



Louisiana Believes

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) & Annual Performance Report (APR) July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004

John White
State Superintendent of Education
February 2015

State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

Mr. Chas Roemer
President
6th BESE District

Mr. James D. Garvey, Jr.
Vice President
1st BESE District

Ms. Kira Orange Jones
2nd BESE District

Ms. Lottie P. Beebe
3rd BESE District

Ms. Mary Harris
4th BESE District

Mr. Jay Guillot
5th BESE District

Ms. Holly Boffy
Secretary-Treasurer
7th BESE District

Ms. Carolyn Hill
8th BESE District

Dr. Judith Miranti
Member-at-Large

Ms. Connie Bradford
Member-at-Large

Ms. Jane Smith
Member-at-Large

For further information, contact:
Bernell Cook
Office of Student Programs
Division of NCLB & IDEA Support
1201 N. Third Street
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
225-342-3736
<http://www.louisianabelieves.com>

The mission of the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) is to ensure equal access to education and to promote equal excellence throughout the state. The LDOE is committed to providing Equal Employment Opportunities and is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. The LDOE does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, or genetic information. Inquiries concerning the LDOE's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Attorney, LDOE, Office of the General Counsel, P.O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064; 877.453.2721 or customerservice@la.gov. Information about the federal civil rights laws that apply to the LDOE and other educational institutions is available on the website for the Office of Civil Rights, USDOE, at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/>.

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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) will implement a comprehensive, Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP). This data-driven, differentiated system of monitoring will elevate and target areas that directly impact student performance. This system of monitoring will serve as a major component of the State's overall General Supervision structure.

The primary focus of the State's monitoring activities will be on: (1) improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and (2) ensuring that Louisiana meets the program requirements under Part B of the Act, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.

Annually, LDOE will engage in a selection process to determine which local education agencies (LEAs) will be monitored and what type of monitoring will occur. 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).

Embodied in this process will be ways for local education agencies to self-assess. Also, LDOE plans to leverage more targeted, and strategic technical assistance by utilizing the results of this monitoring process to better inform our support structure.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) is committed to assisting schools and parents in their efforts to resolve disagreements in the least adversarial manner possible. Therefore, the 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.

A- IEP FACILITATION

IEP facilitation is available to parents and school districts. Typically, an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Facilitator is brought in when parents and school district staff are having difficulties communicating with one another regarding the needs of the student. The IEP Facilitator assists in creating an atmosphere for fair communication and also oversees the successful drafting of an IEP for the student. Either the parent or the school district 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 district.

B- 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 districts working cooperatively in the educational interest of children to achieve their shared goals of meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities.

C- FORMAL COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION

A parent, adult student, individual, or organization may file a signed written complaint with the LDOE to begin a formal complaint investigation. Formal administrative complaints procedures are developed under the

supervisory jurisdiction of the LDOE to address allegations that a school district is violating a requirement of Part B of the IDEA.

D- MEDIATION

Mediation is available to resolve a disagreement between parents and the school districts regarding the identification, evaluation, placement, services, or the provision of a FAPE to a child with a disability. Parents or school districts may request mediation 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 districts 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 the LDOE at no cost to parents and school districts.

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.

E- DUE PROCESS HEARING

Only the parent of a child with a disability, an attorney representing the parent, or a school district may request a due process hearing regarding a student with a disability. A due process hearing is a formal proceeding in which evidence is presented to an independent hearing officer to resolve a dispute between the parents of a child with a disability and the school district regarding the identification, evaluation, eligibility, or placement of or the provision of a free appropriate public education to a child with a disability.

A request for a due process hearing must be made 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 district specifically misrepresented that it had resolved the problem or the school district withheld pertinent information that it was required to provide under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).

Once a request for a hearing is received, the 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 the LDOE. The Division of Administrative Law will assign an Administrative Law Judge (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.

F- RESOLUTION MEETING PROCESS

The school district is required to convene a resolution meeting within 15 days of receipt of a request for a due process hearing. If the parent and the school district have not resolved the due process complaint within 30 calendar days of receipt of the request, the due process hearing timeline begins. The 45-calendar-day timeline for issuing a final decision begins at the expiration of the 30 calendar-day resolution period. The parent and the school district may agree in writing to waive the resolution session or to use the mediation process instead of conducting a resolution meeting. If the resolution session is

waived, the 45 day hearing timeline begins on the date of the waiver.

G- DUE PROCESS HEARING PROCEDURES

The parties will not be able to raise issues at the hearing that were not included in the hearing request, unless the other parties agree to allow the addition of new issues.

Before the hearing, the parent is entitled to a copy of the child's educational record, including all tests and reports upon which the school's proposed action is based. In addition, at least 5 business days before the date of the hearing, the parent and the school district must disclose to each other the evaluations each intends to use in the hearing. Specifically, copies of all evaluations and recommendations based on those evaluations must be exchanged by that deadline. If either the parent or the school district fails to make these disclosures on time, the hearing officer may bar the evidence from the hearing. If an evaluation is underway and has not been completed, it is necessary to inform each other and the independent hearing officer.

The decision of the hearing officer is made on substantive grounds based on a determination whether the school provided the child with a free appropriate public education. If the request for a hearing includes or is based on alleged procedural violations, the hearing officer may find that the child did not receive a free appropriate public education only if he or she finds that the procedural violations occurred and they:

- impeded the child's right to a free appropriate public education;
- significantly impeded the parent's opportunity to participate in the decision-making process regarding the provision of free appropriate public education; or
- deprived the child of educational benefits.

As part of his or her decision and order, the ALJ may order the school district to comply with the procedural requirements.

The independent hearing officer must conduct the hearing and mail the parent and the school district a written decision within 45 calendar days from the end of the resolution period. The 45-day timeline may be extended if the independent hearing officer grants a request for a specific extension of time from the parent or the school district.

The independent hearing officer's decision is final, and the orders must be implemented unless the parent or the school district files a civil action in State or Federal court of competent jurisdiction within 90 days of receipt of the notification of the findings and decision of the hearing officer.

The LDOE is responsible for the costs of conducting the hearing. Both parties are responsible for the costs of their participation in the hearing (e.g., witness fees, attorney's fees, costs of copying documents, etc.).

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

Network Structure

The network structure is the primary support vehicle for districts, providing immediate, targeted assistance to all of Louisiana's LEAs. Louisiana's parishes are divided into five networks plus a charter school network. Networks are organized by geography, size and existing relationships. Each network has a network support team that includes a District Support Officer and an NCLB/IDEA Point of Contact. These leaders assess the unique needs and approaches of their districts and build upon those strengths to support implementation of instructional reforms. They are also the LEAs primary point of contact, and they answer all programmatic

questions—including IDEA-related questions. They also review and approve applications and prepare districts for audits and monitoring.

Network leaders and teams facilitate regular meetings with school districts to discuss what is working in classrooms statewide and what processes need further refinement. Network staff works side by side with district and school level administrators to regularly observe practices at the school level, fostering alignment on quality instructional practices and effective feedback. Their work will include analyzing student and teacher data on which to base feedback and recommendations; providing technical assistance in determining the best evaluation systems and curriculum; and assisting districts in the transition to new evaluation systems and the Common Core.

Teacher Leaders

This program supports a cohort of 4,000 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. With training and ongoing support from the LDOE and Teacher Leaders, School Implementation Team members ensure effective implementation 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. In response to feedback received from special education stakeholders and teachers of English language learners, Teacher Leaders, School Implementation teams and the LDOE District Support Networks also target supports to district and school-level personnel serving students with disabilities and limited English proficiency students to help all students achieve.

Planning Resources

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

District Planning Guide defines the most important work Louisiana LEAs will take on in the course of the school year. The guide catalogs all the major decisions LEAs will make to plan for the next school year, and it catalogs all the resources the Department will share with districts to support this planning. The guide is divided into six focus areas: school leader and teacher learning targets, assessment and curriculum, school and teacher collaboration, Compass observation and feedback, pathway to college and career, and aligning resources.

District Planning Calls are scheduled throughout the school year to discuss topics and resources in the Planning Guide with district planning teams. These calls provide continuous, ongoing support to LEA superintendents, as well as senior staff in technology, assessment and curriculum. During these calls, LDOE provides more in-depth support, fields questions in real time, and integrates high-priority policies and other topics. In FFY 2013, LDOE regularly integrated support for special education professionals including training and policy guidance on high cost services, Louisiana's Act 833 – alternative pathways to promotion and graduation, and Louisiana's Acts 833 and 677 - data privacy.

Empowering Educators: Planning for Success is LDOE's strategic framework for its audit and monitoring process to ensure that LEAs are monitored no more than one time a year. LDOE's NCLB and IDEA Point of Contact works with any selected LEA to prepare for monitoring, which may include a review of the LEAs IDEA implementation. For more information on LDOE's IDEA monitoring program, see the monitoring section above.

More information on LDOE's District Support Structure can be found on the Department's website at:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support-toolbox/district-support-toolbox/district-network-support-structure>

(Additional note: LDOE also sought technical assistance sources and took actions as a result of that

technical assistance. For further information, please see the attached "Louisiana FFY 2013 SPP/APR Clarification Response April 2015".)

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 students with disabilities.

Educator-Focused Professional Development System

LDOE believes that those closest to students, educators and parents, are best positioned to support students and thus the implementation of the standards. Given this belief, LDOE invests in support by providing educators with resources and training so that they can make local, empowered decisions to support their unique students. LDOE's direct-to-teacher strategy is building capacity around strong ELA and math content knowledge to fill those structures. Below, LDOE's support structure is described, focusing on three key components of professional development: resources, direct support, and supporting students with disabilities.

Resources

Teacher toolbox: This central resource hub houses all of the key resources teachers need in a one stop shop. This toolbox was created with the support of educators from across the state. It is built from the perspective of a teacher and the key steps they take to teach students. All resources and tools released from the LDOE are integrated and connect to help teachers take these key actions.

Curriculum guides: LDOE created a robust set of instructional tools for math and ELA. The ELA guidebooks contain a full set of unit plans to build a complete curriculum for educators K-12. In math, the guidebooks are meant to be a supplement to any program. They support teachers as they work to provide students tasks and appropriately remediate.

Video library: This library houses instructional videos that illustrate quality instruction connected to Louisiana's Compass instructional rubric and the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). This library is regularly updated and includes guides to help teachers and principals use the videos for instructional improvement.

Assessment tools: Assessment guides, sample tests, and other tools help teachers to understand how students will be assessed on the standards. These tools prepare teachers to set strong goals for student mastery of the standards and align their instruction accordingly.

High School Students Planning Guidebook: This guidebook is a series of short documents showing administrators, counselors, and teachers how to use key policies, programs, and resources to help both students and schools achieve their goals.

For more information on resource available to Louisiana educators, please visit LDOE's website:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/>

Direct Support

Just as with every level, direct support ensures that teachers are able to use the quality resources and implement the standards successfully in their classroom. In Louisiana, our direct support goes directly to the teacher level. While districts and principals take on a significant amount of teacher training and support, LDOE provides an intense amount of direct training and support.

Teacher Leaders: This cadre of over 4,000 teachers represents every district and school in the state. This cadre ensures that every school has a series of experts on the standards and curricular tools. This provides principals and districts capacity. These Teacher Leaders support districts and schools as they work to train

and support teachers in their districts. All materials are posted publicly so that teacher leaders and others are able to use all training materials for other teachers in their schools and districts.

Blended training: Louisiana Teacher Leaders receive a significant amount of training throughout the year. The LDOE has learned that teachers need different types of training to support their varied needs. Thus, the LDOE provides intensive, blended training throughout the entire school year. Each layer of training provides support in a different area of need for educators.

- **Content training (in person):** In person is often the most effective forum for content based training. To support Teacher Leaders, the LDOE hosts over 10,000 seats of training during the year. In June the entire 4,000 cadre came together for a two day ELA and math training. This is followed by content institutes throughout the year.
- **Resource/curricula use (virtual):** LDOE hosts grade specific math and ELA bi-monthly webinars. These webinars break down upcoming weeks of lessons, help teachers adjust plans based on student needs, and share resources among other teachers.
- **Ongoing improvement (collaboration):** LDOE hosts in-person regional collaborations led by expert and trained teacher advisers. These regional collaborations provide space throughout the year for teachers to reflect on student work, identify areas for improvement, and share resources.

EdModo collaboration: This online forum provides an immediate place to go to find and share resources across the state. Thousands of teachers use this site weekly to share resources, ask teacher questions, and support others. LDOE monitors this site and pulls high quality resources to key folders to ensure quality for others.

Supporting Students with Disabilities

The resources and support provided by the LDOE described above will enable districts and educators to better serve all students, however, to achieve significant gains with this specific population LDOE must execute meaningful college and career readiness initiatives targeted at our students with disabilities.

Special Education Department Restructuring. A couple of year ago, LDOE went through a structural reorganization, so that special education became part of Louisiana's network and field support structures. As a result, the agency is delivering more effective support to districts and schools with regard to IDEA compliance and increasing academic outcomes for students with disabilities. The work has shifted to not only helping students access the new standards, but also to increasing the rate at which they make academic progress, meet IEP goals, and earn diplomas and career credentials within the regular education setting. To work specifically on these initiatives and enhance collaboration within the agency, LDOE hired a new Special Education Policy Director in the summer of 2014. The special education policy office is concentrating on improving the LDOE monitoring system with a focus on target setting, increasing the prominence of special education specific reporting, working closely with the network teams to deliver targeted support to local school districts and high-need schools, and conducting an analysis of special education data to inform the Department's policies. To assist in meeting district needs, LDOE also provides funding to eight regional centers to offer support and training in the area of technology for students with disabilities, students on 504 plans, and Universal Design for Learning and to 11 Families Helping Families centers across the state to provide services and training to families and educators.

Communication and Assistance. LDOE has multiple mechanisms in place for providing communication and assistance to Louisiana's educators. District staff regularly facilitates special education-focused trainings for staff and educators with updates on LDOE initiatives, in addition to information disseminated in the weekly district newsletter. As Louisiana's Act 833, which provides alternative pathways to promotion and graduation, is implemented in the 2014-2015 school year, LDOE is using the webinars and newsletters to provide guidance to special education directors on how to accurately identify students eligible for the alternate pathways, set rigorous IEP goals aligned to grade level standards, evaluate student achievement, and select

appropriate measurements of student proficiency.

Special Education Professional Development and Support. The Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), awarded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs, is enabling LDOE to develop a system of professional development and support based on state, district, and school needs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and create sustainable, evidence-based practices. The project has four focus areas related to the use and effectiveness of data-based decision making, inclusive practices, family engagement, and culturally responsive practices. These areas will be addressed through the use of blended professional development, data collection and analysis, implementation measures, and collaboration with state efforts. The grant provides and links districts to professional development that connects special needs instruction to the Common Core State Standards; collaborative initiatives that link regular education and special education teachers; and provides training on the effective utilization of data to make informed decisions.

Planning and Support Materials: LDOE continues to develop and disseminate materials and resources statewide based on strategies found to be most effective. Currently available resources include the Louisiana Co-Teaching Guide, ParaPros Make the Difference, Equitable Classroom Practices Checklist, and Professional Development Planning Guide for Culturally Responsive Practices. Partnerships with Louisiana State University and Pyramid Community Parent Resource Center are supporting the achievement of the project's goals and objectives.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

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. This inclusive vision and Louisiana's values are apparent in the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process. LDOE used three phases to develop the SPP targets for FFY 2013 – FFY 2018.

Internal Review and Vetting Process

LDOE's special education policy office reviewed historical data, existing and planned legislation, and LDOE policies, procedures and practices; compared Louisiana's performance on all indicators to our peers; and collaborated with internal divisions (Data Analytics, Early Childhood Education, Assessment and Accountability, Policy, IDEA Monitoring, and Network Support) to develop draft targets that were both rigorous and attainable.

External Stakeholder Feedback

The special education policy office developed and executed an SPP target setting engagement strategy to solicit broad stakeholder feedback on the FFY 2013 –FFY 2018 draft targets. LDOE held three webinars where LDOE's draft targets were presented and stakeholders provided both structured and free form feedback. The three webinars covered: 1) Early Childhood Indicators 6 and 7, 2) Graduation and Drop-Out Indicators 1 and 2, and 3) Target Overview of Indicators 3-5, 8, and 14-16. LDOE strategically held these sessions as webinars to allow for a broad geographic range of participants across the State. Stakeholders included parents, advocacy organizations, SEAP members, local education agency personnel including special education directors, and LDOE personnel. Webinars averaged 25-35 participants, and provided meaningful feedback and lively conversations. LDOE compiled and reviewed all feedback, and used it to adjust targets, as appropriate.

SEAP Integration Throughout

LDOE updated the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) on the target setting process at three separate meetings. LDOE presented proposed targets for FFY2013 – 2018 as well as historical data, relevant policy, etc., to SEAP members who provided input. SEAP’s structure also allows for public comments, which were exercised at each of these meetings, providing further external stakeholder feedback.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 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 2012 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

LDOE reports annually to the public on the performance of each LEA on the targets in the SPP/APR by posting a “Performance Profile” on LDOE’s website. For more information, please click on the following web link and locate the section titled “Students with Disabilities: Performance Profiles”.

<https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/academics>

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		18.00%	19.00%	25.00%	25.00%	40.67%	50.00%	61.00%
Data	13.60%	17.70%	17.10%	35.30%	34.30%	30.30%	29.30%	32.96%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline


FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,725	1725
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	4,705	4,705
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	36.70%	Calculate 

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
1,725	4,705	32.96%	38.00%	36.70%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Students in Louisiana can earn two types of diplomas, either the College and Career Diploma or a Career Diploma. The College and Career Diploma (TOPS University diploma) requires that students earn 24 credits. The Career Diploma (Jump Start TOPS Tech diploma) requires that students earn 23 credits. Both options are available to students with IEPs.

Louisiana also has a graduation waiver process for students with IEPs. Students with IEPs who have passed two of the three required components of the exit examinations and have exhausted all opportunities available to pass the remaining component may apply for *Senior Waiver*. The waiver process allows the state to waive one required component of the exit examinations if the Department of Education determines that the student's disability significantly impacts his or her ability to pass required assessments.

Going forward, Act 833 of Louisiana's 2014 legislative session gives IEP teams the authority to establish alternate means of demonstrating proficiency for students with disabilities who have persistent academic challenges due to their disabilities. 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.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		25.00%	23.00%	21.00%	21.00%	18.60%	16.70%	25.00%
Data	22.99%	28.97%	29.90%	12.20%	11.20%	6.00%	37.00%	39.15%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	35.00%	34.00%	33.00%	30.00%	27.00%	25.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,680	
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	965	
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	42	
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,400	
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	35	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,400	4,122	39.15%	35.00%	33.96%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		70.00%	73.50%	75.50%	80.00%	85.00%	87.50%	87.50%
Data	74.60%	54.60%	56.80%	72.10%	64.70%	50.00%	51.10%	55.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP? Yes No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO? AYP AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
180	72	29	55.80%	100%	40.28%

Explanation of Slippage

According to OSEP's data source definition, AMO data is used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA as a result of ESEA flexibility. Since Louisiana has an approved ESEA flexibility waiver, the state is reporting on progress towards AMO targets. Louisiana did not meet its target for Indicator 3A. For the FFY 2013 APR submission, 40.28% of districts both met the minimum "n" size of ten (10) and met the annual measurable objective (AMO). This represents a decline from the state's FFY 2012 submission of 55.80%. The process for determining whether a district meets AMO and AYP is complex, involving multiple tiers and multiple steps within those tiers. Please see the attached report, "2013-2014 State of Louisiana Subgroup Component Report" for more information.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥		98.71%	97.75%	98.70%	98.70%	98.75%	98.80%	98.80%
			Data	99.19%	99.35%	99.40%	99.30%	99.70%	99.40%	99.20%	99.50%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥		98.68%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
			Data	99.16%	99.31%	99.30%	99.20%	99.70%	99.30%	99.10%	99.50%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Math	A ≥ Overall	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	41,091	40,696	99.50%	98.80%	99.04%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	41,211	40,783	99.50%	98.80%	98.96%

Public Reporting Information

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

LDOE's Accountability Center, including School Letter Grades, School Performance Scores, Top Gains School, High-Performing High Poverty Schools, and Federal Accountability:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/accountability>

LDOE's Academic Center for Students with Disabilities, including Performance Profiles:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/academics>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2008	Target ≥				53.50%	53.50%	65.20%	68.40%	68.40%
			Data				33.50%	35.20%	35.40%	36.80%	38.90%
Math	A Overall	2008	Target ≥				57.90%	57.90%	68.40%	65.20%	65.20%
			Data				36.50%	38.40%	37.00%	38.30%	37.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	37.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	41.00%	43.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	37.70%	37.70%	38.70%	39.70%	40.70%	41.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	40,696	15,049	38.90%	37.00%	36.98%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

For this Indicator, Louisiana's FFY 2013 data shows that 36.98% of all children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school) across all ESEA assessments achieved a proficiency level score. Louisiana aggregates scores from assessments administered in grades 3-8 and high school to calculate the overall proficiency rate. Louisiana did not meet it's FFY 2013 target of 37.00%, and saw a slight decrease from FFY 2012's proficiency rate of 38.90%. However, this still demonstrates longer term improvement, as

the FFY 2013 data shows improvement over the state's baseline data, 33.5%.

Starting in FFY 2014, as part of a broader effort to prepare students for Louisiana's economy, Louisiana is raising expectations for students. As a part of this transition, students in grades 3-8 will take the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment. The PARCC assessment is aligned to Louisiana's standards, was developed with significant input from Louisiana educators, and was field tested with nearly 50,000 students in spring 2014. In addition, the assessment has other important advantages for our state.

- Our students can demonstrate that they are on par with their peers across the country.
- Students will be asked to think independently, not just fill in bubble tests.
- Our state's educators are involved in test development.
- PARCC testing allows increased accessibility features for all students and more comprehensive accommodations for students with disabilities.
- The state will not pay more for a higher-quality assessment.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	40,783	16,444	37.80%	37.70%	40.32%

Public Reporting Information

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

LDOE's Accountability Center, including School Letter Grades, School Performance Scores, Top Gains School, High-Performing High Poverty Schools, and Federal Accountability:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/accountability>

LDOE's Academic Center for Students with Disabilities, including Performance Profiles:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/academics>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		21.50%	19.00%	19.00%	16.50%	13.90%	11.40%	7.00%
Data	26.50%	29.20%	18.80%	33.33%	16.00%	18.40%	27.30%	25.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	23.50%	21.50%	19.50%	17.50%	15.50%	13.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
47	149	25.00%	23.50%	31.54%

Explanation of Slippage

Louisiana did not meet its target for Indicator 4A. Forty-seven (31.54%) of the LEAs were found to be discrepant in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for all students with disabilities. For Indicator 4A, all LEAs determined to be significantly discrepant were required to review and if necessary, revise their policies, procedures and practices to determine whether these contributed to the significant discrepancy or failed to comply with the procedural safeguards of IDEA.

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
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same



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 ten (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 2013 APR submission, the state average was .68. Thus, any LEA whose percentage was greater than 1.02% was identified as having a significant discrepancy.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

For each of the LEAs that the state identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions of greater than ten (10) days in a school year for children with IEPs, LDOE completed the following process:

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:
 1. The LEA's code of conduct;
 2. The referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;
 3. The development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child's learning, including the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) or other strategies to address the child's behavior;
 4. The LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;
 5. The procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
 6. 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 noncompliance with IDEA discipline requirements, LDOE issued a finding of noncompliance.
4. To demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance, each LEA must:
 1. Revise their noncompliant policies, procedures and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and
 2. 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 noncompliance. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2013 APR, due February 1, 2015.

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					0%	0%	0%	5.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
32	6	117	5.00%	0%	5.13%

Explanation of Slippage

Louisiana did not meet its target for Indicator 4B. The State determined that thirty-two (32) LEAs had a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten (10) days in the 2012 – 2013* school year of children with IEPs. Those 32 LEAs were required to use a state-developed plan of action protocol to review their practices, policies and procedures including areas such as the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Six (6) of those LEAs identified policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and therefore do not comply with requirements. These six (6) LEAs, which account for 5.13% all LEAs in the state, submitted corrective action plans to revise their policies, procedures and practices within one year from being notified of noncompliance. The state will report on the correction of noncompliance on findings related to this indicator in next years APR.

*While most indicators report using data from the 2013-2014 school year, this is a lag indicator, meaning that we report on data from the 2012-2013 school year.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Louisiana defined significant discrepancy for a particular race/ethnicity as the percent of all students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) days at a rate 1.5 times greater than the state average not to exceed 3%. Additionally, in order to be significantly discrepant, there had to be more than one (1) student in the race/ethnic group. As in the calculation for Indicator 4A, the state average was .68. Thus, any race/ethnic group whose percentage was greater than 1.02% and who had more than one (1) student represented in the race/ethnic group was considered significantly discrepant.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State did not report on whether it revised (or required the affected districts to revise) policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b). In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected districts to revise policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2012. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2012 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.5 In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

For all the LEAs that remained noncompliant from the FFY 2012 APR submission, the IDEA Point of Contact for the LEA developed a plan to offer intensive support and technical assistance to ensure correction and compliance. The state verified that LEAs: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through monitoring or through the Special Education Reporting System (SER); and (2) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Further, as described in the FFY 2012 SPP/APR, LDOE required each LEA identified as discrepant due to inappropriate or insufficient policies, procedures, or practices in FFY 2012 to develop a Plan of Action. The Plan of Action had to address the cause and frequency of the noncompliance related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the tasks or steps developed to resolve the noncompliance, the personnel responsible for the tasks, and the targeted completion data. LEAs identified practices as the root cause, so they targeted improvements to practices to ensure compliance with IDEA. To ensure that the Plan of Action was completed, the Indicator Manger reached out to each discrepant LEA before the February 2015 SPP/APR submission and verified the LEAs had completed the committed actions, and changed practices to align with policies and procedures. As a result, the Plans of Action are considered resolved.

To provide additional support, LDOE took further action. For example, LDOE identified two LEAs that were discrepant in FFY 2012 and then again in FFY 2013. LDOE provided more intensive support, strongly recommending that the two LEAs attend positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) trainings within their consortium. Also, LDOE recommended that the Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) team reach out to all LEAs that provided Plan of Actions to the Department for intense professional

development to improve discipline outcomes. SPDG provides professional develop support including using data to disaggregate discipline data to understand trends, identify issues, and make more informed discipline decisions, including suspensions and expulsions.

Louisiana believes that the actions taken by the Department and LEAs not only fulfills the required action, but demonstrates the state's commitment to improving discipline outcomes by leveraging the expertise of partners like SPDG.

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Please see the description below for information on the review of policies, procedures, and practices completed in FFY 2013 using 2012-2013 data.

- 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 identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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.

For each of the LEAs that the state identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions of greater than ten (10) days in a school year for children with IEPs, LDOE completed the following process:

- a. 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. Areas reviewed by the LEA included:
 1. The LEA's code of conduct;
 2. The referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;
 3. The development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child's learning, including the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) or other strategies to address the child's behavior;
 4. The LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;
 5. The procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
 6. The procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.
- b. 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.
- c. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated noncompliance with IDEA discipline requirements, LDOE issued a finding of noncompliance.
- d. To demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance, each LEA must:

1. Revise their noncompliant policies, procedures and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and
 2. Demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.
- e. The State will report on the verification of correction of this noncompliance. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2013 APR, due February 1, 2015.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7		0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The IDEA Point of Contact for the LEA that remained noncompliant for FFY 2012 developed a plan to offer intensive support and technical assistance to the LEA. The state verified that LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through monitoring or through the Special Education Reporting System (SER).

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

The IDEA Point of Contact for the LEA that remained noncompliant for FFY 2012 developed a plan to offer intensive support and technical assistance to the LEA. One component was having the state verify that LEAs have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. See the description above for further information.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs 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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥		57.76%	60.22%	62.69%	65.15%	67.61%	62.50%	62.50%
		Data	57.60%	57.99%	60.39%	61.30%	60.80%	61.10%	61.20%	62.40%
B	2005	Target ≤		16.11%	14.53%	12.94%	11.35%	9.76%	12.50%	12.50%
		Data	16.70%	15.71%	14.85%	14.30%	14.10%	13.70%	13.50%	14.02%
C	2005	Target ≤		2.19%	2.17%	2.14%	2.11%	2.08%	1.80%	1.80%
		Data	1.90%	1.86%	1.74%	1.50%	1.40%	1.30%	1.30%	1.33%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	61.50%	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	63.50%	64.00%
Target B ≤	13.74%	13.70%	13.65%	13.60%	13.56%	13.50%
Target C ≤	1.31%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	68,883	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	42,963	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,575	

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	239	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	79	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	622	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	42,963	68,883	62.40%	61.50%	62.37%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,575	68,883	14.02%	13.74%	13.90%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	940	68,883	1.33%	1.31%	1.36%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								25.00%
		Data							21.20%	23.90%
B	2011	Target ≤								3.00%
		Data							3.70%	3.20%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	25.00%	25.00%	27.00%	27.00%	30.00%	31.00%
Target B ≤	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.90%	2.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	9,784	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	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	2,217	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	356	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	15	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C089; Data group 613)				

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,217	9,784	23.90%	25.00%	22.66%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	371	9,784	3.20%	3.00%	3.79%

Explanation of A Slippage

Louisiana did not meet the two targets set for Indicator 6. The target for Measurement A was 25.0% and the actual state performance was 22.66%. The target for Measurement B was 3.0% and the actual state performance was 3.79%.

LDOE has worked with LEAs to increase the percent of young children who are in a regular early childhood program, and receive the majority of special education and related serves in the regular early childhood program, while reducing the percentage of children with disabilities who attend separate special education classes, separate schools or residential facilities. The LEAs have had success with their efforts to include children with disabilities in the general early childhood programs. However, their efforts to provide a majority of services in the general early childhood programs still need to improve.

Louisiana is deploying a number of early childhood initiatives that should positively impact these outcomes over time. Louisiana's Act 3 -- Early Childhood Care and Education Network -- will expand access to high quality, publicly-funded early childhood programs to families across Louisiana to ensure more children enter school kindergarten ready. Further, Early Learning for All -- a new preschool inclusion pilot project will increase the percent of students in inclusive settings in the pilot program's area. LDOE hopes that these new initiatives will improve the State's results in the coming years.

Explanation of B Slippage

"Explanation of B Slippage" is included in the "Explanation of A Slippage" above.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2010	Target ≥					32.00%	63.00%	63.50%	63.50%
		Data				24.00%	63.42%	69.60%	70.50%	73.06%
A2	2010	Target ≥					72.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.00%
		Data				75.00%	67.57%	64.90%	63.90%	65.16%
B1	2010	Target ≥					35.00%	63.00%	63.50%	63.50%
		Data				37.00%	63.01%	70.90%	71.20%	73.24%
B2	2010	Target ≥					80.00%	57.50%	58.00%	58.00%
		Data				82.00%	57.84%	56.20%	55.50%	57.89%
C1	2010	Target ≥					38.00%	70.50%	71.00%	71.00%
		Data				41.00%	70.63%	74.70%	75.00%	77.49%
C2	2010	Target ≥					80.00%	74.00%	74.50%	74.50%
		Data				83.00%	74.31%	69.00%	69.00%	69.88%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	63.50%	71.00%	71.00%	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%
Target A2 ≥	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.50%	66.00%	66.50%
Target B1 ≥	63.50%	72.00%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%
Target B2 ≥	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.50%	59.00%	59.50%
Target C1 ≥	71.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%
Target C2 ≥	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	4,108
--	-------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	77
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	758
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	604
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,494
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,175

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,098	2,933	73.06%	63.50%	71.53%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,669	4,108	65.16%	65.00%	64.97%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	64
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	841
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	802
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,532
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	869

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,334	3,239	73.24%	63.50%	72.06%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,401	4,108	57.89%	58.00%	58.45%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	62
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	651
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	529
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,700
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,166

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,229	2,942	77.49%	71.00%	75.76%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2,866	4,108	69.88%	70.00%	69.77%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Louisiana local education agencies (LEAs) use AEPS (Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children) as the entry and exit assessment instrument for Indicator 7. Results are reported into the online system, AEPSi (Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children Interactive), administered by Brookes Publishing. AEPSi produces a summary report providing outcome numbers and percentages for the indicators in each of the three outcomes.

More information on AEPS, including its established validity as an OSEP reporting mechanism, can be found here:

<http://aepsinteractive.com/overview/osep-accountability/>.

An expertly validated AEPS’s crosswalk of test items correlated to OSEP child outcomes can be found here:

http://aepsinteractive.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/AEPS_OSEPCrosswalk.pdf.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Justification for re-establishing the baseline to FFY 2010.

In 2005-06 Louisiana began using a research version of the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) for assessing child outcomes. Brookes Publishing Company offered a research version of the instrument and scoring procedures for the purpose of OSEP reporting.

On January 1, 2007, the standard version of AEPS and the Assessment, Evaluation and Program System interactive (AEPSi) management tool became the new near-entry and near-exit assessment protocol. But children who had been administered the research version of AEPS upon entry were administered the same form for near exit assessment. By 2010 those children had all exited the program and both near entry and near exit assessment were administered using the standard AEPS, with summary scores provided by the online system, AEPSi.

While Louisiana's baseline was established in FFY 2005, the survey methodology changed over time, resulting in the need to re-establish a baseline. FFY 2010 was the first year in which AEPSi was used for both entry and exit assessments for all children, making a comparison of data from this year forward more reliable. Due to a reporting oversight, the baseline was not re-established, so Louisiana is correcting this going forward and re-establishing the baseline for FFY 2010.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Louisiana reported on progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in this FFY 2013 APR. For more information, please compare the "FFY13 Data" section to the "Historical Data and Targets" section for this indicator.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%	45.00%	45.00%
Data	39.00%	38.00%	31.00%	36.00%	39.00%	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
92	275	36.00%	34.00%	33.45%

Explanation of Slippage

In FFY 2013, Louisiana's results show that 33.45% of respondent parents reported that school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. For many years, LDOE has used a private contractor to administer the parent survey developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). As a result of recent changes to State privacy laws and other changing conditions, LDOE is in the process of evaluating the survey methodology. LDOE hopes to improve results on this Indicator when that evaluation is complete and a new survey methodology is finalized.

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.

In FFY 2013, there were 4,995 surveys mailed to parents, and 275 surveys with valid data were returned for a

return rate of a 5.5%. The following table reports the total number of pre-kindergarten parents who returned the survey, the number at or above the standard value of 600, the percentage at or above the standard value of 600, and the 95% confidence interval for the population percentage. This shows that the data was valid and reliable, and shows that there is 95% confidence that between 13% and 55% of pre-kindergarten parents would report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Percentage of Parents at or above Standard Score by Grade Category:

Grade Category	Total Number Returning Survey	Number at or above the Standard Value of 600	Percentage at or above the Standard Value of 600	95% Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage
Pre-Kindergarten	21	7	33%	13% – 53%
Kindergarten – Grade 5	143	49	34%	26% – 42%
Grades 6 - 8	69	21	30%	19% – 41%
Grades 9 - 12	42	15	36%	21% – 50%

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

LDOE uses a private contractor to administer the parent survey developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). A group of national stakeholders worked with NCSEAM to set the standard used for data analysis including the parent survey items, ranking them in order according to field-tested parent responses. Stakeholders set a minimum standard of "agree" responses from 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.

In FFY 2013, there were 4,995 surveys mailed to parents, and 275 surveys with valid data were returned for a return rate of a 5.5%. The following tables show descriptions of the respondents relative to the general population of students with disabilities in Louisiana.

Percentage of Parents at or above Standard Score by Racial/Ethnic Category:

Race/Ethnicity	Total Number Returning Survey	Number at or above the Standard Value of 600	Percentage at or above the Standard Value of 600	95% Confidence Interval for the Population Percentage
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	0	-	-
Black (Not Hispanic)	96	30	31%	22% - 40%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0	-	-
Hispanic	2	1	50%	19% – 119%
Two or More Races	106	36	34%	25% – 43%

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

White (Not Hispanic)	69	25	36%	25% – 47%
----------------------	----	----	-----	-----------

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

Survey responses are collected based on the districts chosen to be monitored which will ensure all parents are sampled over the 6-year cycle. Because the sampling is representative of the state's population, the figures are believed to reflect the opinions of parents statewide. In addition, the private contractor who administers the parent survey, compiles and reports on the results using sound statistical methods, which yield valid and reliable estimates. For more information, the Scantron Survey Services survey report "Louisiana Department of Education - Study of Parents of Students with Disabilities Project" is attached.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

According to the "Louisiana State Performance Plan - Part B: July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2012" revised February 15, 2013, the baseline data for Indicator 8 is from FFY 2004 at 39%. The oldest baseline year allowed in GRADS360 is FFY 2005, so the State is accounting for the baseline data here.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
5	0	142	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for over representation. 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 2013 APR submission, the number of students with disabilities in each race or ethnic category was extracted from the state's October 1, 2013 Child Count Data. LDOE reviewed the data, and excluded thirteen (13) LEAs from calculations because they did not meet the minimum "n" size of (25) in the designated race or ethnic category. All other LEAs in the state met the minimum "n" size for at least one race or ethnicity category because the number of students with disabilities in that category exceeded (25). Of the remaining 142 LEAs, LDOE identified five (5) LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the five (5) LEAs to determine whether or not the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs were required to fill out a Disproportionality Review Rubric—a tool designed to assist the LEAs in identifying inappropriate practices, policies, and procedures that may lead to inappropriate disability-based identification of students. The rubric includes topics such as professional development and teacher support, instructional practices, intervention efforts, and assessment procedures. All five (5) LEAs completed the review, and no (0) LEAs identified instances where disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations



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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0.94%	3.51%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
61	0	142	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for over representation. 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 any of the following six (6) specific disability categories: Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech or Language Impairment. For the FFY 2013 APR submission, the number of students in each racial and ethnic group in the six (6) specific disability categories was extracted from the state's October 1, 2013 Child Count Data. LDOE reviewed the data, and excluded thirteen (13) LEAs from calculations because they did not meet the minimum “n” size of (25) in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the remaining 142 LEAs, LDOE identified sixty-one (61) LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the sixty-one (61) LEAs to determine whether or not the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs were required to fill out a Disproportionality Review Rubric—a tool designed to assist the LEAs in identifying inappropriate practices, policies, and procedures that may lead to inappropriate identification of students based on their race or ethnicity, by disability. All sixty-one (61) LEAs completed the review, and no (0) LEAs identified instances disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%	99.86%	99.89%	99.90%	99.55%	99.70%	98.44%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
14,692	14,559	98.44%	100%	99.09%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	133
---	-----

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 133 children for whom parental consent was obtained, but for whom evaluations were not completed within the state's 60-day timeline. The range of days beyond the timeline is included in the table below.

Table 1: Range of Days Children Were Evaluated Beyond the State's 60-day Timeline

Number of Students	Delay
67	1-15 Days
25	16-30 Days
16	31 – 45 Days
6	46 – 60 Days

19

60 + Days

The number of days the LEAs completed evaluations outside of the 60-day time frame ranged from 1-69 days. Primary reasons for delay stated by LEAs included:

- inaccurate data entry,
- miscalculation of evaluation dates,
- delayed reports from the outside agencies, and
- delayed receipt of medical documents.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- 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 2013 (the 2013-2014 school year) Indicator 11 data was extracted from Louisiana's Special Education Reporting System (SER). Evaluation timelines begin when the LEA receives a signed Parental Consent-to-Evaluate form. SER has a series of system edits that aid in ensuring data accuracy, including a calendar that may be generated for calculations of 30, 45, and 60-day intervals. Data must pass electronic system edits and comparison reports before new data are stored.

Process for data collection, determination of non-compliance, and issuance of findings:

1. Gather data from SER after the end of the 2013-2014 school year.
2. Identify LEAs who appear noncompliant and offer them an opportunity to clarify their data or provide allowable exceptions.
3. Identify LEAs who have cases of non-compliance.
4. Conduct outreach to LEA IDEA directors; provide them with the names of students whose evaluations 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.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

In FY 2011, Louisiana reported 16 findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 11. In the FFY 2012 SPP/APR, the state verified that LEAs corrected 15 of the 16 instances of noncompliance. The state reported one remaining finding of noncompliance in FFY 2011 and initiated follow-up actions within the required timelines to verify correction.

To verify correction of that one remaining finding consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, the state verified timeline reports from data collected in Louisiana's Special Education Reporting (SER) system, which indicated correction of noncompliance.

The state conducted the following steps:

1. LDOE conducted follow-up by identifying and reviewing this particular LEA's Plan of Action whereby the student was identified.
2. After consulting SER, LDOE determined that this student's evaluation exceeded the 60-day timeline as a result of a jurisdiction matter.
3. LDOE then ran a jurisdiction report in SER. This revealed the student changed jurisdiction while the evaluation remained open.
4. Once the new jurisdiction was confirmed, the state verified that the evaluation was completed in the new jurisdiction on 11/16/2012.

Further, to ensure other evaluations occurred in a timely manner, LDOE determined this LEA achieved compliance when the LEA reached 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following fiscal year. No other instances of noncompliance were identified.

In addition, the state required the district to submit and implement a corrective Plan of Action which included activities to ensure compliance, correction, and identification of practical methods to avoid slippage around evaluation timelines in the future. The state verified completion of corrective action activities by conducting outreach to the LEA.

In summary, the state verified that: the FFY 2011 remaining instance of noncompliance was corrected, no systemic issues of noncompliance were identified, and the LEA was correctly implementing specific regulatory requirements. The state ensured that measures of correction as submitted in the corrective plan of action were implemented with fidelity. It was determined the district was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and that Louisiana had appropriately conducted follow-up activities consistent with both prongs of OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	64.60%	90.80%	95.41%	81.15%	96.50%	99.37%	99.24%	97.87%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,652
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	71
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,190
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.	4
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	349

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	1,190	1,228	97.87%	100%	96.91%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	38
--	----

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

A total of 1,190 children transitioning from Part C to Part B were determined eligible and had IEPs developed and implemented prior to the third birthday. However, Louisiana identified a total of 38 children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determinations, but did not receive a determination before the third birthday, and were not included in b, c, d, or e, above. Of these 38 children, 8 were transitioning children determined not eligible for Part B services, but only after the third birthday. For the remaining 30

children who were determined eligible for Part B services, the chart below indicates the number of days after the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed.

Number of Students	Delay
13	1-15 Days
7	16-30 Days
2	31 – 45 Days
2	46 – 60 Days
6	60 + Days

Primary reasons for delays:

- Data entry errors or paperwork mistakes,
- Evaluations that were not conducted in a timely manner,
- Changes in personnel, lack of training, staff who were unclear about transition timelines,
- Service start dates that were recorded for the later start date of the Pre Kindergarten program instead of the general start date of the district, resulting in incorrect data, and
- Clerical issues related to children moving from one district to another.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

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 and Hospitals, provides LDOE monthly reports and eligibility data. LDOE’s Part B staff, including the Indicator 12 manager, collaborate with LDOE’s data analytics staff 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 district. After this report is completed, the Indicator 12 manager assembles a list of districts that did not meet the federally-mandated

100% target. LDOE then notifies any district with noncompliance within 30 days. Districts 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.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

The action required in the FFY 2012 response table was not prepopulated in the table above, but Louisiana did have a required action. To resolve this finding, the Indicator 12 manager reviewed 2012 data entered into SER. The SER report indicates each LEA by name and shows the percentage of compliance in 4 different quarters from July 1 to June 30. Upon a run of this report, the Indicator 12 manager compiled a list of LEAs that did not meet the 100% target. After this report was run from SER, the Indicator 12 manager determined which LEAs corrected non-compliance from the previous year by making 100% in any one quarter of the present year. The LEAs not meeting 100% compliance for the current year were notified via e-mail that they were out of compliance on this indicator. An encrypted "Plan of Action" was sent to each early childhood special education supervisor in the noncompliant LEA. The "Plan of Action lists each child that did not transition on time. LEAs were asked to return the "Plan of Action" within one month of receiving the form. Each LEA was asked to indicate: 1) reason for delay, 2) root cause, 3) action taken, and 4) personnel responsible for rectifying the situation. LEAs were also asked to indicate what actions would be taken to ensure substantial, ongoing compliance, description of this evidence (evaluation compliance report in SER run three months in a row to show 100% compliance), and the persons responsible for this work. The Indicator Manager received all "Plan of Action" forms from each noncompliant district. The Plans were reviewed to determine the reasons for the delay.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

LDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance correctly implemented the regulatory requirements. To do this the Indicator 12 manager reviewed the state's Special Education Reporting System (SER), and verified that all LEAs have achieved 100% compliance. LDOE has further verified that IEPs have been developed and implemented for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely unless the child is no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA.

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

LDOE also verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance. LDOE obtained verification by electronically matching birth date, IEP development date, and the IEP start date

(Implementation date). This match is done in the SER system. If the three dates do not properly align, the student record is flagged, and the LEA received an indication of noncompliance with transition requirements. Verification was obtained by reviewing the 2013 SER report to determine which districts reported correction of noncompliance for the FFY 2012. Correction of noncompliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% in any given quarter during the following year.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	31.00%	76.00%	66.00%		53.00%	76.00%	77.00%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
232	232	100%	100%	100%

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

For this indicator, Louisiana obtained monitoring results through a desk audit process. The state targeted LEAs for monitoring when they had a “Needs Intervention” determination and GAP Scores (the difference between special education proficiency scores and regular education proficiency scores in 1) 4th grade ELA/Math, 2) 8th grade ELA/Math, and 3) the LEA’s graduation rate) that indicated a risk for low achievement.

The state focused monitoring on the effective general supervision of IDEA Part B and an effective transition processes. 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.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2009	Target ≥						25.50%	25.70%	25.90%
		Data					25.30%	23.39%	25.00%	28.70%
B	2009	Target ≥						55.50%	55.70%	55.90%
		Data					55.30%	67.97%	68.00%	74.44%
C	2009	Target ≥						73.80%	74.00%	74.20%
		Data					73.60%	83.53%	86.00%	88.19%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	30.00%	33.00%	33.00%	35.00%	37.00%	39.00%
Target B ≥	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	79.00%	82.00%	84.00%
Target C ≥	89.00%	90.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	3,417
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,142
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,395
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)	295
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).	163

	Number of respondent	Number of respondent	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
--	----------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	youth	youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school			
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,142	3,417	28.70%	30.00%	33.42%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	2,537	3,417	74.44%	75.00%	74.25%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	2,995	3,417	88.19%	89.00%	87.65%

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥			75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	
Data	60.00%	73.90%	63.00%	71.00%	67.00%	73.33%	35.71%	62.50%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	5	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	9	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
5	9	62.50%	75.00%	55.56%

Explanation of Slippage

The state is not required to report on slippage except in any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions are held. In FFY 2013, Louisiana held nine resolution sessions. Therefore, Louisiana did not meet the reporting threshold.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 16: Mediation

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)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥			82.00%					
Data	81.80%	77.00%	87.00%	50.00%	66.67%	0%	80.00%	50.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Target setting for this indicator was integrated into the overall stakeholder engagement strategy. Please see the "stakeholder involvement" section on the introduction page for more information.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	2	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
2	0	2	50.00%	82.00%	100%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The state is not required to report on slippage except in any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions are held. In FFY 2013, Louisiana had two mediations. Therefore, Louisiana did not meet the reporting threshold.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target					

Description of Measure

Please see the "Executive Summary" in the Louisiana SSIP document for a description of the measure, baseline data, and FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 targets.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the "Executive Summary" in the Louisiana SSIP document for a brief description of stakeholder input. Louisiana's overall stakeholder engagement strategy is detailed in "Appendix A", and additional information on stakeholder input can be found in each component section.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Please see the "Component #1: Data Analysis" section in the Louisiana SSIP document for this information.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Please see the "Component #2: Infrastructure Analysis" section in the Louisiana SSIP document for this information.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Please see the "Component #3: State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)" section in the Louisiana SSIP document for this information.

Description

Please see the "Component #3: State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)" section in the Louisiana SSIP document for this information.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Please see the "Component #4: Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies" section in the Louisiana SSIP document for this information.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Please see the "Component #5: Theory of Action" section in the Louisiana SSIP document for this information.

Louisiana's Theory of Action graphic can be found on page 55 (PDF page 58) in the Louisiana SSIP document.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.