

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Louisiana



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

198

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

MONITORING

The Louisiana Department of Education, LDOE, recognizes its duty as a state education agency to ensure statutory and regulatory requirements related to federal education programs are followed and program activities, supports, and services are achieving intended outcomes. The LDOE, Office of Statewide Monitoring, monitors the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B programs. The LDOE's monitoring process is a model of Continuous Improvement Monitoring. The process includes a tiered system of ranking using a risk-based selection process, and more diverse, meaningful monitoring experiences. Through this process, LDOE can uncover the root cause for systemic issues of non-compliance.

The risk-based process evaluates every school system every year for monitoring support. Risk indicators are determined through annual consultation with stakeholders, experts, and LDOE staff who lead the State's academic planning, accountability, and program support structures. Factors considered during the monitoring selection process currently include a growth analysis component for subgroup performance on statewide assessments, graduate and dropout rates. Other factors considered during the monitoring selection process may include one or more of the following components: LEA Determinations, federally required compliance indicators, performance indicators, state complaints, fiscal audits, and/or other agency established goals and priorities such as those identified in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Results from the ranking process informs the level and type of monitoring which is most appropriate.

The primary focus of the State's monitoring activities are on: (1) improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and (2) ensuring that Louisiana meets the program requirements under IDEA Part B, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. The risk-based monitoring structure co-exist alongside the required APR monitoring and reporting requirements. This data-driven differentiated system of monitoring help elevate and target areas that directly impact student performance and serves as a major component of the State's overall General Supervision structure.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

LDOE is committed to assisting schools and parents in their efforts to resolve disagreements in the least adversarial manner possible. Therefore, LDOE has developed several processes, including those described below, for resolving disagreements about the provision of a free appropriate public education, payment for services obtained, or a child's eligibility, evaluation, level of services, or placement.

IEP FACILITATION

IEP facilitation is available to parents and school systems. Typically, an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Facilitator is brought in when parents and school system staff are having difficulties communicating with one another regarding the needs of the student. The IEP Facilitator is an independent professional, trained to assist in creating an atmosphere for fair communication who also oversees the successful drafting of an IEP for the student. Either the parent or the school system can request IEP facilitation; however, since the process is voluntary, both sides must agree to participate. The process can be initiated by request to the Legal Division of the State Department of Education, and the service is provided at no cost to the parent or the school system.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS / EARLY RESOLUTION PROCESS

Parents of children with disabilities may file informal complaints. The implementation of the informal complaint/Early Resolution Process (ERP) draws on the traditional model of parents and school systems working cooperatively in the educational interest of children to achieve their shared goals of meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities.

FORMAL COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION

A parent, adult student, individual, or organization may file a signed written request with LDOE to begin a formal complaint investigation. Formal complaint investigation procedures are developed under the supervisory jurisdiction of the LDOE to address allegations that a school system is violating a requirement of Part B of the IDEA. The formal complaint investigation request is also limited by regulations to action(s) occurring within one year before the formal complaint was filed.

MEDIATION

Mediation is available to resolve a disagreement between parents and the school systems regarding the identification, evaluation, placement, services, or the provision of a FAPE to a child with a disability. Parents or school systems may request mediation independent of, before, at the same time, or after requesting a due process hearing or complaint investigation. Requesting mediation will not prevent or delay a due process hearing or complaint investigation, and participating in mediation will not impair or waive any other rights of parents.

Mediation is a method for discussing and resolving disagreements between parents and school systems with the help of an impartial third person who has been trained in effective mediation techniques. Mediation is a voluntary process, and all parties must agree to participate in order for the mediation session to occur. The mediation sessions are scheduled in a timely manner and held in a location that is convenient to the parties in the dispute.

Mediation services are provided by LDOE at no cost to parents and school systems.

A mediator does not make decisions; instead, he or she facilitates discussion and decision-making. The discussions in a mediation session are confidential and may not be used as evidence in subsequent due process hearings or civil court proceedings. If the mediation process results in full or partial agreement, the mediator will prepare a written mediation agreement that must be signed by both parties. In addition to describing agreements made in the course of mediation, the mediation agreement will state that all discussions that occurred during the mediation are confidential and may not be used as evidence in a due process hearing or civil court proceeding. The signed agreement shall be legally binding on both parties and enforceable in a court of competent jurisdiction.

DUE PROCESS HEARING

A due process hearing is a formal proceeding in which evidence is presented to an administrative law judge (ALJ) to resolve a dispute between the parents of a child with a disability and the school system regarding the identification, evaluation, eligibility, or placement of or the provision of a free appropriate public education to a child with a disability. Only the parent of a child with a disability, an attorney representing the parent, or a school system may request a due process hearing regarding a student with a disability within one year of the date that the alleged action forming the basis of the hearing request was known or should have been known. This one-year limit does not apply if the parents were prevented from requesting the hearing because the school system specifically misrepresented that it had resolved the problem or the school system withheld pertinent information that it was required to provide under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).

Once a request for a hearing is received, LDOE will issue an acknowledgement of receipt and forward the request to the Division of Administrative Law, an independent state agency that conducts due process hearings for LDOE. The Division of Administrative Law will assign an ALJ to the case, and he or she will be provided with a copy of the hearing request. Otherwise, the request remains confidential. The ALJ will then coordinate a prehearing conference to discuss the hearing process and establish a schedule for activities related to the hearing. Please see Introduction attachment for additional information.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

LDOE employs two primary mechanisms to provide technical assistance that ensures the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to LEAs: field support and planning resources.

FIELD SUPPORT

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM

The School Improvement Team is the primary support vehicle for school systems, providing immediate, differentiated, targeted assistance to school systems. The Team targets Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) schools, and the Team includes School Improvement Support Specialists (SISS) who work collaboratively with school system leaders to draft cooperative agreements, analyze data, and determine the School Improvement Best Practice(s) that best meet the needs of school system, educators, and students. These leaders assess the unique needs and approaches of their school systems and build upon those strengths to support implementation of the School Improvement Best Practices through collaboratively analyzing data, strengths and opportunities for growth, a school improvement plan, observations and reflective feedback. The School Improvement Best Practices strategy is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2023-2024 school year. LDOE has partnered with the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) to develop, implement, and support five School Improvement Best Practices. The five best practices are:

- instructional leadership team support,
- teacher collaboration support,
- teaching standards support,
- principal standards support, and
- career pipeline support.

129 school systems are currently receiving support with instructional leadership teams, and of those, 64 are also receiving support in teacher collaboration. Additionally, the SISS is the the school system's primary point of contact, and they answer all programmatic questions—including IDEA-related questions, accommodating the needs of the school system.

Teacher Leaders

This program supports a cohort of 5,000 LEA-selected staff that receives training and ongoing support from LDOE, and serves as the chief liaisons between the LDOE and the School Implementation Teams. Teacher Leaders receive a variety of resources and training throughout the school year. This training includes: 1) Annual Teacher Leader Summit – a three-day conference that kicks off instructional planning for the following school year; and 2) School Support Institutes - a training sequence during the school year to support school leadership teams in ensuring teachers plan for and deliver instruction in a way that meets the needs of their students. Teacher Leaders leverage this professional development and support within their schools, not only through training and monitoring, but also through modeling lessons and instructional strategies and by encouraging data analysis to inform instruction. LDOE also expanded Teacher Leaders to incorporate targeted resources and content specifically for special education professionals including teachers, guidance counselors and special education directors. By leveraging this successful statewide program with the special education population, Louisiana is able provide access to high-quality professional development and support that helps all students achieve.

Teacher Leader Advisors

Teacher Leader Advisors are a group of exceptionally talented group of educators who play an influential role in raising expectations for students and ensuring that fellow educators have access to high-quality instructional materials and resources, and curriculum-aligned professional development. Teacher Leader Advisors participate in the LDOE's instructional materials review and create tools for the Teacher Support Toolbox. Additionally, they develop and lead professional development for educators across the state.

PLANNING RESOURCES

LDOE provides school systems with robust, forward-focused assistance through a variety of planning resources. These include:

- 1) School System Planning Framework - serves as the primary planning tool for school systems. The Framework includes the key priorities LDOE has established in partnership with school systems, and school systems should use this Framework to identify their own priorities for student improvement.

2) Super App - is a new online application that communicates school system priorities for the next school year and consolidates the process for approval of formula and competitive funds.

3) School System Planning Guide - provides crucial guidance on how a school system will build a plan and submit a Super App for formula and competitive funds to support that plan. This includes the additional resources needed to build a plan that aligns to priorities highlighted in the Framework.

4) Strategies for Success: A Guidebook for Supporting Students with Disabilities - provides principals and school system leaders with resources to create strong support plans. It is organized around four proven strategies for improving the academic achievement of students with disabilities: 1) identify disabilities early and accurately, 2) provide high-quality instruction to ensure the achievement of ambitious IEP goals, 3) strengthen instruction with specialized supports and related services, and 4) coordinate effective transition planning and implementation.

5) School System Planning Calls - scheduled throughout the school year to discuss topics and resources in the School System Planning Guide with school system planning teams. These calls provide continuous, ongoing support to LEA superintendents, as well as senior staff in technology, assessment and curriculum, and special education. During these calls, LDOE provides more in-depth support, fields questions in real time, and integrates high-priority policies and other topics. LDOE regularly integrates support for special education professionals including training and policy guidance on the alternate assessment, Louisiana's Connector standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, high cost services, alternative pathways to promotion and graduation, and other priorities.

More information on LDOE's School System Support Structure can be found on LDOE's website:

<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support/school-system-support-toolbox>

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

LDOE employs two primary mechanisms to provide technical assistance that ensures the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assistance and support to LEAs: field support and planning resources.

FIELD SUPPORT

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TEAM

The School Improvement Team is the primary support vehicle for school systems, providing immediate, differentiated, targeted assistance to school systems. The Team targets Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) schools, and the Team includes School Improvement Support Specialists (SISS) who work collaboratively with school system leaders to draft cooperative agreements, analyze data, and determine the School Improvement Best Practice(s) that best meet the needs of school system, educators, and students. These leaders assess the unique needs and approaches of their school systems and build upon those strengths to support implementation of the School Improvement Best Practices through collaboratively analyzing data, strengths and opportunities for growth, a school improvement plan, observations and reflective feedback. The School Improvement Best Practices strategy is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2022-2023 school year. LDOE has partnered with the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) to develop, implement, and support five School Improvement Best Practices. The five best practices are:

- instructional leadership team support,
- teacher collaboration support,
- teaching standards support,
- principal standards support, and
- career pipeline support.

129 school systems are currently receiving support with instructional leadership teams, and of those, 64 are also receiving support in teacher collaboration. Additionally, the SISS is the the school system's primary point of contact, and they answer all programmatic questions—including IDEA-related questions, accommodating the needs of the school system.

Teacher Leaders

This program supports a cohort of 5,000 LEA-selected staff that receives training and ongoing support from LDOE, and serves as the chief liaisons between the LDOE and the School Implementation Teams. Teacher Leaders receive a variety of resources and training throughout the school year. This training includes: 1) Annual Teacher Leader Summit – a three-day conference that kicks off instructional planning for the following school year; and 2) School Support Institutes - a training sequence during the school year to support school leadership teams in ensuring teachers plan for and deliver instruction in a way that meets the needs of their students. Teacher Leaders leverage this professional development and support within their schools, not only through training and monitoring, but also through modeling lessons and instructional strategies and by encouraging data analysis to inform instruction. LDOE also expanded Teacher Leaders to incorporate targeted resources and content specifically for special education professionals including teachers, guidance counselors and special education directors. By leveraging this successful statewide program with the special education population, Louisiana is able provide access to high-quality professional development and support that helps all students achieve.

Teacher Leader Advisors

Teacher Leader Advisors are a group of exceptionally talented group of educators who play an influential role in raising expectations for students and ensuring that fellow educators have access to high-quality instructional materials and resources, and curriculum-aligned professional development. Teacher Leader Advisors participate in the LDOE's instructional materials review and create tools for the Teacher Support Toolbox. Additionally, they develop and lead professional development for educators across the state.

PLANNING RESOURCES

LDOE provides school systems with robust, forward-focused assistance through a variety of planning resources. These include:

1) School System Planning Framework - serves as the primary planning tool for school systems. The Framework includes the key priorities LDOE has established in partnership with school systems, and school systems should use this Framework to identify their own priorities for student improvement.

2) Super App - is a new online application that communicates school system priorities for the next school year and consolidates the process for approval of formula and competitive funds.

3) School System Planning Guide - provides crucial guidance on how a school system will build a plan and submit a Super App for formula and competitive funds to support that plan. This includes the additional resources needed to build a plan that aligns to priorities highlighted in the Framework.

4) Strategies for Success: A Guidebook for Supporting Students with Disabilities - provides principals and school system leaders with resources to create strong support plans. It is organized around four proven strategies for improving the academic achievement of students with disabilities: 1) identify disabilities early and accurately, 2) provide high-quality instruction to ensure the achievement of ambitious IEP goals, 3) strengthen instruction with specialized supports and related services, and 4) coordinate effective transition planning and implementation.

5) School System Planning Calls - scheduled throughout the school year to discuss topics and resources in the School System Planning Guide with school system planning teams. These calls provide continuous, ongoing support to LEA superintendents, as well as senior staff in technology, assessment and curriculum, and special education. During these calls, LDOE provides more in-depth support, fields questions in real time, and integrates high-priority policies and other topics. LDOE regularly integrates support for special education professionals including training and policy guidance on the alternate assessment, Louisiana's Connector standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, high cost services, alternative pathways to promotion and graduation, and other priorities.

More information on LDOE's School System Support Structure can be found on LDOE's website:

<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support/school-system-support-toolbox>

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

9

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Throughout 2021-2022 many stakeholder groups were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input. Parent engagement mostly occurred via the following:

Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)

Teacher Leader Advisors

Families Helping Families

Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council

Statewide stakeholder engagement partnerships

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The LDOE solicited feedback from the following groups quarterly to increase parent diversity:

Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
Families Helping Families, Louisiana's parent centers
Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council

Additionally, the LDOE used the School System Planning Monthly Calls and the Superintendent's Weekly Newsletter to promote and encourage relevant stakeholders to participate in implementation activities.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Louisiana remains committed to a comprehensive vision for student success in our state with every child on track to a college degree or professional career. Louisiana continues to engage stakeholders at our Special Education Advisory Panel meetings, Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council, Families Helping Families Centers and other commissions and all stakeholders through our special education reporting and funding website: <https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. The target setting results, data analysis, development and evaluation of improvement strategies will be available to the public using this Target Setting webpage.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

LDOE reports annually to the public on the performance of each school system on the targets in the SPP/APR in the Special Education Reporting and Funding library on the State's website. This information is labeled Performance Profiles and is located under the Performance Profiles section. The Special Education Reporting and Funding library also publicly reports the State's SPP, including any revisions. This information is labeled LA SPP/APR and is located under the State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report section. To access this information, please use the following web link and locate the sections titled Performance Profiles and State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, respectively.

<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

The State did not describe the mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and subsequent revisions that the State made to those targets. Specifically, the State did not report a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents.

Intro - Required Actions

The State has not provided a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. In its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide the required information.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	76.45%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	76.00%
Data	46.64%	52.50%	59.29%	64.73%	76.45%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and

changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,740
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	188
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	36
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	703

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2,740	3,667	76.45%	78.00%	74.72%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During data review and annual comparisons, it was noted that Louisiana had 88 more students with disabilities exited as drop outs than last year's data, and while graduation waivers were offered the previous year due to COVID, that option was not available last year. While our graduation target data declined 1.73%, Louisiana's graduation rate for students with disabilities continues to trend in a very positive direction remaining above 70%. Incredible gains have been made from the 46.64% graduation rate in 2016. While we have historically met this target, during our recent target setting process, Louisiana, increased the rigor of this target alongside stakeholders, and Louisiana will continue to strive for increased graduation rates for students with disabilities through technical assistance and guidance to LEAs on meaningful high school experiences and implementation of the Louisiana April Dunn Act.

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Students in Louisiana can pursue one of two pathways to a Louisiana high school diploma, the TOPS University diploma or the Jump Start TOPS Tech (Career) diploma. The TOPS University diploma pathway requires students to earn 24 credits and prepares them for four-year colleges and universities. The Jump Start TOPS Tech (Career) diploma pathway requires students to earn 23 credits and equips them with the skills and industry-valued credentials, or Industry Based Certifications (IBC), to move into a chosen industry after high school. Both options are available to students with IEPs.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Students with IEPs have the option to pursue either the TOPS University diploma or the Jump Start TOPS Tech diploma. However, the April Dunn Act (2014) gives students with disabilities who have persistent academic challenges due to their disabilities the ability to pursue a high school diploma by meeting graduation requirements through alternate means. The law can be implemented in compliance with federal and state law, provided that students remain able to access the traditional diploma and curriculum requirements, even as they use alternate means of demonstrating proficiency. Graduation requirements for April Dunn Act eligible students include the following:

- 1) Meet all graduation requirements, which include earning all Carnegie units and statewide credentials for the diploma pathway they are pursuing and demonstrating proficiency in the courses assessed by the state assessment, LEAP 2025. If a student is unable to meet the state-established

benchmarks - scoring proficient - on the LEAP 2025 assessment requirements through traditional means, the student can meet this requirement through an alternate means as determined by the IEP team.

2) In addition to meeting IEP goals and objectives, students must meet at least one of three transition criteria to graduate. The criteria include: employment in inclusive integrated environments, demonstrating mastery of specific employability skills, and access to services not provided by the school, employment, or education options.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	37.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	30.00%	27.00%	25.00%	25.00%	20.00%
Data	28.54%	24.31%	20.58%		17.08%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	18.00%	16.00%	14.00%	12.00%	10.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2,740
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	188
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	36
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	703

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
703	3,667	17.08%	18.00%	19.17%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During data review and analysis, it was noted that 88 more students with disabilities were reported as dropping out, and the number of youth with IEPs who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diplomas is not reported, which impact slippage. While Louisiana's drop out target data increased 2%, Louisiana's drop out rate for students with disabilities continues to trend in a very positive direction. Incredible gains have been made from the 28.54% of students with disabilities dropping out in 2016. While we have historically met this target, during our recent target setting process, Louisiana increased the rigor of this target alongside stakeholders, and Louisiana will continue to strive to decrease drop out rates for students with disabilities.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

LDOE is required to federally report dropout statistics via the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) Local Education Agency Survey website <http://nces.ed.gov/>. The NCES definition of a dropout is an individual who was enrolled at some time during the previous school year and was not enrolled on October 1 of the current school year, or was not enrolled on October 1 of the previous school year and has not graduated or completed a state or school system approved educational program, and does not meet any of the exclusionary conditions for leaving school. A student is considered a dropout if s/he left school without receiving a diploma or other certification; or left school, and status is unknown or not in school; or transferred and enrolled in and adult education program (unless the program is monitored by an LEA). Examples include, but not limited to, students enrolled but stop attending, joined the military, moved but whereabouts are unknown, is incarcerated, or enrolled in a vocational technical college (not monitored by the LEA).

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	97.50%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	95.63%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	90.73%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	97.43%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	95.46%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	89.15%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE’s Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP’s primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state’s targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	6,640	6,427	5,752
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	924	251	172
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	5,010	4,986	4,224
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	622	987	980

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	6,639	6,439	5,605
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	901	223	153
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	5,033	5,012	4,054
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	618	984	972

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,556	6,640	97.50%	98.80%	98.73%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6,224	6,427	95.63%	98.80%	96.84%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,376	5,752	90.73%	98.80%	93.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,552	6,639	97.43%	98.80%	98.69%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6,219	6,439	95.46%	98.80%	96.58%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,179	5,605	89.15%	98.80%	92.40%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The "Regular and Alternate Test Summary" publicly reports participation and performance results for children with disabilities on regular assessments - with or without accommodations - and alternate assessments.

For Spring 2022 Regular and Alternate Test Summary results in the Special Education Data section, use the following link:
<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Louisiana reports comprehensively on children with disabilities. Subgroup data are reported on every school and school system.

Louisiana's Spring 2022 LEAP criterion-referenced test reports on state, school system, and school achievement levels, and is inclusive of all students.
https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2022-leap-2025-state-lea-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=17826418_4

LDOE's "Measuring Results" and "Data Center" web links report on K-12 assessments, early childhood centers, and school and student results, including School and Center Report Cards, School and Center Performance Scores, and Closing the Equity Gap.

Measuring Results homepage: <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/assessment>

Data Center: <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/data-center>

Furthermore, Louisiana has a webpage dedicated to special education reporting. This webpage includes Louisiana's "Special Education Data Profile", which consists of statewide assessment tables, including: 1) children with disabilities assessment participation for both the regular and alternate (LEAP Connect) assessments, 2) children with disabilities who scored proficient on regular assessments, percent by grade and subject, and 3) children with disabilities who met or exceeded standards on the LEAP Connect assessment. The webpage also includes each LEA's Performance Profile, which reports on the LEA's performance against the State's targets in the APR. The Special Education Reporting and Funding page is available at <https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	16.49%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	9.39%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	7.69%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	12.40%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	4.88%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	5.59%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	17.50%	19.50%	21.50%	23.50%	25.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	10.50%	12.50%	14.50%	16.50%	18.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	13.50%	15.50%	17.50%	19.50%	21.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	7.00%	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%	15.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	5,934	5,237	4,396
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	482	122	41
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	619	431	341

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	5,934	5,235	4,207
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	431	80	42
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	450	228	316

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,101	5,934	16.49%	17.50%	18.55%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	553	5,237	9.39%	10.50%	10.56%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	382	4,396	7.69%	8.00%	8.69%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	881	5,934	12.40%	13.50%	14.85%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	308	5,235	4.88%	6.00%	5.88%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	358	4,207	5.59%	7.00%	8.51%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The "Regular and Alternate Test Summary" publicly reports participation and performance results for children with disabilities on regular assessments - with or without accommodations - and alternate assessments.

For Spring 2022 results found under the Special Education Data section, use the following link:
<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Beginning in FFY 2020, the State defined proficiency as scoring Mastery+ instead of Basic+ on statewide assessments. Louisiana is excited to see the gains and evidence that statewide evidence-based practices are resulting in learning recovery.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	50.65%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	56.70%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	71.59%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	51.69%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	59.34%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	49.65%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	52.00%	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	73.00%	75.00%	77.00%	79.00%	81.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	51.00%	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE’s Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP’s primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state’s targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	622	987	980
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	321	571	707

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	618	984	972
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	322	620	517

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	321	622	50.65%	52.00%	51.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	571	987	56.70%	58.00%	57.85%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	707	980	71.59%	73.00%	72.14%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	322	618	51.69%	53.00%	52.10%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	620	984	59.34%	60.00%	63.01%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	517	972	49.65%	51.00%	53.19%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The "Regular and Alternate Test Summary" publicly reports participation and performance results for children with disabilities on regular assessments - with or without accommodations - and alternate assessments.

For Spring 2022 results, use the following link where the results are posted under the Special Education Data section:

<https://louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/special-education-reporting-and-funding>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Beginning in FFY 2020, States were required to report on this indicator. The State's alternate assessment defines proficiency as Near Goal or above. Louisiana is excited that while we did not meet our targets for this indicator, we did see growth in all sub-indicators.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	25.28
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	34.71
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	33.50
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	19.60
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	22.20
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	26.47

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	25.00	24.00	23.00	22.00	21.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	34.00	33.00	32.00	31.00	30.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	33.00	32.00	31.00	30.00	29.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	19.00	18.00	17.00	16.00	15.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	21.00	20.00	19.00	18.00	17.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	26.00	25.00	24.00	23.00	22.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and

juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	48,342	50,382	48,798
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	5,934	5,237	4,396
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	19,411	21,755	19,523
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,963	1,766	1,397
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	482	122	41
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	619	431	341

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	48,351	50,428	46,966
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	5,934	5,235	4,207

c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	15,966	14,236	15,187
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,750	989	1,225
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	431	80	42
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	450	228	316

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.55%	44.21%	25.28	25.00	25.66	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10.56%	46.69%	34.71	34.00	36.13	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	8.69%	42.87%	33.50	33.00	34.18	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

While students with disabilities did show gains and evidence of learning recovery so did all students, thus the achievement gap remains. Proficient in Louisiana is scoring mastery or advanced which is a high bar. Review of the data and numbers of students with accommodations scoring proficient led us to examine students with disabilities and statewide assessment accommodation provision. Louisiana will continue to implement evidence-based practices to improve this target and close achievement gaps for students with disabilities, including ensuring accessibility of the curriculum and ensuring assessments are accessible as well.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14.85%	36.64%	19.60	19.00	21.79	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	5.88%	30.19%	22.20	21.00	24.31	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	8.51%	34.94%	26.47	26.00	26.43	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

While students with disabilities did show gains and evidence of learning recovery so did all students, thus the achievement gap remains. Proficient in Louisiana is scoring mastery or advanced which is a high bar. 4th graders also are still recovering from pandemic impacts in earlier years. Louisiana also examined the low number of students receiving accommodations and scoring proficiency. Louisiana will continue to implement evidence-based practices to improve this target and close achievement gaps for students with disabilities.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

While students with disabilities did show gains and evidence of learning recovery so did all students, thus the achievement gap remains. Proficient in Louisiana is scoring mastery or advanced which is a high bar. Louisiana also examined the low number of students receiving accommodations and scoring proficiency. Louisiana will continue to implement evidence-based practices to improve this target and close achievement gaps for students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2021 data represent slippage from the FFY 2020 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2021 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	26.50%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	17.50%	15.50%	13.50%	13.50%	13.50%
Data	19.02%	18.50%	19.78%	11.92%	7.33%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	13.50%	13.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE’s Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP’s primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state’s targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
13	187	7.33%	13.50%	6.95%	Met target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

Louisiana has defined significant discrepancy as the percent of students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, 1.5 times greater than the state average, not to exceed 3%. Since the State uses percentages, there is no minimum n-size. Thus, all LEAs were included in the calculation. For the FFY 2021 APR submission, the state average was 0.299%. Thus, any LEA whose percentage was greater than 0.45% was identified as having a significant discrepancy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2021 APR generally reflects data from school year 2021-2022. However, indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2020-2021.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

1. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies were required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities to complete a self-review of the LEA’s discipline policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs reviewed areas including:

- a. the LEA’s code of conduct;
- b. the referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;

- c. the development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child's learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address the child's behavior;
- d. the LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;
- e. the procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
- f. the procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.

2. LEAs that were discrepant were required to use a self-review instrument to review, and, if necessary, revise their policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and procedural safeguards and submit a plan of action to the LDOE.

3. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated non-compliance with IDEA requirements, LDOE issued a finding of non-compliance.

4. To demonstrate correction of the identified non-compliance, each LEA must: a. revise their noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and b. demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.

5. The State reports on the verification of correction of this non-compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2021 APR, due February 1, 2022. The State DID NOT identify non-compliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0		0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

24

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
8	0	163	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Louisiana defines significant discrepancy as the percent of all students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days at a rate 1.5 times greater than the state average not to exceed 3%. To be considered for this indicator, an LEA must meet the State-established minimum N size of 25 and have at least 3 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered with disciplinary removals greater than 10 days. As in the calculation for Indicator 4A, the state average was 0.299%. Thus, any LEA with a percentage greater than 0.45% for any racial/ethnic group who met the above criteria was considered significantly discrepant.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2021 APR generally reflects data from school year 2021-2022. However, indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2020-2021.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

1. LEAs identified with significant discrepancies were required to establish a team of personnel involved in disciplinary actions for students with disabilities to complete a self-review of the LEA's discipline policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs reviewed areas including:

- the LEA's code of conduct;
- the referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;
- the development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child's learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address the child's behavior;
- the LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;
- the procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
- the procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.

2. LEAs that were discrepant were required to use a self-review instrument to review, and, if necessary, revise their policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and procedural safeguards and submit a plan of action to the LDOE.

3. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated non-compliance with IDEA requirements, LDOE issued a finding of non-compliance.

4. To demonstrate correction of the identified non-compliance, each LEA must: a. revise their noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and b. demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.

5. The State reports on the verification of correction of this non-compliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2020 APR, due February 1, 2022. The State DID NOT identify non-compliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	63.00%	63.50%	64.00%	64.00%	72.00%
A	71.98%	Data	60.72%	60.87%	61.76%	63.93%	71.98%
B	2020	Target <=	13.60%	13.56%	13.50%	13.50%	9.50%
B	9.61%	Data	14.71%	14.66%	14.59%	14.00%	9.61%
C	2020	Target <=	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.20%
C	1.29%	Data	1.25%	1.24%	1.20%	1.22%	1.29%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
Target B <=	9.50%	9.50%	9.40%	9.40%	9.40%
Target C <=	1.20%	1.20%	1.10%	1.10%	1.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	77,861
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	52,826
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10,431
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	293
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	99
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	551

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	52,826	77,861	71.98%	72.00%	67.85%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the	10,431	77,861	9.61%	9.50%	13.40%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
regular class less than 40% of the day							
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	943	77,861	1.29%	1.20%	1.21%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	During target setting, Louisiana reset this target with more rigor since historical targets had been met. While Louisiana did not meet the 2021 target, performance is still trending in the right direction with the majority of Louisiana students spending 80% or more of the school day in regular classes. There was a change in population last year and while 2,000 more are in the regular education classroom than last year, 3,743 more were reported as spending less than 40% of their day in the regular education classroom. Inclusive settings will remain a focus.
B	During target setting, Louisiana reset this target with more rigor since historical targets had been met. While Louisiana did not meet the 2021 target, performance is still trending in the right direction with less students in more restrictive environments. There was a change in population last year and while 2,000 more are in the regular education classroom than last year, 3,743 more were reported as spending less than 40% of their day in the regular education classroom. Inclusive settings will remain a focus.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	27.00%	30.00%	31.00%	31.00%	16.25%
A	Data	21.25%	20.27%	18.57%	17.75%	16.21%
B	Target <=	3.00%	2.90%	2.90%	2.90%	5.00%
B	Data	3.86%	5.06%	5.14%	4.90%	5.77%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to

clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	16.21%
B	2020	5.77%
C	2020	3.34%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	16.50%	17.00%	17.25%	17.50%	18.00%
Target B <=	5.00%	4.90%	4.90%	4.80%	4.80%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	3.34%	3.20%	3.20%	3.10%	3.10%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	1,425	2,824	1,896	6,145
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	108	507	313	928
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	118	201	80	399
b2. Number of children attending separate school	1	7	1	9

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
b3. Number of children attending residential facility		1		1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	110	85	22	217

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	928	6,145	16.21%	16.50%	15.10%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	409	6,145	5.77%	5.00%	6.66%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	217	6,145	3.34%	3.34%	3.53%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable

While Louisiana did not meet this target and slipped by 1%, technical assistance is specifically being sought to address indicator 6 and guidance will be provided to LEAs. After analyzing the data, Louisiana believes there are reporting issues with this data, and our team is working with a TA provider for assistance.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable

While Louisiana did not meet this target and slipped by 1%, technical assistance is specifically being sought to address indicator 6 and guidance will be provided to LEAs. After analyzing the data, Louisiana believes there are reporting issues with this data, and our team is working with a TA provider for assistance.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C aged 3 through 5, if applicable

While Louisiana did not meet this target and slipped by less than 1%, technical assistance is specifically being sought to address indicator 6 and guidance will be provided to LEAs. After analyzing the data, Louisiana believes there are reporting issues with this data, and our team is working with a TA provider for assistance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by ((the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2010	Target >=	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%	72.50%	71.50%
A1	69.60%	Data	72.90%	71.37%	68.52%	68.11%	69.15%

A2	2010	Target >=	65.50%	66.00%	66.50%	66.50%	65.00%
A2	64.90%	Data	63.74%	61.44%	50.60%	47.51%	48.73%
B1	2010	Target >=	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	73.50%	72.00%
B1	70.90%	Data	73.14%	71.08%	72.57%	68.90%	66.58%
B2	2010	Target >=	58.50%	59.00%	59.50%	59.50%	57.00%
B2	56.20%	Data	56.37%	55.00%	55.25%	45.99%	46.34%
C1	2010	Target >=	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	76.50%	72.50%
C1	74.70%	Data	75.96%	74.69%	59.09%	54.70%	60.20%
C2	2010	Target >=	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%	71.50%	60.00%
C2	69.00%	Data	67.30%	65.93%	44.70%	30.79%	31.37%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
Target A2 >=	65.20%	65.40%	65.60%	65.80%	66.00%
Target B1 >=	72.00%	72.50%	72.50%	73.00%	73.00%
Target B2 >=	57.20%	57.40%	57.60%	57.80%	58.00%
Target C1 >=	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%
Target C2 >=	60.25%	60.50%	60.75%	70.00%	70.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also

engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,828

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	13	0.71%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	420	22.98%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	350	19.15%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	643	35.18%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	402	21.99%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	993	1,426	69.15%	72.00%	69.64%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,045	1,828	48.73%	65.20%	57.17%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	8	0.44%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	391	21.39%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	428	23.41%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	711	38.89%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	290	15.86%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of	1,139	1,538	66.58%	72.00%	74.06%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$							
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,001	1,828	46.34%	57.20%	54.76%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	34	1.86%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	500	27.35%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	288	15.75%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	648	35.45%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	358	19.58%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	936	1,470	60.20%	73.00%	63.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,006	1,828	31.37%	60.25%	55.03%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

Criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" was determined through Item Response Theory (IRT) analyses by Teaching Strategies, based on a national sample. The algorithms result in a 7-point rating system that parallels the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) ratings. These ratings by age are input into the TS GOLD online system which generates a rating based on TS GOLD scores for each functional outcome. Research studies examining the reliability and validity of the TS GOLD are found at https://teachingstrategies.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2020-Tech-Manual_GOLD.pdf. Ratings are made on the tools standard objectives and the system pulls outcome data from the assessment checkpoints corresponding to the preschool IEP entry and exit dates to produce each category. Teaching Strategies GOLD uses their online system to automatically produce OSEP progress

categories and crosswalk the data with the Global Child Outcomes 1-3, which can be found on ECTA's website:
<https://ectacenter.org/eco/assets/pdfs/Crosswalk-TS%20GOLD.pdf>

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Ratings are made on the tools standard objectives and the system pulls outcome data from the assessment checkpoints corresponding to the preschool IEP entry and exit dates to produce each category. Teaching Strategies GOLD uses their online system to automatically produce OSEP progress categories and crosswalk the data with the Global Child Outcomes 1-3, which can be found on ECTA's website:
<https://ectacenter.org/eco/assets/pdfs/Crosswalk-TS%20GOLD.pdf>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	39.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	81.50%	82.50%	83.50%	83.50%	84.50%
Data	85.38%	83.25%	85.71%	84.31%	86.88%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	85.50%	86.50%	87.50%	88.50%	89.50%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
488	589	86.88%	85.50%	82.85%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

After analyzing the survey data, a likely reason for the slippage is the response rates within LEAs. LEAs are required to send the surveys to parents. Louisiana LEAs and the SEA analyzes submission data throughout the collection and provides technical assistance to parents as needed. Louisiana communicated via school system leader monthly calls, special education director monthly calls, and weekly newsletter reminders regarding increased participation in the parent engagement survey. Louisiana also used our Families Helping Families Centers and PTIC to send communication to families. Direct outreach is provided to school systems and regions with low participation to increase response rates. In the future, both paper and electronic options will be offered.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

LDOE uses a single parent involvement survey. LEAs disseminate the survey to parents of all children with disabilities, including preschool children. LDOE's FFY 2021 data reflect both preschool and school age respondents. LDOE compares the response rate of parents of preschool children with the statewide percentage of preschool children with disabilities to ensure responses are valid and reliable. In FFY 2021, approximately 7.3% of survey respondents were parents of preschool students with disabilities, which is reflective of the statewide rate of 13.0%, ensuring valid and reliable results.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

16,837

Percentage of respondent parents

3.50%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	3.80%	3.50%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Historically, Louisiana has reported low response rates for the special education parent involvement survey. For FFY 2021, the LDOE offered office hours to assist parents with completing the survey instead of the option to complete the online survey. LDOE partnered with Families Helping Families and the PTIC to assist parents in completion of the survey. While the survey was available online, LDOE understood the need to offer families another method besides completing the survey electronically. With this method, LDOE staff read the survey questions to the respondent, and the answers were recorded in the online survey. School systems were also provided with a QR code for the survey to share with parents. The QR code allowed parents to easily access the survey on a mobile device.

To increase the response rate from FFY 2022 onward, the LDOE will continue to provide multiple ways for parents to engage with and complete the survey.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

After review of the State's special education parent involvement survey, beginning FFY 2020, the special education parent involvement survey included questions to collect demographics on respondents in addition to questions to collect demographics on the respondents' children receiving services. The parent survey considered the following categories:

- race/ethnicity;
- gender;
- age;
- geographic location (urban or rural).

In analyzing the response rate, the LDOE found the racial demographic of parents responding was representative of the demographic of children receiving special education services. The percent of students with disabilities in Louisiana by race is 48% Black or African-American, followed by 43% White. The percent of Black or African-American respondents was 51%, followed by White respondents at 39%. The percent of students with disabilities in the remaining ethnic groups - Asian, Hispanic or Latino, Native American, or Two or More Races - are all less than 5%. The percent of respondents for each of these ethnic groups is less than 5%.

The analysis did identify nonresponse bias for male respondents. The percent of male students with disabilities in Louisiana is 67%; the percent of female students with disabilities is 33%. Although the percent of male and female students with disabilities for whom parents responded is representative of the percent of male and female students in Louisiana (67% and 34%, respectively), the percent of female respondents was 92%; only 8% were male respondents. The LDOE will seek and implement strategies to reduce nonresponse bias for male respondents for future surveys.

Please see Indicator 8 attachment for the FFY 2020 special education parent involvement survey.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The special education parent involvement survey included questions to collect demographics on respondents in addition to questions to collect demographics on the respondents' children receiving services. The parent survey considered the following categories:

- race/ethnicity;
- gender;
- age;
- geographic location (urban or rural).

In analyzing the response rate, the LDOE found the racial demographic of parents responding was representative of the demographic of children receiving special education services. The percent of students with disabilities in Louisiana by race is 48% Black or African -American, followed by 43% White. The percent of Black or African-American respondents was 51%, followed by White respondents at 39%. The percent of students with disabilities in the remaining ethnic groups - Asian, Hispanic or Latino, Native American, or Two or More Races - are all less than 5%. The percent of respondents for each of these ethnic groups are less than 5%.

Because Louisiana selects a sampling based on the methodology described below and one that selects participants representative of the student population each year, the sampling method helps to ensure the demographics are representative of the children receiving services.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

For FFY 2021, the special education parent involvement survey included questions to collect demographics on respondents in addition to questions to collect demographics on the respondents' children receiving services. The responses were analyzed to determine representativeness.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Louisiana serves over 118,000 students with disabilities, ages 3-21, in LEAs ranging in size from single school charter schools to districts with over 40,000 students. To reach this diverse range of school systems, schools, and students, LDOE developed a statistically valid sampling plan for the SPP/APR cycle. Louisiana uses a two-step process to develop the sampling plan for each SPP/APR cycle.

Step 1: Louisiana stratified LEA selection based on a number of factors.

The LDOE considers a number of variables to ensure that each year's sample is representative of the state as a whole. The population is stratified into three groups: 1) traditional LEAs—include parish and city school districts and state special schools, 2) Type 2 charter schools, and 3) Type 5 charters and other non-traditional LEAs. Additionally, LEAs are stratified to ensure geographic (northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest) as well as urban,

suburban, and rural representation across the state. The LDOE uses statistical software to randomly assign LEAs to a cohort.

The LDOE conducts a series of additional analyses to ensure that the survey years contains a sample that will be representative of the state as a whole in disability, race, age and gender. Each year is found to be representative, ensuring a valid and reliable sample. OSEP requires that any LEA with an average daily membership of more than 50,000 students must be included in the sample each year. Since Louisiana does not have any LEAs that meet this criterion, each LEA will be included one time during the SPP/APR cycle.

Step 2: Louisiana includes all students with disabilities in each selected LEA.

In selected LEAs, each parent of a student with a disability will receive the Indicator 8 parent involvement survey. LDOE developed an electronic survey tool to administer the survey and letters to parents with access information. Furthermore, for FFY 2020, the LDOE provided LEAs with a QR code in addition to the survey letters for parents to better access the survey. Each LEA was required to disseminate letters along with the QR code to every parent of a student with a disability with a unique ID to access the electronic survey. This census approach, where every parent in the population is included for a complete count, means that LDOE will not use any other sampling of the population after Step 1. Using this approach, LDOE plans to reach each parent within the LEA.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the metric used to determine representativeness and must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and identify steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities and strategies to reduce nonresponse bias, as required by the Measurement Table.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR required the State to submit a revised sampling plan for this indicator. The State submitted its revised sampling plan, and OSEP's evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it is approvable.

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. However, in its narrative, the State reported "Although the percent of male and female students with disabilities for whom parents responded is representative of the percent of male and female students in Louisiana (67% and 34%, respectively), the percent of female respondents was 92%; only 8% were male respondents. ". Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

In its description of strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, the State did not specifically address strategies to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State reported that its response rate for FFY 2021 was 3.50%, that the data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, and nonresponse bias was not identified. The State must describe how it determined: (1) the data are representative; and (2) that nonresponse bias was not present.

The State did not describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe strategies which are expected to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. In addition, the State must report the metric used to determine representativeness.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

26

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
27	0	172	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

LDOE has a two-step process for the analysis of disproportionate representation data. LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for over representation based on one year of data. To determine the rate of disproportionate representation, LDOE follows a two-step process.

First, LDOE examines each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in designated populations of students. For the FFY 2021 APR submission, LDOE used the October 1, 2021 Child Count Report to extract the number of students with disabilities in each race or ethnic category. LDOE then completes a risk ratio analysis for each LEA to identify whether a particular race or ethnicity was at a disproportionately greater risk of being identified for special education and related services, excluding any LEA that did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the 172 LEAs included in the analysis, LDOE identified 27 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 27 LEAs to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification through policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs were required to fill out a Disproportionality Review Rubric- a tool designed to assist the LEAs in identifying practices, policies, and procedures that may lead to inappropriate identification of students for special education and related services. The rubric includes topics such as professional development, teacher support, instructional practices, intervention efforts, and assessment procedures. All 27 LEAs completed the review; none of the LEAs identified instances where disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

LDOE completes a risk ratio analysis, based on one year of data, for each LEA to identify whether a particular race or ethnicity was at a disproportionately greater risk of being identified for special education and related services. LDOE conducts outreach to LEAs found to be disproportionate, requiring LEAs to complete a self-review rubric. The rubric is used to identify any policies, practices, and procedures that result in inappropriate identification. The rubric is then submitted to LDOE for review. If a rubric indicates disproportionate representation because of inappropriate identification, the LEA must revise its policies, practices, and procedures to address this concern.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

57

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
33	0	141	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

LDOE has a two-step process for the analysis of disproportionate representation data. LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for over representation based on one year of data. To determine the rate of disproportionate representation, LDOE uses the following protocol:

First, LDOE examines each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in any of the following six specific disability categories: Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech or Language Impairment. For the FFY 2021 APR submission, the number of students in each racial and ethnic group in the six specific disability categories was extracted from the state's October 1, 2021 Child Count Report. LDOE reviewed the data, and excluded any LEA that did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the 198 LEAs, LDOE identified 33 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 33 LEAs to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification of their policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs were required to fill out a Disproportionality Review Rubric—a tool designed to assist the LEAs in identifying their practices, policies, and procedures that may have led to inappropriate identification of students based on their race or ethnicity, by disability. All 33 LEAs completed the review, and zero LEAs determined that the instance of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

LDOE completes a risk ratio analysis, based on one year of data, for each LEA to identify whether a particular race or ethnicity was at a disproportionately greater risk of being identified for special education and related services. LDOE conducts outreach to LEAs found to be disproportionate, requiring LEAs to complete a self-review rubric. The rubric is used to identify any policies, practices, and procedures that result in inappropriate identification. The rubric is then submitted to LDOE for review. If a rubric indicates disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, the LEA must make revisions to its policies, practices, and procedures to address this concern.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.69%	98.59%	99.13%	98.01%	89.57%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
15,454	15,386	89.57%	100%	99.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

68

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

LDOE identified a total of 68 children for whom parental consent was obtained, but from whom evaluations were not completed within the 60-day timeline. The range of days beyond the timeline is included below:

- (32) 1-15 days
- (6) 16-30 days
- (16) 31-45 days
- (6) 46-60 days
- (8) 60+ days

The majority of delayed evaluations were completed within 60+ days of the deadline. LEAs identified the following primary reasons for delay:

- school closures due to weather events
- staff shortages
- inaccurate data entry
- miscalculation of evaluation dates
- delayed reports of outside agencies
- delayed receipt of medical documents

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The FFY 2021 Indicator 11 data was extracted from Louisiana's Special Education Reporting (SER) System. Evaluation timelines begin when the LEA receives a signed Parental Consent-to-Evaluate form. SER has a series of system checks that aid in ensuring data accuracy, including a Business Day calendar that may be generated for calculations of 45 and 60-day intervals. Data must pass electronic system edits and comparison reports before new data are stored.

LDOE uses a standard process for data collection, determination of non-compliance, and issuance of findings:

1. LDOE gathers data from SER after the end of the 2021-2022 school year.
2. LDOE identifies LEAs who appear noncompliant and offers them an opportunity to clarify their data or provide allowable exceptions.
3. LDOE identifies LEAs with cases of non-compliance.
4. LDOE conducts outreach to LEA Special Education Directors, providing them with information on evaluations that exceeded the 60-day timelines in the absence of an approved extension.
5. LEAs that were identified as non-compliant submit a plan of action that indicates the reason for the non-compliance, a description of what could have been done to keep the evaluation compliant, a list of actions taken to ensure non-compliance will not be repeated, and the personnel responsible for implementing the plan of action.
6. LEAs are required to correct issues of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year after noncompliance is identified.
7. In order to satisfy the second prong of OSEP Memo 09-02, compliance reports are reviewed quarterly. Correction of non-compliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1,584	1,584	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 2020, LDOE reported findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 11. LEAs that have findings of noncompliance are placed in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The CAP includes activities that target the areas of noncompliance listed on the monitoring report. For each CAP activity, the LEA must submit a deliverable according to the timeline prescribed on the CAP. Each CAP activity is reviewed and feedback is given to the LEA as to whether or not the deliverable is sufficient to address the activity on the CAP. If the deliverable is not sufficient, the LEA is notified and they are directed to resubmit with the correct information. If the information submitted is sufficient, then the LEA is notified that the activity is complete for that particular activity and timeline. Once the LEA has been found to sufficiently have completed all activities on the CAP by the LDOE reviewer, the LEA is sent an email closing out the CAP. The LEA must also go through a follow-up monitoring (desk review or onsite) where new data is reviewed to see if systemic changes of compliance have occurred from prior monitoring.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

LDOE verified that each individual case of non-compliance was corrected by requiring LEAs to submit and implement a CAP, which includes activities to ensure compliance, correction, and identification of practical methods to avoid slippage regarding evaluation timelines in the future. The State verified the completion of corrective plan of action activities by conducting outreach to the LEAs. To satisfy the second prong of OSEP Memo 09-02, LDOE runs SER evaluation compliance reports that are reviewed quarterly. Correction of non-compliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following year.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 247 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 1,584 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and remaining 247 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	64.60%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.71%	96.16%	97.20%	96.99%	82.78%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,489
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	32

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	928
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	6
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	335
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	928	1,116	82.78%	100%	83.15%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
188

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Attach PDF table (optional)

Louisiana FFY 2021 Indicator 12 Reason for Non-Compliance and Range of Days

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

There are two components to LDOE's data collection method:

First, LDOE engages in a monthly review of relevant data. IDEA Part C program staff, managed by Louisiana's Department of Health, provides LDOE monthly reports and eligibility data. LDOE's Part B staff, including the Indicator 12 manager, collaborate with LDOE's data analytics personnel to identify children who were referred and determined to be NOT eligible, and whose eligibility was determined prior to his/her third birthday.

Second, LDOE conducts a yearly review of these data. LDOE compiles a report from its state database, the Special Education Reporting (SER) system, that includes data for the entire reporting year. The report identifies the percentage of compliance for the last year, by quarter, for each school system. After this report is completed, the Indicator 12 manager assembles a list of LEAs that did not meet the federally-mandated 100% target. LDOE then notifies any LEA with noncompliance. LEAs must submit the completed Plan of Action within 30 days that indicates the reason for the delay, the root cause and what they will do to rectify the situation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
22	20	0	2

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Each year, the 619 Coordinator receives a Statewide Summary Report from the SER Manager that indicates LEAs meeting compliance and those that do not meet the 100% requirement. SER calculates compliance by comparing the child's date of birth with the data entered by LEA staff for IEP Implementation and date services are started. If the date of IEP Implementation and Service Start date are not on or before the child's third birthday, the system indicates that in the report, and a finding of non-compliance is generated. The report provides compliance ratings for each quarter of the year. LEAs are notified of the non-compliance and placed in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The CAP includes activities that target the areas of noncompliance listed on the monitoring report. For each CAP activity, the LEA must submit a deliverable according to the timeline prescribed on the CAP. Each CAP activity is reviewed and feedback is given to the LEA as to whether or not the deliverable is sufficient to address the activity on the CAP. If the deliverable is not sufficient, the LEA is notified and they are directed to resubmit with the correct information. If the information submitted is sufficient, then the LEA is notified that the activity is complete for that particular activity and timeline. Once the LEA has been found to sufficiently have completed all activities on the CAP by the LDOE reviewer, the LEA is sent an email closing out the CAP. The LEA must also go through a follow-up monitoring (desk review or onsite) where new data is reviewed to see if systemic changes of compliance have occurred from prior monitoring.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Each year, the State verifies this by a review of a SER Compliance Statewide Summary Report. The report indicates LEAs and the levels of compliance across 4 quarters of the year. A list of all LEAs in non-compliance each year is maintained by the 619 Coordinator. State staff use the previous year's

report to determine which LEAs were out of compliance for that period and compare this information with the LEA status for the current year report. Any LEA with corrected non-compliance in at least one quarter was considered having corrected that non-compliance.

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

LEA Supervisors were notified that their programs were in uncorrected non-compliance by the LDOE Monitoring Division. These supervisors must submit a Plan of Action to indicate measures their LEA would take to ensure that non-compliance does not occur in the future. In all cases, the uncorrected non-compliance was due to new staff who were unfamiliar with procedures for ensuring transitions were occurring according to required timelines and that data entered into SER was periodically checked for accuracy.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and two findings identified in 2018 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, FFY 2019, and FFY 2018 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, FFY 2019, and FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator in the FFY 2022 APP/APR. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 22 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, remaining 33 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, and remaining 13 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, FFY 2019, and FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

OSEP notes that one or more of the Indicator 12 attachment(s) included in the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	53.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
727	739	100.00%	100%	98.38%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In reviewing the data for this indicator, 2 LEAs were found noncompliant. 12 students with IEPs did not have the required components for secondary transition. LEA outreach and technical assistance will result in compliance.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

For this indicator, Louisiana obtained monitoring results through desk audits and self-assessments. The State initially targeted specific schools for an on-site monitoring event if they scored at Quartile 1 (the highest risk) of a risk analysis rubric. The rubric considered year to year changes in ELA and Math proficiency on statewide assessments, graduation rate, drop-out rate, and Special Education LEA Determinations. Since the COVID-19 Pandemic, on-site monitoring events were changed to desk reviews.

The State focused monitoring on the effective general supervision of IDEA Part B and an effective transition process. The State reviewed records to determine the percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that included: 1) appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are updated annually and upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet postsecondary goals, and 2) annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition service needs. Further, the State reviewed records for evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

The State also required selected LEAs to complete a self-assessment tool to determine if student transition records were compliant with the following established criteria. LEAs use a state-mandated process to identify records to review. LEAs follow a state-developed protocol to determine if the selected transition plan in the current IEP meets required components, including 1) measurable postsecondary goals that cover education/training, employment, and as needed, independent living; 2) annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable students to meet their postsecondary goal(s); 3) evidence that representatives of external agencies were invited to IEP meetings; and 4) courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of students to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.

LDOE reviewed 71 records and LEAs completed self-assessments on an additional 668 records, for a total of 739 records of youth aged 16 and above reviewed for compliance.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0		0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

The State’s FFY 2021 data represent slippage from the FFY 2020 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2021 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2009	Target >=	35.00%	37.00%	39.00%	39.00%	34.00%
A	25.30%	Data	39.48%	39.33%	39.68%	34.79%	32.30%
B	2009	Target >=	79.00%	82.00%	84.00%	84.00%	74.00%
B	55.30%	Data	74.98%	76.93%	79.32%	65.93%	66.05%
C	2009	Target >=	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	96.00%	90.00%
C	73.60%	Data	87.16%	88.30%	89.78%	88.82%	87.86%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%
Target B >=	74.50%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%
Target C >=	90.50%	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	5,179
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2,976
Response Rate	57.46%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	982
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	972
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	455
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	234

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	982	2,976	32.30%	35.00%	33.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,954	2,976	66.05%	74.50%	65.66%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively	2,643	2,976	87.86%	90.50%	88.81%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)							

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	55.85%	57.46%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State’s Post School Transition survey is provided to school systems. School systems disseminate the survey to post-school youth using their preferred method, and results are collected in the State’s Special Education Reporting (SER) system. To increase the response rate year over year, the LDOE will also provide school systems with a QR code for the survey to disseminate to youth who are no longer in high school. Youth who are no longer in school can use the QR code to complete the survey on a mobile device. The SER system is also being enhanced to collect more contact information, such as an email address, to better reach youth who are no longer in school.

Furthermore, the LDOE will consider using its Be Engaged Initiative to promote participation in the post school transition survey. Within the initiative, the LDOE uses PimsPoints, a system designed to support and ignite engagement. The post school transition survey can be shared with parents in PimsPoints, who can encourage or assist youth with completing the survey.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The response rate increased, and the LDOE collected data and reviewed response rates to determine whether the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Specifically, LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2021 public IDEA student count. LDOE determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Louisiana uses a census method to collect data; the State does not sample. School systems disseminate the survey to post-school youth, and results are captured in the State’s Special Education Reporting (SER) data system. In FFY 2021, LDOE collected data and reviewed response rates to determine whether the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Specifically, LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2021 public IDEA student count. LDOE determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2021 public IDEA student count. LDOE determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, including steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, as required by the Measurement Table.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

In its description of strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, the State did not specifically address strategies to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias or identify steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from parents of children receiving special education services in the State, as required by the Measurement Table.

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, the State did not include the analysis to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and have IEPs in effect at the time they left schools, including the analysis of race/ethnicity and at least one of the other demographic category. Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

The State did not describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe strategies which are expected to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and report on steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. In addition, the State must report the metric used to determine representativeness.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

YES

If yes, provide an explanation below

The data was not submitted by the November deadline. The data file will be submitted as requested by OSEP. Louisiana held 22 resolution sessions and 9 were resolved through settlement agreements.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and

changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	60.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%
Data	66.67%	50.00%	28.57%	35.29%	58.82%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
9	22	58.82%	75.00%	40.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

After reviewing the data, while 9 of the 22 resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements through resolution meetings, 17 were withdrawn or dismissed by the parent, including those resolved without a hearing. In summary, LEAs are working with parents and families to resolve disagreements at the local level.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported in its narrative that "The data was not submitted by the November deadline. The data file will be submitted as requested by OSEP." OSEP notes that the State resubmitted its 2021-22 IDEA Part B Resolution data. Those resubmitted data are included on the Dispute Resolution attachment in the reporting tool. However, as noted in the IDEA Part B FFY 2021 SPP/APR User Guide, the 2021-22 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey as of the November 2, 2022 snapshot date, are used to prepopulate data under this Indicator.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

YES

If yes, provide an explanation below

The data were not submitted by the November deadline. The data file will be submitted as requested by OSEP.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana's children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE's Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP's structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP's primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state's targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	81.80%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%
Data	71.43%	50.00%	70.59%	72.73%	45.45%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3	3	10	45.45%	82.00%	60.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported in its narrative that "The data was not submitted by the November deadline. The data file will be submitted as requested by OSEP." OSEP notes that the State resubmitted its 2021-22 IDEA Part B Resolution data. Those resubmitted data are included on the Dispute Resolution attachment in the reporting tool. However, as noted in the IDEA Part B FFY 2021 SPP/APR User Guide, the 2021-22 IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey as of the November 2, 2022 snapshot date, are used to prepopulate data under this Indicator.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Louisiana's SiMR focuses on improving student-centered outcomes. Louisiana Believes starts with the premise that all children can achieve high expectations and should be prepared for college or career. The challenges of meeting the needs of diverse learners begin early. When Louisiana improved the LEAP assessment, the gap between students with disabilities and their general education peers was shown to be larger than previously understood. For these reasons, Louisiana is focusing on literacy, a foundational skill necessary for success in all subjects and grades. Louisiana's SiMR is to increase ELA proficiency rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in third through fifth grades, in eight school systems (SSIP cohort) across the state.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The SSIP cohort remains the same and includes 30 elementary/middle schools in 8 LEAs and specifically looks at the performance of students with disabilities in the cohort. Students in the cohort will change each year with incoming students into 3rd grade and as students move out of 5th grade.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Louisiana's theory of action states that if (a) data-informed decision making, (b) evidence-based literacy practices and (c) continuous leadership development are implemented with fidelity then (a) districts, schools and teachers will be able to continuously analyze and use multiple data sources to assess, plan and track outcomes for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, (b) educators can implement literacy practices with fidelity for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, and (c) districts, schools and teachers will have the capacity to enact change focused on improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in grades 3-5.

Louisiana's theory of action can also be accessed on page 6 here:

https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/state-systemic-improvement-plan-report-2019-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=70a66518_2.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	34.03%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	30.50%	31.50%	32.50%	33.50%	34.50%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total Number of Students W/ Disabilities in the Cohort Who Scored Proficient in ELA	Total Number of Students W/ Disabilities in the Cohort Who Took ELA 3-5 Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
135	510	27.62%	30.50%	26.47%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

While statewide data showed improvement in grades 4-5 ELA assessment results, fluctuation in the cohort numbers can impact our data even slightly, and Louisiana is still addressing learning recovery across the state. Grade 3 ELA continues to be an area Louisiana will address since those students saw impacts from the pandemic in critical years (K-1) for learning to read. Evidence-based practices and structures of support are expected to impact this data positively in the future.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

The data source used is LEAP 2025 statewide ELA assessments for grades 3-5.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Louisiana continues to collect data from a variety of sources. Using the data collection plan, the Department will collect both implementation and outcome data. Outcome measures are collected and analyzed using Louisiana LEAP 2025 annual statewide assessment results. Implementation measures are collected using the K-2 Classroom Support Tool, 3-12 Classroom Support Tool, the Common Planning Time Tool, and Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Observation Tool which measure high quality curriculum implementation and leader and teacher development/collaboration practices.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

Additional reading data from 2021-2022 NAEP results also indicate that Louisiana led the nation in 4th grade reading growth. While many states fell in ranking across the board, Louisiana moved up in overall ranking; in 2019 Louisiana ranked 46th and in 2022 Louisiana ranked 42nd. Also in 2022, Louisiana was #1 in the nation for 4th grade reading growth; Louisiana grew in scale scores while the national overall declined in 4th grade reading. These results are tied directly to our SiMR which encompasses grades 3-5 ELA performance, and Louisiana believes our priority to safely return students to in-person learning as quickly as possible post-pandemic, our statewide learning acceleration initiative, and our statewide literacy initiatives led to these results.

Literacy data from 2021-2022 showed improvement in performance among first, second and third graders over their prior year performance. Student scores at each grade level are reported as either "On or Above Benchmark" or "Below Benchmark." Students who scored "Below Benchmark" are considered "at risk" for reading difficulties according to authors of the reading assessments for our youngest learners. We show improvements are needed for our kindergartners entering with foundational reading skills. 55% of 3rd graders assessed in the fall of 2022 were scoring on or above benchmark, which is the highest since 2018.

The School Improvement Division/Team, which provides support to 49 school systems and 129 schools, conducted 363 classroom observations across Louisiana in K-12 classrooms using the K-2 Classroom Support Tool and the 3-12 Classroom Support Tool. In 2021-2022 the team shifted from solely evaluating curriculum implementation to intentional support of system and school leaders in instructional leadership teams and effective teacher collaboration. Team members also observed 41 common planning sessions using the Common Planning Tool and 69 Instructional Leadership Team meetings using the ILT Observation Tool. In the SSIP cohort schools, the School Improvement Team conducted 35 total classroom, common planning time, and instructional leadership team observations at 8 out of the 30 schools in the cohort.

The data shows that as a state we are making gains in literacy and reading shown on these multiple measures, and Louisiana will continue to focus on intentional structures and initiatives that drive capacity of educators and student growth.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

Louisiana remains committed to the theory of action, logic model and evaluation as interconnected components of the SSIP. In Phase III, the outcomes and data continue to drive our evidence-based literacy practices as well as continued professional development. Our evaluation plan is the same on pages 30-31 of the SSIP for 2019-2020 at this link:

<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/state-systemic-improvement-plan-report-2019-2020.pdf>.

Louisiana's LEAs also had to submit their Louisiana Comeback plans for 2021-2022, which outline their plans for increasing outcomes and recovering learning loss post-pandemic, including supports and outcomes for students with disabilities. Those LDOE approved plans are linked for every school system at louisianacomeback.com.

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Louisiana Comeback Plans: From catastrophic hurricanes to a global pandemic, Louisiana has faced extraordinary obstacles over the past few years. To ensure our state and our LEAs have intentional strategic plans, the Department required LEAs to submit Comeback Plans in 2021-2022. All LEA plans can be found at louisianacomeback.com, which provides families and communities transparent access.

ELA Grades 3-5 Updated Curriculum/Educator Development: The Department offered the opportunity for systems to pilot updated ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) and/or participate in the ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) Materials Review during the 2021-2022 school year. Caddo and St. Charles parishes participated in the pilot which included the following: 12 schools, 111 teachers, and 3055 students. The pilot consisted of teachers implementing the pilot units, being observed implementing these units, completion of a formal feedback survey, and offering ongoing feedback. Additionally, 13 school systems participated in the ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) Materials Review: Rapides, St. Helena, Bossier, Belle Chasse Academy, Webster, Central Community, St. Tammany, Vermillion, Caldwell, St. Martin, Ouachita, DeSoto, and Iberia. The materials review consisted of teachers and school system leaders who reviewed the pilot materials, participated in roundtable discussions with participating districts, the completion of a formal feedback survey, and participants offering ongoing feedback. Additional information can be found at [https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/teacher-toolbox-resources/ela-guidebooks-3-5-\(2022\)-pilot-feedback.pdf?sfvrsn=6e1f6218_2](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/teacher-toolbox-resources/ela-guidebooks-3-5-(2022)-pilot-feedback.pdf?sfvrsn=6e1f6218_2).

In addition, in Fall 2022, the ELA content leader professional development modules for grades 3-5 were updated and released to reflect the revisions that were made to ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022). The modules were revised to assist educators in gaining the knowledge, content expertise, and skills to successfully instruct and leverage the ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) curriculum. By the end of the modules, participants will be able to do the following:

- understand the ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) curriculum, its content pedagogy approach, and how to effectively use it,
- describe the knowledge and skills needed to read and write to the level expected of students, and
- identify how the ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) unit lessons build the knowledge and skills needed for students to be successful on the unit assessments, which measure the grade-level standards.

Literacy Coach Expansion: In 2021-2022, Louisiana wrote and published a Comprehensive Literacy Plan, which includes intentional literacy goals, key pillars and literacy best practices, and the Department began a Reading Revival Campaign. Moving forward in next steps from our Literacy Coaching Pilot of 2020-2021, in 2021-2022, the Department added a requirement that CIR elementary schools employ a literacy coach. The Department continued to offer free, required Science of Reading professional development for all K-3 administrators and educators in our state, and added a K-2 literacy content leader track to our content leader cohorts.

Teacher Leader Summit in May 2022, a gathering of approximately 4,000 school system leaders, school leaders and teacher leaders, was a fully in-person event that celebrated "Making A Comeback." The event included more sessions geared toward supporting students with disabilities than ever before. Objectives of this annual event include improving the everyday practice of Louisiana leaders and educators, providing opportunities for collaboration and sharing best practices, introducing high-quality strategies, resources, and professional development and fostering an empowering, engaging and inspiring culture among educators. Sessions geared toward the objective of our SiMR include a series of grades 3-5 sessions on the new ELA Guidebook units "ELA Guidebooks 3-5 Overview of Updates," "ELA Guidebooks 3-5 Evaluation Plan Participant Guide," "ELA Guidebooks 3-5 Evaluation Plan," and "ELA Guidebooks 3-5 Using Core and Optional Activities." Additional sessions included "Accelerate ELA," "Building Knowledge in ELA Units," "Science of Reading," "Using IEPs to Support Daily Instruction" and many more.

The School Improvement Team continued to support many LEAs in 2021-2022, and the team refocused on the School Improvement Best Practice strategy to provide targeted, differentiated support to school systems by supporting and coaching system and school leaders on Instructional Leadership Teams and Teacher Collaboration. The Division of School Improvement supports the Department's priority to cultivate high-impact systems, structures and partnerships by providing differentiated and targeted school improvement support to system leaders in the implementation of the Department's school improvement best practices in schools identified as Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) and Urgent Intervention Required - Academics (UIR-A). This work focuses on the sustainability of school improvement by providing system leaders with the tools and knowledge to ensure both the implementation and continual improvement of best practices at the school level through high-quality coaching and feedback. During 2021-2022, the division signed agreements with 49 systems to support 129 selected schools in the implementation of Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Support and/or Teacher Collaboration (TC) Support. School Improvement Support Specialists (SISS) consulted with system leaders to determine needs and set goals for each targeted site. These SISS conducted 473 paired observations with system leaders of ILT meetings, TC meetings, and K-12 classroom instruction and coached these system leaders to deliver high-quality feedback to school leaders. Progress at each system/school was monitored using walkthrough tools specific to the best practice observed and the resulting data was used to inform subsequent coaching visits. 71% of Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) Schools receiving Best Practice Support increased students scoring Mastery and above by an average of 3%. In addition, 49% of supported schools increased their School Performance Score by at least 3 points. A focus on these intentional structures is designed to support schools in adopting the essential components that drive professional and student growth and will continue during the 2022-2023 school year.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Louisiana continues to carry out a multi-layered approach to driving improved student outcomes for students with disabilities. The Louisiana Comeback plans required by each LEA, which required LDOE approval, allowed LDOE to ensure high-yield strategies were being implemented across the state to address attendance and well-being, learning acceleration and recovery, and professional learning. The Super App school planning process is still utilized and is aligned to the state's priorities, allowing spending to also be directed toward Louisiana priorities. The planning process continues to allow school systems to use data in planning, budgeting and implementation in alignment with key priorities. This operating cycle continues each year. This level of state and local governance and planning led to improved outcomes, learning recovery and our growth in literacy, in ELA mastery and in NAEP results.

Louisiana is also committed in its structures to embed supports for students with disabilities and ownership of outcomes across all offices in the Department. Specifically related to our SiMR, the Department has continued work to embed supports for diverse learners in its ELA Guidebook curriculum, ensuring quality standards, with feedback and development from Louisiana educators. This work resulted in increased achievement in ELA in Louisiana across the board and more schools and educators using our high-quality ELA Guidebook curriculum.

Our educator development structures include Content Leader and Teacher Leader initiatives that impact LEAs and sustainability by developing cadres of talented teacher leaders each year who develop the knowledge and skills to lead and coach other teachers in their LEAs and schools. The School Improvement Team also conducts similar technical assistance and support in some of our most struggling schools throughout the state intended to provide LEA and school leaders with curriculum implementation and educator development knowledge and skills that allow them to scale that support throughout their schools. Our SPED Fellow Academy, which launched cohort two in 2021-2022, is a year-long, comprehensive development program for

novice special education leaders across the state. The fellowship provides in-person training, coaching, and a community of practice that will instill the knowledge and skills the next generation of leaders need to lead and sustain change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Louisiana's intense literacy strategy and increase in professional development and literacy coaches across Louisiana is allowing for literacy and reading recovery in our elementary grades demonstrated by our fall reading report.

Monitoring and technical assistance efforts of the School Improvement Team led to 71% of Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) Schools receiving Best Practice Support increasing students scoring Mastery and above by an average of 3% in 2021-2022. In addition, 49% of supported schools increased their School Performance Score by at least 3 points.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

The Department relocated the Office of Special Education into Office of Teaching and Learning: In January 2022, the Department intentionally placed the Office of Special Education within the Office of Teaching and Learning. Immediately, the Department modeled the collaboration required in LEAs to improve outcomes for all students, a model that brings academic content, literacy, school improvement and special educators together. The decision places students with disabilities at the center of our teaching and learning strategy in Louisiana.

Literacy Field Employees: The Literacy Team hired several field employees to provide regional literacy training and technical assistance and to provide technical support to literacy coaches that are now required in elementary schools across Louisiana. Additional literacy support has impacted literacy growth in our state and immediately increased support and capacity of our educators impacting literacy outcomes.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Louisiana uses a multi-layered approach to implementing specific structures and best practices intended to increase outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities. Louisiana Comeback Plans will ensure intentional strategic planning and alignment of funds to improve priority areas for LEAs. Guidance from the SEA throughout the year supports this success.

Educator Development: The Department recognizes the critical role that school leadership teams serve in supporting educators in making data informed decisions and in supporting the implementation of evidence-based practices. The Department will release a Professional Learning Roadmap and will reinstate LDOE facilitated School Support Institutes to provide additional training to school system instructional leadership teams (ILT) in synthesizing data and supporting educators in the implementation of high-quality curriculum. The expanded Content Leader initiatives will work together with the School Support Institutes to develop leaders at multiple levels of the school system who can enact change to improve outcomes for students with disabilities in grades three through five and even earlier with the K-2 Literacy Content Leader structure. Continuous leadership development improves teaching and facilitates and promotes lifelong learning. While our Content Leader and Teacher Leader structures will continue, Louisiana is launching supports for new educators entering the field and will include a specific affinity group for new special educators entering the field. The intent will be to support new special educators entering the field, to support them in their craft and to retain them for years to come.

Literacy Field Employees: The literacy team will continue to provide "road shows," and support in LEAs with writing literacy goals, monitoring progress and implementing high quality foundational literacy programs. These field staff will also serve to support the many literacy coaches across the state, which will lead to better literacy outcomes for children with disabilities. The special education team will also begin work alongside the literacy team to support children with dyslexia in our state.

School Improvement Team Efforts: The School Improvement Team will continue to provide differentiated support on best school improvement practices in LEAs across the state. Planning will also begin around supporting schools who persistently struggle, including more targeted intervention and support.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

High quality instructional materials with embedded diverse learner supports
Literacy support
Accelerating Learning and High Quality Intervention
High Quality Summer Learning Programs
Leading Inclusive Special Education Programming Guidance

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

High quality instructional materials with embedded diverse learner supports:
Louisiana continues to intentionally expand efforts and embed diverse learner supports within high quality instructional materials. Louisiana's ELA Guidebooks 3-5 (2022) curriculum helps all students read, understand, and express their understanding of complex, grade-level texts, build students' understanding and knowledge through text sets, compelling questions, and integrated reading and writing activities. Louisiana released new ELA Guidebooks grades 3-5 units in May 2022 and began training at the Teacher Leader Summit. ELA Content Leaders across the state were provided updated training to deploy the updated curriculum across the state in every LEA.

Louisiana's Literacy Team continue to support literacy across the state providing support on writing literacy goals, developing and releasing literacy interventions, supporting professional development and creating family literacy resources. Louisiana now has over 300 trained literacy coaches and 16 regional literacy specialists across the state in elementary schools. Resources for K-3 literacy support such as sound wall resources, phonological awareness cards, and dyslexia resources were released. The Literacy Intervention and Foundational Toolkit (LIFT) kit for grades 2 and up and the Foundational Instruction for Reading Excellence (FIRE) kit for grades 3-5 were released. Family literacy resources and grab-and-go activities were also released. Our comprehensive literacy plan can be found at https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/literacy/louisiana-comprehensive-literacy-plan.pdf?sfvrsn=500c6418_6.

Accelerate is Louisiana's Pre-K-12 Tutoring Strategy, designed for school systems to implement equal access tutoring at-scale in order to achieve significant results for all students. Grounded in the most impactful research-based practices, Accelerate is a just-in-time, pre-teaching model that addresses unfinished learning by building knowledge and connecting it to skills in current lessons. In 2021-2022, an Accelerate Pilot was launched that required pilot participants to implement the Accelerate tutoring strategy and accompanying materials in their schools. Pre-K-12 ELA and math tutoring materials were updated in 2021-2022 and continue to be used in tutoring, intervention and summer learning programs in many schools. In 2021-2022

the Department released Staffing and Scheduling Guidance, with specific supports for students with disabilities, to ensure equal access to intervention and schedules that provide students with the extra time needed to recover learning. Staffing and Scheduling Guidance can be found at https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/staffing-and-scheduling-guidance.pdf?sfvrsn=f5776618_20.

Summer Learning Guidance released in 2021 was expanded in 2022 and the most struggling schools in Louisiana were issued a requirement to provide summer learning to students. The guidance focused on structures and elements of a summer program, resources for implementing elements, staffing and scheduling considerations, sample schedules, checklists for action steps and funding information. Webinars were provided to LEAs to implement high quality summer learning programs. Guidance can be found here: https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/summer-learning-program-guidance.pdf?sfvrsn=9f5a6618_18.

Inclusive Special Education Programming Guidance: School systems often face unique and complex challenges in improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Addressing these challenges is multifaceted and requires leaders who can effectively coordinate programming within and across departments and schools to increase access to inclusive learning opportunities for students with disabilities. In January 2022, the Department began releasing a series of guidance materials for Leading Inclusive Special Education Programs. Each guidance document covers a critical topic for special education programming. Following the release of each guidance document, a webinar is available to school systems to support implementation. School system leaders are encouraged to review the guidance materials and attend webinars in partnership with special education leaders. An example of the guidance can be seen here: [https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/guidance-for-leading-inclusive-special-education-programs---cultivating-high-quality-teaching-and-learning-aligned-to-louisiana-s-vision-for-success-\(june-2022\).pdf?sfvrsn=86906218_6](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/guidance-for-leading-inclusive-special-education-programs---cultivating-high-quality-teaching-and-learning-aligned-to-louisiana-s-vision-for-success-(june-2022).pdf?sfvrsn=86906218_6)

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Each of the evidence-based practices are aimed at providing comprehensive support for educators in all grades, but specifically ELA educators in grades 3-5. Our 3-5 ELA Guidebook updates will strengthen and embed diverse learner supports and intentional writing supports into the curriculum which will directly impact their achievement on aligned statewide assessments used to measure the SiMR. Strategic literacy best practices will continue to be refined and implemented to support literacy development such that students in grades 3-5 will be on grade-level and increase outcomes in ELA. Family literacy tools were also released that increased parents' capacity to support their children at home. Louisiana must start in the foundational years to comprehensively impact this outcome. Our tutoring and intervention strategies will provide students with disabilities the extra time they need in an equitable way to increase outcomes; the support for educators around these strategies ensure they have the capacity to implement data-driven interventions for students. The Summer Learning Guidance will help LEAs plan and implement effective, accessible summer learning, especially targeting Mathematics and ELA instruction, aimed at addressing accelerating learning for all students following the pandemic. This layered approach to implement SSIP strategies is intended to increase student achievement.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Data from 2021-2022 NAEP results indicate that Louisiana led the nation in 4th grade reading growth. While many states fell in ranking across the board, Louisiana moved up in overall ranking; in 2019 Louisiana ranked 46th and in 2022 Louisiana ranked 42nd. Also in 2022, Louisiana was #1 in the nation for 4th grade reading growth; Louisiana grew in scale scores while the national overall declined in 4th grade reading. These results are tied directly to our SiMR which encompasses grades 3-5 ELA performance, and Louisiana believes our priority to safely return students to in-person learning as quickly as possible post-pandemic, our statewide learning acceleration initiative, and our statewide literacy initiatives led to these results. Additionally, state LEAP ELA assessment results are collected and analyzed.

Literacy data from 2021-2022 showed improvement in performance among first, second and third graders over their prior year performance. Student scores at each grade level are reported as either "On or Above Benchmark" or "Below Benchmark." Students who scored "Below Benchmark" are considered "at risk" for reading difficulties according to authors of the reading assessments for our youngest learners. We show improvements are needed for our kindergartners entering with foundational reading skills. 55% of 3rd graders assessed in the fall of 2022 were scoring on or above benchmark, which is the highest since 2018.

The School Improvement Division/Team, which provides support to 49 school systems, conducted 363 classroom observations across Louisiana in K-12 classrooms using the K-2 Classroom Support Tool and the 3-12 Classroom Support Tool. The classroom observation tools help observers determine to what extent the teacher is using and delivering a high-quality curriculum, the degree to which students are actively engaged, whether the teacher is actively monitoring student learning and providing feedback. The Common Planning Time Tool assist observers with determining if teachers are planning using high-quality materials and if they are planning for student supports and anticipating student needs. Efforts of the School Improvement Team led to 71% of Comprehensive Intervention Required (CIR) Schools receiving Best Practice Support increasing students scoring Mastery and above by an average of 3% in 2021-2022. In addition, 49% of supported schools increased their School Performance Score by at least 3 points.

Louisiana's indicator 5 data also indicates that the majority of our students with disabilities are in inclusive settings receiving high quality content instruction, which impacts students' ability to master grade level content expected on the state LEAP assessments.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

NAEP reading results, our fall literacy data, and the School Improvement observational data are all used to provide additional progress monitoring.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

High quality instructional materials with embedded diverse learner supports: 3-5 ELA Guidebooks implementation support will continue and will include additional professional development sessions at Teacher Leader Summit 2023. Additionally, in the spring of 2023 Louisiana will release adoption plans and guidance for three best instructional practices for students with disabilities: high quality core instruction, extra time to learn, and content strong educators. All of these research-based best instructional practices will lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

Literacy support: Continued professional development around the science of reading will continue and Louisiana will extend opportunities for that professional development for middle school special educators, interventionists and literacy specialists who support students with disabilities who may struggle to read beyond the foundational years. Additional intervention resources will be released for grades 3-5 and high school resources for older students who struggle to read.

Accelerating Learning and High Quality Intervention: Following the Accelerate Pilot, much more emphasis will be placed on high quality intervention that accelerates learning for students with disabilities. The 2023 Teacher Leader Summit theme will be around accelerating learning.

High Quality Summer Learning Programs: Updated guidance on summer programs will include a specific recommendation of at least 5 weeks of programming. This will provide supports for our students with disabilities and help to further accelerate learning and help close achievement gaps.

Leading Inclusive Special Education Programming Guidance: Additional inclusive education guidance documents will be released based on feedback from special education advisors and leaders across our state and based on feedback from LEA leaders and educators.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

While Louisiana will continue the implementation of the strategies outlined, the SEA will begin stakeholder engagement to reassess the SiMR cohort model and its support of all students with disabilities in Louisiana.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Louisiana has developed a comprehensive vision for the future of education in our state—Louisiana Believes. The driving force of this vision is that every one of Louisiana’s children should be on track to a college degree or a professional career. Louisiana regularly seeks input from a broad set of stakeholders when establishing policy, regulation, or implementation strategies. Louisiana’s Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) is key in the development of the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and SSIP; this group is the driving force for our target setting process and data analysis. SEAP includes representation from the following: parents, special education administrators, teachers, institutions of higher education, transition providers, individuals with disabilities, homeless liaison, related service provider, private schools, foster care representative, and juvenile or adult correction representative. Our panel selection committee also includes a diversity component on the selection rubric to ensure diverse representation on our advisory panel, of which more than 50 percent are parents or individuals with a disability.

Internal Review

The LDOE’s Division for Diverse Learners reviewed historical data and LDOE policies, procedures, and practices; and collaborated with internal teams to develop targets that were rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The Division for Diverse Learners developed and executed an SPP/APR target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 targets. The LDOE developed a State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report Target Setting webpage on the Louisiana Believes website. The webpage contains an overview document with an explanation of each indicator, historical data for each indicator, and tables to clearly identify whether or not the State met targets for each indicator. After review of the overview document, a target setting survey was available for stakeholders to provide input on targets. No adjustments were made to targets for FFY 2021.

SEAP Integration

The LDOE informed the SEAP on the target setting process and SSIP at two separate meetings. LDOE provided an overview of each indicator along with historical data to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at the meetings, providing external stakeholder feedback. Again, SEAP’s primary membership is parents and individuals with disabilities.

The LDOE set targets based on feedback, historical data, and whether previous targets set were met. LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP. No revisions were made to targets for FFY 2021.

Louisiana also partners with the Louisiana Association of Special Education Administrators (LASEA) to get valuable input on state policy and strategy and to build capacity and increase intentional communication with the local administrators. The Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council was also engaged around our state’s targets, data and progress and that council is also comprised of parents of individuals with disabilities and individuals with disabilities.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Throughout 2021-2022 many stakeholder groups were engaged, experts, state commissions, educators and parents. This broad engagement was an improved stakeholder engagement effort that focused on more frequent, detailed input and included the following:

- Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP)
- Related Services Advisory Commission (new commission)
- Superintendent’s Teacher Advisory Council (which includes special educators)
- Early Literacy Commission
- Teacher Leader Advisors
- Families Helping Families
- Exceptional Lives Louisiana
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Governor’s Office of Disability Affairs
- Louisiana Association of Special Education Supervisors

Parents and parent-advocates are also often consulted by the State Superintendent, State Director and executive staff to provide input on key improvements.

Surveys are also used to solicit improvement ideas from parents, administrators and educators.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Stakeholder feedback and input is valued at all levels of engagement. Concerns expressed during 2021-2022 were primarily focused on staff shortages and learning recovery post-pandemic. Louisiana has deployed several strategies to quickly address staffing shortages. Louisiana launched a Recruitment and Retention Taskforce last year, which has made many recommendations. Several targeted at special education staffing shortages have included launching a paraeducator to teacher model, helping to fund paraeducators to obtain degrees and become educators, and Louisiana invested ESSEER dollars to pay for special education coursework and certification for educators. The latest workforce data indicates that special education certification is no longer in the top three needs in our state for certification and data also shows we have increased the number of certified educators of color. Additionally, our accelerate learning strategy and specific best practices included in our SSIP are aimed specifically at learning recovery.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

All activities have been included.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Louisiana believes that if (a) data-informed decision making, (b) evidence-based literacy practices and (c) continuous leadership development are implemented with fidelity then (a) districts, schools and teachers will be able to continuously analyze and use multiple data sources to assess, plan and track outcomes for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, (b) educators can implement literacy practices with fidelity for students with disabilities in 3-5 grades, and (c) districts, schools and teachers will have the capacity to enact change focused on improving literacy outcomes for students with disabilities in grades 3-5. Louisiana's theory of action can also be accessed on page 6 here:

https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/students-with-disabilities/state-systemic-improvement-plan-report-2019-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=70a66518_2.

https://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/assessment/2022-2023-assessment-calendar.pdf?sfvrsn=4de36518_2

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

As Louisiana identifies barriers, stakeholders are consulted and solutions are put into place. For example, the infrastructure improvement to relocate the special education office within the Office of Teaching and Learning addresses a long-time need to break down silos separating academics from special education. Any additional barriers will be proactively addressed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Meredith Jordan

Title:

Executive Director of Diverse Learners

Email:

meredith.jordan@la.gov

Phone:

2254855228

Submitted on:

04/27/23 10:30:08 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
69.58%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	13	54.17%
Compliance	20	17	85.00%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	89%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	81%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	22%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	85%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	32%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	83%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	89%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	81%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	32%	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	87%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	13%	0
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	84%	1

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	19	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	74	1

*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2023 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.56%	NO	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	83.15%	NO	1
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	98.38%	N/A	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	80.00%		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			1
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	Yes, 2 to 4 years		

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

Data Rubric

FFY 2021 APR³

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	Subtotal	21
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

³ In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

	618 Data ⁴			
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	0	0	1
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	0	1	2
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	0	1	2
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	0	0	1	1
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	0	N/A	N/A	0
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	0	1	2
			Subtotal	11
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	13.62

⁴ In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	13.62
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	39.62
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	2.48
Denominator	49.52
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	0.8000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	80.00

*Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2023 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	1 st Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in May

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>