

**Table B–Idaho Part C**  
**Previously Identified Issues**

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> In its September 29, 2005 APR response letter, OSEP identified noncompliance with this requirement, and requested that the State provide its data and analysis, in its SPP, demonstrating progress toward compliance with the requirement that all services identified on the IFSP are provided as required by 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p>The State was also required to submit to OSEP its data and analysis demonstrating compliance with those Part C provisions by October 29, 2006.</p>	<p>The State submitted its data and analysis in a letter dated December 2, 2005, sent through electronic mail, and its SPP, pages 2-3.</p> <p>The State reported a Statewide level of compliance at 87.2%. Corrective action plans were in place for all regions not demonstrating compliance and the Idaho lead agency requested emergency funds from the State to address its noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State provided data that demonstrate continuing noncompliance with this indicator, specifically that all IFSP services are provided as required by 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1). The level of compliance reported was 87.2%.</p> <p>See also Table A, Indicator 1.</p>	<p>The State’s final progress report demonstrating compliance with this requirement, which was due October 29, 2006, may be submitted with the State’s FFY 2005 APR, due by February 1, 2007.</p> <p>The State must review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>See also Table A, Indicator 1.</p>

**Table B—Idaho Part C**  
**Previously Identified Issues**

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p><b>Indicator 7:</b> In its September 29, 2005 APR response letter, OSEP requested that the State provide data demonstrating compliance, in the SPP, for conducting evaluations and assessments and holding initial IFSP meetings within 45 days of referral as required by 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).</p> <p>OSEP initially identified this requirement as an area of noncompliance in two regions in December 2002. The State's subsequent progress reports to OSEP demonstrated improvement, with 94.7% Statewide compliance reported in the State's previous (FFY 2003) APR.</p>	<p>The State submitted its data and analysis in a letter dated December 2, 2005, sent through electronic mail, and its SPP, pages 35-39.</p> <p>The State's baseline data for achieving compliance in this area was 88.9% from September 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. However, the State also reported a Statewide compliance rate of 76.2% for September 1, 2005 (one quarter).</p> <p>The State has a corrective action plan in place that includes hiring temporary employees and requesting emergency funds from the State legislature to address this area of noncompliance.</p>	<p>The State provided data that demonstrate continuing noncompliance with this indicator, specifically the requirements for conducting evaluations and assessments and holding initial IFSP meetings within 45 days of referral as required by 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a).</p> <p>The State's level of compliance slipped from 88.9% from September 1, 2004 through June 2005, to 76.2% in September 2005, due primarily to significant slippage in one region in the State.</p>	<p>In its APR, due February 1, 2007, the State must submit data that demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>The State must review and, if necessary, revise its improvement strategies to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

**Table B–Idaho Part C**  
**Previously Identified Issues**

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p><b>Indicator 8A:</b> In its September 29, 2005 APR response letter, OSEP did not identify noncompliance with this issue, but requested that the State ensure that the data provided in the SPP, in response to Indicator 8A, represent data regarding children exiting Part C.</p>	<p>The State submitted its data and analysis in a letter dated December 2, 2005, sent through electronic mail, and its SPP, pages 41-44.</p> <p>The State's data, collected in September 2005, indicated that three regions were in compliance for this Part C requirement, four regions did not demonstrate compliance and corrective action plans were in place for regions not demonstrating compliance.</p>	<p>The State reported an 81.25% level of compliance, with four of seven regions not in compliance with this indicator, specifically that IFSPs contain transition steps and services as required by 34 CFR §§303.344(h) and 303.148(b)(4).</p>	<p>The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>The State should review and, if necessary, revise its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

**Table B–Idaho Part C  
Previously Identified Issues**

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p><b>Indicator 8B:</b> In its September 29, 2005 APR response letter, OSEP did not identify noncompliance with this issue, but requested that the State provide baseline data regarding the number of children who may have been eligible for Part B services in which the LEA was notified of the child’s potential eligibility for Part B.</p>	<p>The State submitted its data and analysis in a letter dated December 2, 2005, sent through electronic mail, and its SPP, pages 41-44.</p> <p>The State’s data indicated that three regions were in compliance for this Part C requirement, four regions did not demonstrate compliance, and corrective action plans were in place for regions not demonstrating compliance.</p>	<p>The State reported a 58% level of compliance, with four of seven regions not in compliance with this indicator, specifically the requirement to notify the LEA, if a child is potentially eligible for Part B as required by 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1).</p>	<p>The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>The State should review and, if necessary, revise its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p>

**Table B–Idaho Part C**  
**Previously Identified Issues**

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p><b>Indicator 8C:</b> In its September 29, 2005 APR response letter, OSEP did not identify noncompliance with this issue, but requested that the State provide data regarding transition conferences that represents children potentially eligible for Part B.</p>	<p>The State submitted its data and analysis in a letter dated December 2, 2005, through electronic mail, and its SPP, pages 41-44.</p> <p>The State's data, collected in September 2005, indicated that two regions were in compliance for this Part C requirement, five regions did not demonstrate compliance and corrective action plans were in place for regions not demonstrating compliance.</p>	<p>The State reported a 66.7% level of compliance, with five of seven regions not in compliance with this indicator, specifically the requirement that a transition conference is held, if a child is potentially eligible for Part B as required by 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i).</p> <p>See Table A for other issue regarding 8C.</p>	<p>The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>The State should review and, if necessary, revise its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>See Table A for other issue regarding 8C.</p>