School Z	20 %	200	200

**Evidence:**

Board action, August 15, 2003

**3.2b What are the State’s annual measurable objectives for determining Adequate Yearly Progress?**

Idaho has established annual measurable objectives/intermediate goals for reading and mathematics. These goals/objectives will identify a single percent of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on the ISAT and the Idaho Alternate Assessment.

Idaho has set annual measurable objectives/intermediate goals separately for reading and mathematics. Beginning in 2003-2004 the annual intermediate goals/objectives will be used to determine AYP and serve as a guide to public schools in reaching the target goal by the end of the 2012-13 school year. The goals/objectives are the same for all public schools and LEAs for each grade configuration. The goals/objectives may be the same for more than one year. Idaho has set the goals/objectives and will use them to determine AYP for each public school and LEA by each student subgroup through 2012-13. (Refer to Section 3.1.)

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
<b>Reading</b>											
Annual Goals (recommended)		3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Intermediate Goals	66%	66%	72%	72%	76%	78%	84%	84%	92%	92%	100%
<b>Math</b>											
Annual Goals (recommended)	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Intermediate Goals	51%	51%	60%	60%	70%	70%	80%	80%	90%	90%	100%

**Evidence:**

Board action, August 15, 2003

**3.2c What are the State’s intermediate goals for determining Adequate Yearly Progress?**

Idaho has set intermediate goals that will be applied to all school configurations (elementary, middle, and high school.) The intermediate goals will increase in equal increments towards the goal of having 100% of students proficient in 2012-13. See chart in Section 3.2b (Previous page).

**Evidence:**

Board action, August 15, 2003

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.**

**4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State makes AYP?**

Idaho makes annual determinations of AYP for all public schools and LEAs. Idaho Code requires that ISDE publish an annual report of school, LEA, and state performance. Idaho Code § 33-4502 and IDAPA 08.02.03, Section 112, require annual decisions before the beginning of each school year regarding school performance.

Information used for AYP determination includes:

- The proficiency status of each student tested in the state based on the assessment results for the student. (Each student will have a total mathematics and a reading score and students' proficiency will be determined for each test as provided by the testing company contracted to score and report test results.)
- Whether each student has completed a full academic year at the school, LEA, or state level as determined by a comparison of the roster of students enrolled from the end of the first eight weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year who were continuously enrolled through the spring testing window. A student is continuously enrolled if he/she has not transferred or dropped-out of the public school. Students who are serving suspensions are still considered to be enrolled students. Students who are expelled but return to another school in the same district are considered continuously enrolled to determine the district AYP.
- The number of students enrolled for a full academic year determined by comparing the number of continuously enrolled students with the number of tested students.
- The percent of students enrolled for a full academic year.
- The graduation rate for public high schools as determined by the formula indicated in Section 7.1 with information coming from the current Tenth Month Enrollment Report (June) and prior year dropout reports (by student)
- Performance on the additional academic indicators: See Section 7.2 for description of the third academic indicator for public elementary and middle schools.
- Disaggregated test results, percent tested, and a third academic indicator and for elementary and middle schools the academic indicator described in Section 7.2 across all required subgroups. Beginning in 2004-2005 the proxy for disaggregation of high school subgroups was based on the individual district's choice of third academic indicator for elementary and middle schools; graduation rate disaggregation will be available for AYP determination for the 2006-2007 school year.

All required subgroups are identified based on subgroup membership indicated in the March testing collection. Idaho will notify schools and LEAs of any subgroup that initially does not achieve AYP in one year on any indicator (i.e., reading, mathematics,

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

participation rate, additional academic indicator, or graduation rate). However, if that school/LEA successfully achieves AYP for that same indicator the following year, that school/LEA will be considered to have achieved the AYP standard and will not be identified for school improvement. This approach will reduce the error of falsely identifying schools in need of improvement.

Each school, LEA, and sub-group will be required to meet the intermediate goals. Each school and LEA, including all subgroups, will be required to meet the 95% assessment participation rate indicator.

An LEA is identified for improvement when it misses AYP in the same subject and same grade span for two consecutive years, or misses the other academic indicator in the same grade span for two consecutive years. This language compares to model 3 of Attachment A of Assistant Secretary Harry Johnson's March 7, 2006, letter to states. No change is being made in the process already used; only the clarification language is being added.

Public schools will be accountable for all students who have been enrolled in the school for a full academic year. The LEA is accountable for all students who have been enrolled for a full academic year in that LEA. The State Education Agency (SEA) is accountable for all students who have been enrolled for a full academic year in state schools. (See Section 2.2.)

The decision about whether a school has achieved AYP is currently the responsibility of ISDE under the direction of the Board. All accountability decisions will be based on the information collected by NWEA, using the following electronic collections:

- Enrollment of Students at the end of the first eight weeks or fifty-six calendar days of the school year
- Class Roster File
- Tenth Month Enrollment Report (June)
- Total Year Student Registration Record
- Assessment Results by Student

**Evidence:**

Idaho State Code § 33-4502  
IDAPA 08.02.03  
Board action, August 15, 2003

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.**

**5.1 How does the definition of Adequate Yearly Progress include all the required student subgroups?**

Idaho’s definition of AYP includes measuring and reporting the achievement of subgroups of students by the indicators and subgroups that appear in Chart 6 (Accountability Subgroups and Academic Indicators). Currently, Idaho reports LEA and state performance by the required student subgroups. The Idaho Report Card can be viewed at ISDE’s website: [Idaho State Report Card 2003-2004](#)

Districts create Reports Cards for individual schools within their respective districts. Reports Cards are available to the public from each LEA.

**Chart 6. Accountability Subgroups and Academic Indicators**

	Academic Indicators		Participation Rate		Graduation/Additional Academic Indicator*
	Reading % Meeting Standard	Mathematics % Meeting Standard	Reading	Mathematics	
All Students					
Economically Disadvantaged					
American Indian/Alaskan Native					
Asian					
Black/African American					
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander					
White					
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity					
Students with Disabilities					
LEP Students					

\* The school/LEA will not be required to disaggregate graduation rate and additional academic indicator data into the subgroups for accountability unless the school/LEA is using the “Safe Harbor” provision to achieve AYP.

Idaho’s definition of AYP requires all student subgroups to be proficient in reading and mathematics by the end of the 2012-13 school year. (See Section 3.1.)



**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**Evidence:**

Idaho Report Card

<http://www.sde.state.id.us/ipd/reportcard/SchoolReportCard.asp>

IDAPA 08.02.03

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of Adequate Yearly Progress?**

Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), Idaho's assessment contractor, collects all data on all student subgroups. This data is then used to match student enrollment data with test results and other indicators to determine AYP for all required subgroups. School determinations of AYP are computed in this system. Each subgroup within the school or LEA must meet the objective for each indicator (assessment proficiency rate and participation rate) in order to achieve AYP.

ISDE uses a uniform averaging procedure across grade levels in a school, LEA, or state to produce a single assessment score for reading and a single assessment score for mathematics. Test results in 2003 provided starting points for determining intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives for schools at those grade configurations. (See Section 3.1) Additionally, Idaho applies the 95% participation rate to student subgroups, and the graduation rate. For 2004-2005 the proxy for disaggregation of high school subgroups will be based on the individual district's choice of third academic indicator for elementary and middle schools; graduation rate disaggregation will not be available until the 2006-2007 school year.

For AYP determination, the additional academic indicator calculation will be used for accountability at the school/LEA levels, but will not be calculated for each subgroup. However, for schools/LEAs that must use the "Safe Harbor" provision to achieve AYP the academic indicator must then be met by the subgroup(s) that failed to achieve AYP on the assessment standards.

Idaho will notify public schools and LEAs of any subgroup that initially does not achieve AYP in one year on any indicator (i.e., reading, mathematics, participation rate, additional academic indicator, or graduation rate). However, if that school/LEA successfully achieves AYP for that same indicator the following year, that school and LEA will be considered to have achieved the AYP standard and will not be identified as a school in need of improvement. This approach will reduce the error of false identification of schools in need of improvement based on that standard.

The Idaho Report Card will chart the progress of all groups of students and the status of each group in relation to annual measurable objectives based on the percent of students at the proficient level for reading, mathematics, the participation rate, and additional academic indicators. ISDE will provide the participating school, LEA, and state with the annual Report Card by the end of September with results.

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of Adequate Yearly Progress?**

Students with disabilities, as defined under Section 602(3) of IDEA and State Board policy are required to participate in all statewide achievement tests in Idaho. For AYP purposes, Board policy also stipulates that students with disabilities who have been enrolled in a public school for a full academic year will be included in the accountability formula. Students with disabilities must participate either in the ISAT, with or without accommodations and adaptations, or in the Idaho Alternate Assessment (IAA). The participation and proficiency results for the students with disabilities will be included in all AYP determinations.

Idaho notifies schools and LEAs of the AYP status for the student with disabilities subgroup on each indicator (i.e., reading and mathematics proficiency and participation rates, graduation rate, or the performance rate on the additional academic indicator). If a school and/or LEA successfully achieves AYP for that same indicator the following year, that school and/or LEA will be considered to have achieved the AYP standard and will not be identified for school improvement based on the AYP standard.

The IAA is for special education students with significant disabilities, whose cognitive impairment may prevent them from attaining grade-level knowledge and skills, even with effective instruction and modifications. The IEP team determines whether a student is eligible to take an alternate assessment by using the state guidelines. The IAA is aligned to alternate knowledge and skills, which are aligned to the Idaho Achievement Standards. Alternate knowledge and skills differ in complexity and scope from the general education knowledge and skills. The IAA has a clearly defined scoring criteria and procedure and a reporting format that identifies the same performance levels as students taking the ISAT. All students taking the IAA are included in the calculations of adequate yearly progress (AYP) as either proficient (and above) or not yet proficient at the school, LEA and state level in reading and math and participation rates. The percent of students in the Alternate Assessment to ISAT will not exceed 1% of all students in the grades assessed at the LEA and the state levels. If it is projected that an LEA may exceed the 1% cap due to unusual circumstances, the LEA must use the state appeal process for approval.

As in 2005-2006, for calculating AYP for 2006-2007 Idaho will again take advantage of the additional flexibility offered for students with disabilities. Using the federal guidelines (May 10, 2005) for a transition option number 1, a proxy equivalent to two percent of the total number of students assessed will be calculated to allow an additional credit (21 percentage points based on 2005 numbers—2006 numbers are not yet available) to schools or districts that miss the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets solely because of students with disabilities. This proxy percentage will be applied uniformly to all relevant schools and districts.

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03

<http://www.sde.state.id.us/SpecialEd/AltAssessment/iaamanual.pdf>

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of Adequate Yearly Progress?**

All LEP students in Idaho public schools are required to participate in the Plan using appropriate accommodations and modifications. LEP, when used with reference to individuals, represents:

- Individuals whose native language is a language other than English.
- Individuals who come from environments where a language other than English is dominant.
- Individuals who are American Indian and Alaskan natives and who come from environments where a language other than English has had a significant impact on their level of English language proficiency, and who, by reason thereof, have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language to deny such individuals the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms, where the language of instruction is English.

The following language is from IDAPA 08.02.03: "Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, as defined in Subsection 112.03.d.iv., who receive a score in the low range on the State Board of Education approved language acquisition proficiency test and have an Education Learning Plan (ELP), shall be given the ISAT with accommodations or adaptations as outlined in the ELP. For AYP purposes students can be categorized as LEP students for two (2) years after testing proficient on the language proficiency test and exiting the LEP program. LEP students who do not have an ELP or a language acquisition score will be given the regular ISAT without accommodations or adaptations. LEP students who are enrolled in their first year of school in the United States may take the English Proficiency test in lieu of the reading/language usage ISAT but will still be required to take the math ISAT with accommodations or adaptations as determined by the ELP and language proficiency score. Their participation will count positively in the 95% participation requirement for both the reading and math assessment. However, neither the math nor reading scores will be counted in the proficiency calculations."

All of the required subgroups, including LEP students as described above, who are enrolled in an Idaho public school for a full academic year will be included in the performance level measures that determine AYP and accountability status of schools, and the approval status of schools, LEAs, and the state.

Idaho will notify schools and LEAs of the LEP subgroup that initially does not achieve AYP in one year on any indicator (i.e., reading, mathematics, participation rate, additional academic indicator, or graduation rate). However, if that school and/or LEA successfully achieves AYP for that same indicator the following year, that school and/or LEA will be considered to have achieved the AYP standard and will not be identified as a school in need of improvement based on the AYP standard.

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

Board rule addresses the participation of LEP students and also outlines the criteria that a school-based team must evaluate each individual LEP student to determine the appropriate participation in the ISAT. LEAs may approve assessment with accommodations and modifications on a case-by-case basis for individual students.

For an LEP student who is also identified as a student with disabilities under IDEA, the IEP team will determine whether the student participates in the ISAT or meets the criteria for the Idaho Alternate Assessment.

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03, §§111.04 and 112

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**5.5 What is the State’s definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?**

Reporting Purposes

ISDE’s minimum “n” for reporting is 10 students. Idaho Report Card does not report student data for less than 10 students. In addition, when the cell being reported is greater than 95% or less than 5%, only the symbols >95% or < 5% will be reported. This will further reduce the possibility of inadvertently identifying information about individual students.

Board rule outlines the achievement performance measures for reporting the school’s total students and each subgroup (migrant students, student gender, students with disabilities, LEP students, economically disadvantaged students, race/ethnicity to include American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, White, and Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity), which contains 10 or more students.

Accountability Purposes

ISDE’s minimum “n” for accountability is 34 students. The minimum “n” of 34 will apply to ISAT, including Idaho Alternative Assessment test scores. ISDE examined the impact of the various “n” values that are statistically defensible for making valid and reliable AYP decisions. The “n” value of 34 provides confidence intervals of .05 and a power of .80, both of which are statistically acceptable.

For a comparative perspective, the following chart shows the impact of various “n” values on the number of schools that would be excluded at each value.

Fall Enrollment	Number of Schools	Elementary	Alternative/ Secondary	Exceptional Child
≤ 50	66	29	27	2
≤ 40	60	27	23	2
≤ 34	51	25	17	2

As the chart illustrates an “n” of 34 includes 15 schools in the calculation that would not be reported with an “n” of 50. Idaho has a very homogeneous student population. Approximately 86% of students are White, 11% are Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, and 3% is identified as Black/African American, Asian, or American Indian/Alaskan Native.

With an “n” greater than 34 the probability is high that whole subgroups of the population would be excluded from performance calculations. Idaho will use grouping techniques consistent with federal guidelines to group students across grade-level averaging to reach reportable student numbers.

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

Beginning in 2002-2003 Idaho introduced the ISAT in grades 4, 8, and 10. With this phased-in introduction, many subgroups did not appear to have missed a target in reading or math because there were less than 34 students (see section 5.5). With the introduction of more grades, more subgroups now have 34 or more students. To avoid the over-identification of schools and districts in “need of improvement,” Idaho will apply safe harbor (the reduction of not proficient students by 10%) to subgroups’ results from 2003 even when the “n” is less than 34.

- The safe harbor formula used is  
$$\frac{\% \text{ of not proficient students, year 1} - \% \text{ of not proficient students, year 2}}{\% \text{ of not proficient students, year 1}}$$
- Idaho will use the % of not proficient students in year 1 even when “n” is less than 34
- The “n” for year 2 data must be equal to or greater than 34

Completion of the introduction of the ISAT in grades 3-8 and 10 will significantly reduce the use of data from groups less than 34 to apply Part 1 of safe harbor.

Board policy outlines the achievement performance level measures for accountability as the “school’s total students and each subgroup (students with disabilities, Limited English Proficient, economically disadvantaged, and racial/ethnic to include American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, White, and Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity) that contains 34 or more students.”

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?**

Idaho uses a minimum “n” of 10 for reporting of school and LEA results. This minimum is acceptable for Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) requirements. Additionally, the Board policy assures the privacy rights of all students.

Individual student results are not public record. In order to assure that individual students cannot be identified, school results are not publicly reported or displayed when the number of students in a subgroup is less than 10. Asterisks will be used on the Idaho Report Card when data has been suppressed.

Results greater than 95% will be reported as “> 95%” and results less than 5% will be reported as “< 5%” in order to prevent reporting information that would violate the privacy of individual students.

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03, §111.05



**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State’s academic assessments.**

**6.1 How is the State’s definition of Adequate Yearly Progress based primarily on academic assessments?**

Idaho’s definition for AYP is based primarily on reading and mathematics assessments for all student subgroups. The 2002-2003 test results serve as the baseline data years for the assessment indicators.

To achieve or exceed AYP, all student subgroups are required to meet the state’s definition of proficient for reading and mathematics by the 2012-13 school year. Beginning in the 2004-05 school year, each school and LEA will be required to increase the percent of students who are at the proficient level in that school or LEA consistent with intermediate goals, based on 2002-2003 baseline data.

The assessments that will be used to determine AYP calculations for schools and LEAs in Idaho are designated by “X” and on the following chart:

**Chart 7. Idaho’s Accountability Assessments**

Grade	ISAT	
	Reading	Mathematics
K		
1		
2	X	X
3	X	X
4	X	X
5	X	X
6	X	X
7	X	X
8	X	X
9		
10	X	X
11		
12		

The same performance level standards are applied to public schools and LEAs, disaggregating the data into the federally-defined subgroups to determine the minimum percent of students at or above the state’s identified proficient performance level for the respective grade spans using the starting point calculations outlined in section 3.2b and Chart 5. These calculations will identify the percent of students achieving AYP for 2003-04; determine AYP intermediate goals/annual objectives based on state performance through 2012–13; and determine annual growth objectives based on school performance up to 2012–13.

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

In addition to meeting the 95% assessment participation rate, the graduation rate will be used as the additional indicator for public high schools. For 2004-2005 the third indicator as described in Section 7.2 will be used for elementary and middle public schools for determining AYP. For 2004-2005 the proxy for disaggregation of high school subgroups will be based on the individual district's choice of third academic indicator for elementary and middle schools; graduation rate disaggregation will not be available until the 2006-2007 school year.

**Evidence:**

Board action, January 26, 2004  
IDAPA 08.02.03

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public high schools and an additional indicator selected by the state for public middle and public elementary schools (such as alternative performance measure rates).**

**7.1 What is Idaho’s definition for public school graduation rate?**

For Idaho, the graduation rate is measured using the number of students who graduate from a public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state’s academic standards) in the standard number of years. Idaho includes in the graduation rate the number of students with disabilities who are entitled to services up to the age of 21 where the Individual Education Plan warrants the additional time to meet graduation requirements. The number of high school graduates and dropouts by grade has been reported to ISDE for the last five years.

Idaho uses the formula for graduation rate from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). Graduation rate ( $G$ ) is defined by NCES as the proportion of students that begin in ninth grade and go on to complete twelfth grade with a diploma. Idaho includes students who complete high school under the IEP exception. A General Education Development (GED) certificate does not meet requirements that are comparable for receipt of a regular high school diploma.

$$G = c_{st}^{long} = \frac{g_{st}}{g_{st} + d_{st}^{12} + d_{s(t-1)}^{11} + d_{s(t-2)}^{10} + d_{s(t-3)}^9}$$

Where

- $G$  = graduation rate.
- $c_{st}^{long}$  = four-year completion rate for state  $s$  at year  $t$ .
- $g_{st}$  = number of high school completers at year  $t$ .
- $d_{st}^{12}$  = number of grade 12 dropouts at year  $t$ .
- $d_{s(t-1)}^{11}$  = number of grade 11 dropouts at year  $t-1$ .
- $d_{s(t-2)}^{10}$  = number of grade 10 dropouts at year  $t-2$ .
- $d_{s(t-3)}^9$  = number of grade 9 dropouts at year  $t-3$ .

The Board established the graduation rate standard of 90%. Schools will be considered as having achieved AYP if they meet or exceed the standard or if they have made improvement toward the standard.

Idaho will first determine whether each school met the 90% target or improved its graduation rate over the previous year.

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

All schools with over 100 in the graduating cohort will continue to have AYP determined by this formula.

Schools with graduating cohorts from 35-100 will have graduation rates calculated to determine whether they have improved or reached 90%. A three year rolling average of graduation rates will be applied to calculate AYP when they fail to meet 90%.

For small schools below the minimum “n” (with 34 or fewer students in the cohort, Idaho will conduct a small school review by

- First determining whether the school has met the 90% target or improved its graduation rate over the previous year.
- Second, a three year rolling average of graduation rates will be applied to calculate AYP when they fail to meet 90%.
- Finally, AYP determination will be based on whether the school lost no more than 1 student per year.

For subgroups with less than 10, the 90% or improvement rule will be applied at the LEA and state levels.

For AYP determination, the graduation rate calculation will be used for accountability at the school/LEA levels, but will not be calculated for each subgroup. However, for schools/LEAs that must use the “Safe Harbor” provision to achieve AYP for the achievement indicator, the graduation rate standard must then be met by the subgroup(s) that failed to achieve AYP on the assessment standards.

While the state can calculate the graduation rate for the student population as a whole, the current level of data does not allow for disaggregation of data by subgroups. Idaho has implemented the collection of disaggregated data, and this detailed data should allow the calculation of subgroup graduation rates for “Safe Harbor” determinations by the 2006-2007 school year. For 2004-2005 the proxy for disaggregation of high school subgroups will be based on the individual district’s choice of third academic indicator for elementary and middle schools; graduation rate disaggregation will not be available until the 2006-2007 school year.

**Evidence:**

Board action October 2, 2003  
IDAPA 08.02.03

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools and public middle schools for the definition of AYP?**

The Idaho State Board of Education has approved beginning in the 2004-2005 school year an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools. Districts may choose among the following three options:

- Meet or exceed previous Language Usage ISAT proficiency rates, or
- Reduce the percentage of students that score at the below basic level on the reading and math ISAT, or
- Increase the percentage of students that score at the advanced level on the reading and math ISAT.

The guidelines for the Language Usage proficiency rates will be the same as for the previous two years. Schools/districts and any applicable subgroup using safe harbor must do one of the following to meet the Language Usage goal:

1. Maintain the percent of proficient or advanced students from the previous year, or
2. Increase the percent proficient or advanced students from previous year, or
3. Achieve a proficiency rate above 72% (this target is set to increase every two years).

In addition, the guidelines below apply to increasing the percent of advanced in reading and math or decreasing the percent of below basic in reading and math:

1. Increase in percent of advanced is an average of the percent of increase in reading and the increase in math delineated by the following formulas:
  - a) Formula for increase of advanced percent:  $((\text{Percent of advanced students in reading year 2} - \text{percent of advanced students in reading year 1}) + (\text{Percent of advanced students in math year 2} - \text{percent of advanced students in math year 1})) / 2$
  - b) Formula for decrease of below basic percent:  $((\text{Percent of below basic students in reading year 1} - \text{percent of below basic students in reading year 2}) + (\text{Percent of below basic students in math year 1} - \text{percent of below basic students in math year 2})) / 2$
2. Districts must maintain the previous year's level or make progress in either the percent of advanced or percent of below basic students to have achieved the goal.

The following are general guidelines for all three options:

1. Selection of an option is in force for a minimum of one year. Districts may change their selection annually by written notification to the Office of the State Board of Education by September 15<sup>th</sup> of each year. The selection will remain in effect unless notification is received by this date.
2. Districts must select a choice that will be applied to all schools within that district, including charter schools. Charter schools not chartered by a district will make a decision as an LEA.

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

LEA choices must be made at the beginning of the school year. The language usage option was assigned to LEAs that did not make the cut off date for the 2004-2005 school year.

These gains will be measured by performance on the ISAT tests, eliminating the need for an additional statewide test. Graduation rate will serve as the additional academic indicator for high schools unless safe harbor is used for AYP determination. For 2004-2005 the proxy for disaggregation of high school subgroups will be based on the individual district's choice of third academic indicator for elementary and middle schools; graduation rate disaggregation will not be available until the 2006-2007 school year.

For the AYP determination, the additional academic indicator calculation will be used for accountability at the school/LEA levels, but will not be calculated for each subgroup. However, for schools/LEAs that must use the "Safe Harbor" provision to achieve AYP for the achievement indicator, the additional academic indicator standard must then be met by the subgroup(s) that failed to achieve AYP on the assessment standards.

**Evidence:**

Board action, January 26, 2004

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?**

Idaho has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable as demonstrated by the use of clear definitions (e.g., United States Department of Education-recommended calculation formulas) for data elements and the statewide collection and analysis of data by the Board and ISDE. The Board and ISDE review data submitted by LEAs, including school/LEA graduation and additional academic indicators, and publishes the information in school/LEA/state Report Cards. All databases are monitored to verify the accuracy of data.

Idaho's graduation rate calculation is consistent with the NCES calculation (See Section 7.1) with the exception that Idaho includes a provision that for students with disabilities who meet the criteria established on his or her IEP that specifically address completion of the student's secondary program more than four years can be taken to graduate.

Idaho has contracted with outside vendors to conduct independent reliability and validity studies of ISAT reading and mathematics assessments. Educators from each part of the state will be involved in ongoing item writing and test development to provide test items for each testing session. Alignment study results will be used to guide the items writing sessions and assure that alignment is maintained. The alternate assessment has been independently analyzed to assure validity, reliability, and alignment.

**Evidence:**

Idaho State Department of Education website for Idaho Report Card  
<http://www.sde.state.id.us/ipd/reportcard/SchoolReportCard.asp>

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.**

**8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?**

For accountability purposes, using the ISAT, achievement in reading and mathematics are measured separately. (See Chart 3 in Section 3.1) During the 2002–03 academic year Idaho implemented the ISAT assessment program on a statewide basis.

The starting points for all student groups were calculated using data from all Idaho public schools.



**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.**

**9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?**

Idaho will provide a process that creates evidence that AYP determinations are reliable. The reliability of the Plan determinations will be assured through:

- Uniform averaging of proficiency categories across grade levels within the school and LEA to produce a single school or LEA score.
- 2002-03 scores were used as baseline for determining starting point. Idaho has established the trajectory of intermediate goals and annual objectives beginning in 2004-2005.
- Statistical tests to support the minimum "n" decision.
- A minimum subgroup size of 34 is being used for accountability.
- External review for content standards alignment.
- "Safe Harbor" provision and evidence that this rule increases reliability of decisions about schools.

**Evidence:**

Assessment Data analysis from ISAT

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?**

Idaho's Plan is designed for construct validity and ongoing analysis of results.

Reliable assessments aligned with content standards will result in accurate identification of schools and LEAs in need of improvement. Accurate data collection and reporting will support the inferences drawn from the System. Schools and LEAs will have access to an appeals procedure following preliminary identification.

In order to increase the validity of accountability decisions, Board policy includes the following Appeals Process:

1. The Idaho State Department of Education, under the direction of the Idaho State Board of Education, determines preliminary identification of all schools and LEAs that have not met AYP according to the state criteria. The LEA will notify Title I schools who are identified for school improvement.
2. Within 30 days of preliminary identification, the agency (LEA/school) reviews its data and may challenge its identification. The agency (LEA/school) not meeting AYP may appeal its status and provide evidence to support the challenge to the agency making the identification (Idaho Board of Education or LEA).
3. No later than thirty days after preliminary identification, the identifying agency reviews the appeal and makes a final determination of identification for school improvement.

A valid and reliable accountability system has been designed for the ISAT assessment program that includes the requirements of NCLB. The new accountability system will be designed to create the most advantageous balance of 1) reliable results, 2) public confidence in the results, 3) including all public schools in the accountability formula, and 4) capacity building and development of resources to serve Idaho students and schools.

As the new Idaho Accountability System is implemented, Idaho will regularly examine the validity and reliability of the data related to the determination of AYP and decision consistency for holding public schools and LEAs accountable within this system. Updated analysis and reporting of decision consistency will be shared with the public at appropriate intervals.

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessment?**

Idaho used the ISAT on-grade-level tests and the Plan as the basis for development of annual measurable objectives determined by the computations for AYP during the transition period of 2002-03. Scores derived from the annual spring administration of the ISAT will be used to determine AYP for Idaho schools.

ISAT is delivered primarily on the computer or paper and pencil format. During the spring 2002-03 test administration period, 94% of Idaho's schools delivered the test via computer. Online administration of the test increases accuracy and reliability of test results. New assessments that are implemented as part of the Plan (i.e., science) will employ similar computer technology to assure consistent accuracy and reliability.

Students attending new public schools for the first year will be included in the LEA and state levels for AYP determinations.

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**PRINCIPLE 10.** In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95 percent of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

**10.1 What is the State’s method for calculating participation rates in the state assessments for use in Adequate Yearly Progress determinations?**

NCLB requires that a *minimum* of 95% of students enrolled in public schools as well as 95% of students in *each* subpopulation take the test. The 95% minimum precludes public schools from shielding low-scoring students in subpopulations from AYP accountability. Failure to include 95% of students automatically identifies the school as not having achieved AYP. The 95% determination is made by dividing the number of students assessed on the Spring ISAT by the number of students reported on the class roster files:

$$\frac{T}{E} \geq .95$$

Where

T = number of students tested.

E = number of enrolled students reported for the March Average Daily Attendance reporting period in the designated grade levels.

Invalid tests are included in the denominator, but not in the numerator.

In 2004 Idaho added to Board Rule the provision to use an average of the most recent three years to determine whether an LEA meets or exceeds the 95% requirement.

IDAPA 08.02.03, Rules Governing Thoroughness, in section 03(b)1 states:

If a school district does not meet the ninety-five percent (95%) participation target for the current year, the participation rate can be calculated by the most current three (3) year average of participation.

This change is in accord with the 2004 policy decision of the U.S. Department of Education.

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03

**State of Idaho**  
**Consolidated State Application - Accountability Workbook**

---

**10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?**

For determining AYP, Idaho will apply the 95% of total enrollment participation requirement for grades tested for all schools and subgroups unless the subgroup has less than the minimum "n." For subgroups less than the minimum "n," the 95% assessed requirement will be applied at the LEA and state levels.

Failure to include ninety-five percent (95%) of all students and ninety-five percent (95%) of students in designated subgroups automatically identifies the school as not having achieved AYP. The ninety-five percent (95%) determination is made by dividing the number of students assessed on the spring ISAT by the number of students reported on the class roster file for the spring ISAT.

- 1) If a school district does not meet the ninety-five percent (95%) participation target for the current year, the participation rate will be calculated by a three (3) year average of participation.
- 2) Students who are absent for the entire state-approved testing window because of a significant medical emergency are exempt from taking the ISAT if such circumstances prohibit them from participating.

For groups of ten (10) or more students, absences for the state assessment may not exceed five percent (5%) of the current enrollment or two (2) students, whichever is greater. Groups of less than ten (10) students will not have a participation determination.

**Evidence:**

IDAPA 08.02.03