

# LA Part B

# FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

<b>Attachments</b>			
	<b>File Name</b>	<b>Uploaded By</b>	<b>Uploaded Date</b>
No APR attachments found.			

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

**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), Office of Statewide Monitoring, revised its monitoring of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B programs. The LDOE’s monitoring process is a model of Continuous Improvement Monitoring. However, the process has evolved to include a tiered system of selection using a risk-based selection process, and more diverse, meaningful monitoring experiences. Through this revised process, LDOE expects to uncover the root cause for systemic issues of non-compliance. The development and release of a new comprehensive local education agency (LEA) self-monitoring tool, which includes submission of results to LDOE, is the newest addition to Louisiana’s special education monitoring. This data-driven differentiated system of monitoring will elevate and target areas that directly impact student performance and 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 IDEA Part B, 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 risk-based selection process to determine which 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).

**DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

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

## IEP FACILITATION

IEP facilitation is available to parents and school 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.

## 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.

## FORMAL COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION

A parent, adult student, individual, or organization may file a signed written complaint with 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.

## 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 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.

## 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, LDOE will issue an acknowledgement of receipt and forward the request to the Division of Administrative Law, an independent state agency that conducts due process hearings for LDOE. The Division of Administrative Law will assign an 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.

## 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.

## 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.

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.).

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**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.

**LOUISIANA'S TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SYSTEM**

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 four 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 and assessment systems.

*Teacher Leaders*

This program supports a cohort of 5,000 LEA-selected staff that receives training and ongoing support from LDOE, and serves as the chief liaisons between the LDOE and the School Implementation Teams. Teacher Leaders receive a variety of resources and training throughout the school year. This training includes: 1) Annual Teacher Leader Summit – a two-day conference that kicks off instructional planning for the following school year; 2) Teacher Leader Collaboration Events – quarterly meetings held in locations throughout the state that provide Teacher Leaders with ongoing professional development and support; 3) Summer Content

Institutes – a variety of trainings over the summer that equip Teach Leaders with content-specific support; and 4) Virtual Support – a variety of supports including virtual book clubs, a monthly newsletter, and a free online collaboration site. Teacher Leaders leverage this professional development and support within their schools, not only through training and monitoring, but also through modeling lessons and instructional strategies and by encouraging data analysis to inform instruction. During the 2014-2015 school year, LDOE expanded Teacher Leaders to incorporate targeted resources and content specifically for special education professionals including teachers, guidance counselors and special education directors. By leveraging this successful statewide program with the special education population, Louisiana is able provide access to high-quality professional development and support that helps all students achieve.

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 2015 – 2016 school year guide is divided into five focus sections: 1) establishing a planning process, 2) preparing children for kindergarten, 3) developing high-quality instruction in every classroom, 4) creating a path to prosperity for every student, and 5) aligning financial resources.

District Planning Calls are scheduled throughout the school year to discuss topics and resources in the District 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 2014, LDOE regularly integrated support for special education professionals including training and policy guidance on high cost services, the SSIP, Louisiana’s Act 833 – alternative pathways to promotion and graduation, and Louisiana’s Acts 837 and 677 - data privacy.

More information on LDOE’s District Support Structure can be found on LDOE's website:

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

Attachments			
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	
No APR attachments found.			

**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 English language arts (ELA) and math content knowledge to fill those structures. Below, LDOE’s support structure is described, focusing on key components of professional development including resources and direct support.

## 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 K-12 educators. 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, bringing its instructional expectations to life. 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 resources available to Louisiana educators, please visit LDOE's website:

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

## DIRECT SUPPORT

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 5,000 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. LDOE has learned that teachers need different types of training to support their varied needs. Thus, 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 of each year the entire 5,000 educator cadre comes 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.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

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 were apparent in the development of the SPP as we solicited and received broad stakeholder input to inform the target setting process for FFY 2013 - FFY 2018. The FFY 2013 SPP/APR describes the three phases: 1) internal review and vetting process, 2) external stakeholder feedback, and 3) Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) integration in depth. Since the target setting process was completed during FFY 2013, LDOE has revisited targets to determine if revisions were needed for the FFY 2014 SPP/APR submission on February 1, 2016. While no revisions are needed at this time, LDOE will continue to monitor data, targets, and changes to Indicator methodology, and may revise targets in the future, as necessary. Any revisions will incorporate stakeholder feedback, including, but not limited to, SEAP.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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 2013 APR in 2015, 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>

Attachments			
-------------	--	--	--



File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">la needs assistance required action letter.pdf</a>	Kristi-Jo Preston		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center;">R</div> e m o v e

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2014 and 2015 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 30, 2015 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2016, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

**Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2015 and 2016 is Needs Assistance.

In the State's 2016 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities.

The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2017, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			18.00%	19.00%	25.00%	25.00%	40.67%	50.00%	61.00%	38.00%
Data		13.60%	17.70%	17.10%	35.30%	34.30%	30.30%	29.30%	32.96%	36.70%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

### 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 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	2,180	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	5,098	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	42.80%	Calculate <input type="button" value=""/>

### FFY 2014 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 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
2,180	5,098	36.70%	40.00%	42.80%

**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 pursue two pathways to a Louisiana high school diploma, either the University pathway or a Career pathway. The TOPS University pathway requires that students earn 24 credits. The Jump Start TOPS Tech pathway 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 a Senior Waiver. The waiver process allows the state to waive one required component of the exit examinations if LDOE determines that the student's disability significantly impacts his or her ability to pass required assessments.

Act 833 of Louisiana's 2014 legislative session gives students with disabilities who have persistent academic challenges due to their disabilities the ability to pursue an alternative pathway to a high school diploma. 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 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			25.00%	23.00%	21.00%	21.00%	18.60%	16.70%	25.00%	35.00%
Data		22.99%	28.97%	29.90%	12.20%	11.20%	6.00%	37.00%	39.15%	33.96%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	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 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</a>	2026	
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</a>	939	
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</a>	45	
Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</a>	1158	
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)</a>	26	

**FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1158	4194	33.96%	34.00%	27.61%

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

10/8/2019



**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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			70.00%	73.50%	75.50%	80.00%	85.00%	87.50%	87.50%	100%
Data		74.60%	54.60%	56.80%	72.10%	64.70%	50.00%	51.10%	55.80%	40.28%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**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 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
173	null	null	40.28%	100%	

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.71%	97.75%	98.70%	98.70%	98.75%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
			Data		99.19%	99.35%	99.40%	99.30%	99.70%	99.40%	99.20%	99.50%	99.04%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.68%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
			Data		99.16%	99.31%	99.30%	99.20%	99.70%	99.30%	99.10%	99.50%	98.96%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%	98.80%
Math	A ≥ Overall	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 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	41035	40051	99.04%	98.80%	97.60%

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	41401	40353	98.96%	98.80%	97.47%

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Louisiana reports comprehensively on students with disabilities. Subgroup data are reported on every school and district report:

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

Louisiana's 2% assessment was phased out starting last year but the final annual report, inclusive of results, is available here:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2013-2014-laa-2-annual-report.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

Louisiana's 1% assessment annual report is available here:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2013-2014-laa-1-annual-report.pdf?sfvrsn=2>



## FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

None

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

### 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2008	Target ≥					53.50%	53.50%	65.20%	68.40%	68.40%	37.00%
			Data					33.50%	35.20%	35.40%	36.80%	38.90%	36.98%
Math	A Overall	2008	Target ≥					57.90%	57.90%	68.40%	65.20%	65.20%	37.70%
			Data					36.50%	38.40%	37.00%	38.30%	37.80%	40.32%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

#### 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 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	40,051	14,675	36.98%	37.00%	36.64%

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

## FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	40,353	13,704	40.32%	37.70%	33.96%

### Explanation of Group A Slippage

Between FFY 2013 and FFY 2014, Louisiana transitioned to the new statewide assessments. In Spring 2015, Louisiana administered the PARCC assessment in addition to the LAA1 assessment. With a better assessment, differentiation of student performance increased (fewer students scored in the middle category ("Basic"); more students score "Mastery" (level 4) and "Approaching Basic" (level 2)).

### Public Reporting Information

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

Louisiana reports comprehensively on students with disabilities. Subgroup data are reported on every school and district report:

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

Louisiana's 2% assessment was phased out starting last year but the final annual report, inclusive of results, is available here:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2013-2014-laa-2-annual-report.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

Louisiana's 1% assessment annual report is available here:

<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/2013-2014-laa-1-annual-report.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

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 2013 response

None

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

## 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			21.50%	19.00%	19.00%	16.50%	13.90%	11.40%	7.00%	23.50%
Data		26.50%	29.20%	18.80%	33.33%	16.00%	18.40%	27.30%	25.00%	31.54%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

### 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 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
29	172	31.54%	21.50%	16.86%

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 LEA

### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Louisiana has defined significant discrepancy as the percent of students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, 1.5 times greater than the state average, not to exceed 3%. Since the state uses percentages, there is no minimum n-size. Thus, all LEAs were included in the calculation. For the FFY 2014 APR submission, the state average was 0.64. Thus, any LEA whose percentage was greater than 0.96% was identified as having a significant discrepancy.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review


For each of the LEAs that the state identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 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 LEAs discipline policies, procedures and practices. LEAs reviewed areas including:
  - a. The LEAs code of conduct;
  - b. The referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;
  - c. The development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child’s learning, including the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) or other strategies to address the child’s behavior;
  - d. The LEAs general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;
  - e. The procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
  - f. The procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.
2. LEAs that were discrepant were required to use a self-review instrument to review and, if necessary, revise their policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and procedural safeguards and submit a plan of action to the LDOE.
3. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated noncompliance with IDEA discipline requirements, LDOE issued a finding of noncompliance.
4. To demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance, each LEA must:
  - a. Revise their noncompliant policies, procedures and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and
  - b. Demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.
5. The State reports on the verification of correction of this noncompliance. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2014 APR, due February 1, 2016.


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:

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

 The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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.

 The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	5.00%	5.13%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

### FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
24	2	172	5.13%	0%	1.16%

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 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 student in the race/ethnic group. As in the calculation for Indicator 4A, the state average was 0.64. Thus, any race/ethnic group whose percentage was greater than 0.96% and who had more than one student represented in the race/ethnic group was considered significantly discrepant.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

For each of the LEAs the state identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions or expulsions of greater than 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:
  - a. The LEA's code of conduct;
  - b. The referral and evaluation process for students suspected of having a disability;
  - c. The development of IEPs for students whose behavior impedes the child's learning, including the use of PBIS or other strategies to address the child's behavior;
  - d. The LEA's general procedures for disciplinary removal for students with disabilities;
  - e. The procedures for conducting a manifestation determination; and
  - f. The procedures for conducting a functional behavioral assessment and the development of a behavioral intervention plan.
2. LEAs that were discrepant were required to use a self-review instrument to review and, if necessary, revise their policies, practices, and procedures with regard to the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and procedural safeguards and submit a plan of action to the LDOE.
3. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated noncompliance with IDEA discipline requirements, LDOE issued a finding of noncompliance.
4. To demonstrate correction of the identified noncompliance, each LEA must:
  - a. Revise their noncompliant policies, procedures and practices through training and revision of appropriate forms; and
  - b. Demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, through the review of state records from a subsequent reporting period.
5. The State reports on the verification of correction of this noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, in the FFY 2014 APR, due February 1, 2016.

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.

Please see the description above for information on LDOE's actions to ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.



**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. LDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via teleconference calls and emails with the LEAs until noncompliance was corrected. The state verified that LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of undated data such as data subsequently collected through monitoring or through the Special Education Reporting System (SER).

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

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEAs worked with LDOE staff through the regularly scheduled contacts to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. Through these phone calls, emails, and on-site technical assistance, LDOE verified correction of all individual cases of noncompliance.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2014 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. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**

**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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			57.76%	60.22%	62.69%	65.15%	67.61%	62.50%	62.50%	61.50%
		Data		57.60%	57.99%	60.39%	61.30%	60.80%	61.10%	61.20%	62.40%	62.37%
B	2005	Target ≤			16.11%	14.53%	12.94%	11.35%	9.76%	12.50%	12.50%	13.74%
		Data		16.70%	15.71%	14.85%	14.30%	14.10%	13.70%	13.50%	14.02%	13.90%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.19%	2.17%	2.14%	2.11%	2.08%	1.80%	1.80%	1.31%
		Data		1.90%	1.86%	1.74%	1.50%	1.40%	1.30%	1.30%	1.33%	1.36%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**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 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	69,536	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	42,650	null

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	9,951	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	241	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	86	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	577	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	42,650	69,536	62.37%	62.00%	61.34%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9,951	69,536	13.90%	13.70%	14.31%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	904	69,536	1.36%	1.30%	1.30%

**Use a different calculation methodology**  
 Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

**Explanation of A Slippage**

Louisiana has been monitoring to ensure students with disabilities are receiving the necessary supports and services to enable them to be successful in the general education classroom. IEP teams are finding students need more time in a special education setting to receive those services. We have been providing training on inclusive practices through the State Personnel Development Grant and have found those districts have a higher rate of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									25.00%	25.00%
		Data									21.20%	23.90%
B	2011	Target ≤									3.00%	3.00%
		Data									3.70%	3.20%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

### 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 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	9,709	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">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</a>	2,358	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	331	null

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	13	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,358	9,709	22.66%	25.00%	24.29%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	344	9,709	3.79%	3.00%	3.54%

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2010	Target ≥						32.00%	63.00%	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%
		Data					24.00%	63.42%	69.60%	70.50%	73.06%	71.53%
A2	2010	Target ≥						72.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.00%	65.00%
		Data					75.00%	67.57%	64.90%	63.90%	65.16%	64.97%
B1	2010	Target ≥						35.00%	63.00%	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%
		Data					37.00%	63.01%	70.90%	71.20%	73.24%	72.06%
B2	2010	Target ≥						80.00%	57.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
		Data					82.00%	57.84%	56.20%	55.50%	57.89%	58.45%
C1	2010	Target ≥						38.00%	70.50%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%
		Data					41.00%	70.63%	74.70%	75.00%	77.49%	75.76%
C2	2010	Target ≥						80.00%	74.00%	74.50%	74.50%	70.00%
		Data					83.00%	74.31%	69.00%	69.00%	69.88%	69.77%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**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 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3818.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	88.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	702.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	625.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1361.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1042.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1986.00	2776.00	71.53%	71.00%	71.54%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2403.00	3818.00	64.97%	65.00%	62.94%

**Explanation of A2 Slippage**

LDOE reviewed the data for this indicator and concluded that the reason for slippage is similar for parts A2, B2 and C2. The Department concluded there are two factors that could contribute to the slippage, both based on the fact that Louisiana served fewer children in FFY 2014 (total served = 3818) than the previous year, FFY 2013 (total served = 4108).

1. Children below the age of three are referred to LEAs and schools from EarlySteps, operated by the Department of Health and Hospitals. In 2012, EarlySteps revised their Developmental Delay eligibility criteria for admission to services, so that a child must score below the mean in two domains rather than one. This has reduced the number of children meeting eligibility criteria, resulting in children with more significant disabilities being referred for IDEA services, which are transferred to school districts when children reach the age of three. While children with more significant disabilities can and do make progress with their social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors, they may need more rigorous interventions or additional time to function within age expectation.
2. This was the second year of implementation of a new Louisiana pre-kindergarten initiative including publicly funded childcare centers and pre-kindergarten classrooms in Louisiana. This initiative places increased emphasis on teacher training and child assessment intended to improve environment and instructional intervention for pre-k children. We believe that this effort has reduced the number of children ages 3-6 who are referred for special education services. This means that children who are receiving services are those who are more at risk and have more significant disabilities, thus needing more intervention to reach age level expectations.

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



	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	74.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	769.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	784.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1408.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	783.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2192.00	3035.00	72.06%	72.00%	72.22%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2191.00	3818.00	58.45%	58.00%	57.39%

**Explanation of B2 Slippage**

Explanation of slippage can be found in section "Explanation of A2 Slippage" above.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	73.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	598.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	532.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1588.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1027.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2120.00	2791.00	75.76%	75.00%	75.96%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2615.00	3818.00	69.77%	70.00%	68.49%

**Explanation of C2 Slippage**

Explanation of slippage can be found in section "Explanation of A2 Slippage" above.

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's LEAs use *AEPS--Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Children* as the entry and exit assessment instrument, reporting results into the online system, AEPSi, administered by Brookes Publishing. AEPSi produces a summary report providing outcome numbers and percentages for the indicators in each of the three outcome components. A technical report explaining the rationale for establishing cut-off scores for the OSEP outcomes is available from Brookes Publishing, on the AEPSi website.

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 crosswalk of test items correlated to OSEP child outcomes can be found here:

[http://aepsinteractive.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/AEPS\\_OSEPCrosswalk.pdf](http://aepsinteractive.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/AEPS_OSEPCrosswalk.pdf)

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**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?

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%	45.00%	45.00%	34.00%
Data		39.00%	38.00%	31.00%	36.00%	39.00%	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%	33.45%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**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 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
193.00	453.00	33.45%	36.00%	42.60%

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 2014, there were 7,904 surveys mailed to parents, and 453 surveys with valid data were returned for a return rate of a 5.7%. The following table presents the percentage of parents meeting or exceeding the standard of 600 as a function of their child's grade level. Grades were grouped into four meaningful categories, so that moderate sample sizes would exist in each category. The four categories are as follows: (1) pre-kindergarten, (b) kindergarten to grade 5, (c) grade 6 to grade 8, and (d) grade 9 to grade 12.

The table below shows that 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 25% and 55% of pre-kindergarten parents would report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Table 8.1 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	Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data
Pre-Kindergarten	46	18	39%	25% – 55%	
Kindergarten – Grade 5	204	99	49%	42% – 56%	
Grades 6 - 8	117	43	37%	28% – 46%	
Grades 9 - 12	85	33	39%	29% – 50%	

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). This instrument was developed for the purpose of providing states with a valid and reliable tool for measuring the extent to which parents perceive that schools facilitate their involvement. 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 2014, there were 7,904 surveys mailed to parents, and 453 surveys with valid data were returned for a return rate of a 5.7%. The following table show descriptions of the respondents relative to the general population of students with disabilities in Louisiana.

Table 8.2 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	1	100%	5% - 100%
Black (Not Hispanic)	91	34	37%	28% - 48%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	0	-	-
Hispanic	6	4	67%	54% - 74%
Two or More Races	225	94	42%	35% - 49%

White (Not Hispanic)	128	60	47%	38% - 56%
----------------------	-----	----	-----	-----------

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.

For the FFY 2014, Louisiana continued to collect data for this indicator using an external expert in survey development, including the development of the sampling methodology. The survey that was administered included a 25-item rating scale, the School's Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS), developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). A total number of 453 respondents provided valid data. The number exceeds the minimum number required for an adequate confidence level based upon established survey sample guidelines ([www.surveysystems.com](http://www.surveysystems.com)). Additionally, the data set submitted for analysis contained no personally identifiable information on the respondents.

Data from the rating scale were analyzed through the Rasch measurement framework. The analysis produces a measure for each survey respondent on a scale from 0 to 1,000. Each measure reflects the extent to which the parent indicated that schools facilitated the parent's involvement. The measures of all respondents were averaged to produce a mean measure reflecting the overall performance of Louisiana schools' facilitation of parent involvement.

OSEP requires that the state's performance be reported as the percent of parents who report that the schools facilitated their involvement. Deriving a percentage from a continuous distribution requires application of a standard or cut-off score. LDOE elected to apply the standard recommended by a nationally representative stakeholder group convened by NCSEAM. The recommended standard, established based on item content expressed in the scale, was operationalized as a measure or cut-off score of 600. Thus, the percent of parents who reports that the schools facilitated their involvement was calculated as the percent of parents with a measure of 600 or above on the SEPPS.

The survey instrument was mailed to parents based on the districts chosen to be monitored. This approach ensures all parents are sampled over the 6-year cycle since all LEAs are monitored over this period.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

LDOE will be implementing a new sampling methodology and collection tool for SPP/APR Indicator 8 beginning in FFY 2015. The new sampling methodology was approved by OSEP in January 2016. For more information, please see the attached sampling plan.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

**OSEP Response**

The State submitted a sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR. An evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it could yield valid and reliable data for this indicator.

**Required Actions**

## 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

### FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
14	0	161	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 has a two-step process for the analysis of disproportionate representation data. LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for over representation. To determine the rate of disproportionate representation, LDOE follows a two-step process.

First, LDOE examines each LEAs child count data to identify disproportionate representation in designated populations of students. For the FFY 2014 APR submission, the number of students with disabilities in each race or ethnic category was extracted from the state's October 1, 2014 Child Count Data. LDOE reviewed the data, and excluded 10 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

161 remaining LEAs that met the minimum n-size, LDOE identified 14 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 14 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 14 LEAs completed the review; none of the LEAs identified instances where disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**



## 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0.94%	3.51%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

### FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
57	1	161	0%	0%	0.62%

### Explanation of Slippage

After LDOE conducted outreach to each LEA with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, one LEA determined that the instance of disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. As a result the state did not meet the target (0%) and this indicator was flagged for slippage.

The LEA that indicated that the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification completed the Disproportionality Review Rubric. The LEA identified procedures for referral and identification as the potential cause of inappropriate identification. While the LEA updates procedures annually, they will conduct a deeper review to address representation of minority students and equitable representation of all students.

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

LDOE has a two-step process for the analysis of disproportionate representation data. LDOE defines disproportionate representation as having a risk ratio greater than 2.0 with a minimum cell size of 25 for over representation. 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 specific disability categories: Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech or Language Impairment. For the FFY 2014 APR submission, the number of students in each racial and ethnic group in the six specific disability categories was extracted from the state's October 1, 2014 Child Count Data. LDOE reviewed the data, and excluded 10 LEAs from the calculations because they did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the 161 remaining LEAs, LDOE identified 57 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 57 LEAs to determine whether or not the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification of 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 57 LEAs completed the review, and one LEA determined that the instance of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. See the explanation of slippage for more information.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the district identified in FFY 2014 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, 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. In the FFY 2015 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**

--

**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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	99.86%	99.89%	99.90%	99.55%	99.70%	98.44%	99.09%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

**FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
14,998	14,869	99.09%	100%	99.14%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	129
---	-----

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

*Table 11.1: Range of Days Children Were Evaluated Beyond the State's 60-day Timeline\**

Number of Students	Delay
124	1 – 15 Days
<10	16 – 30 Days
<10	31 – 45 Days

<10	46 – 60 Days
<10	60 + Days

The number of days the LEAs completed the evaluations outside of the 60-day time frame ranged from 1-59 days. LEAs identified the following primary reasons for delays:

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

\*The Louisiana Department of Education has modified and/or suppressed data reported to protect the privacy of students in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) codified at 20 U.S.C. 1232g. The strategies used to protect privacy vary and may include rounding or other techniques but do not substantially affect the general usefulness of the data. Because of the privacy protections, numerical and percentage totals may not add precisely to the sum of the row or column to which the total refers.

#### 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 2014 (2014-2015 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 checks 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.

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

1. LDOE gathers data from SER after the end of the 2014-2015 school year.
2. LDOE identifies LEAs who appear noncompliant and offers them an opportunity to clarify their data or provide allowable exceptions.
3. LDOE identifies LEAs with cases of non-compliance.
4. LDOE conducts outreach to LEA Special Education Directors, providing them with information on evaluations that exceeded the 60-day timelines in the absence of an approved extension.
5. LEAs that were identified as non-compliant submit a plan of action that indicates the reason for the non-compliance, a description of what could have been done to keep the evaluation compliant, a list of actions taken to ensure non-compliance will not be repeated, and the personnel responsible for implementing the plan of action.
6. LEAs are required to correct issues of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case longer than one year after noncompliance is identified.

7. In order to satisfy the second prong of OSEP Memo 09-02, compliance reports are reviewed quarterly. Correction of non-compliance is achieved when the LEA reaches 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following year.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
133	133	0	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 2013, Louisiana reported 133 instances of noncompliance for Indicator 11. LDOE verified that any LEA with a finding of noncompliance corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. All 133 findings were verified as corrected within one-year. LDOE ensures that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of data collected through SER - a state data system. LDOE monitored the LEAs quarterly through SER and determined the LEA met the regulatory requirement when the LEA reached 100% compliance in timely evaluations in any given quarter of the following fiscal year. All LEAs were found to be compliant by the fourth quarter of the fiscal year.

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

In FFY 2013, Louisiana reported 133 instances of noncompliance for Indicator 11. LDOE verified that any LEA with a finding of noncompliance corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. All 133 findings were verified as corrected within one-year. (Table 1 in the FFY 2013 APR details the range of delays.) Any LEA that had finding(s) of noncompliance was required to submit a plan of action that indicated 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 would not be repeated, and the personnel responsible for implementing the plan of action.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

Required Actions

## 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		64.60%	90.80%	95.41%	81.15%	96.50%	99.37%	99.24%	97.87%	96.91%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,648
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	90
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,161
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.	5
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	374

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	1,161	1,179	96.91%	100%	98.47%

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	18
--	----

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 1,161 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 18 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. The chart below indicates the number of days after the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed.

*Table 12.1 The range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed.\**

Number of Students	Delay
<10	1 – 15 Days
<10	16 – 30 Days
<10	31 – 45 Days
<10	46 – 60 Days
<10	60+ Days

Primary reasons for delays:

- Students moved from one LEA to another
- Data entry error; paperwork mistakes
- Evaluations not conducted in a timely manner
- Changes in personnel, lack of training, staff unclear about transition timelines
- Start dates of pre-kindergarten programs are later than calendars entered into the data system for the district and service start dates were recorded as the start date for pre-kindergarten
- LEA unable to contact parents; parents enrolling children in alternate LEA; jurisdiction questions

\* The Louisiana Department of Education has modified and/or suppressed data reported to protect the privacy of students in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) codified at 20 U.S.C. 1232g. The strategies used to protect privacy vary and may include rounding or other techniques but do not substantially affect the general usefulness of the data. Because of the privacy protections, numerical and percentage totals may not add precisely to the sum of the row or column to which the total refers.

**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 personnel to identify children who were referred and determined to be NOT eligible, and whose eligibility was determined prior to his/her third birthday.

Second, LDOE conducts a yearly review of these data. LDOE compiles a report from its state database, the 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. 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 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
38	38	0	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

To verify that the source of noncompliance was corrected and the LEA was implementing the regulatory requirements, the Indicator 12 manager reviewed 2014 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. LEAs not meeting 100% compliance for the current year were notified by the LDOE Monitoring Division via e-mail that they were out of compliance on this indicator. A Plan of Action was sent to each early childhood special education supervisor in the noncompliant district. The Plan of Action indicated the number of children 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 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 and reviewed the Plan of Action to determine the reasons for the delay and actions taken to ensure compliance.

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

To verify that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, the Indicator 12 manager reviewed FFY 2013 data entered into SER. The SER report indicates each LEA by name and shows the percentage of compliance in four 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 districts corrected non-compliance from the previous year by making 100% in any one quarter of the present year. LEAs not meeting 100% compliance for the current year were notified by the LDOE Monitoring Division via e-mail that they were out of compliance on this indicator. A Plan of Action was sent to each early childhood special education supervisor in the noncompliant district. The Plan of Action indicated the number of children 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 regarding what they plan to do to rectify the situation. The Indicator Manager received all Plan of Action forms from each noncompliant district with the exception of the Recovery School District run by the Louisiana Department of Education (RSD-LDE). RSD-LDE staff indicated that the LEA no longer provided direct services to children. The Indicator 12 manager worked with SER staff to determine where these children were enrolled and

reached out to the new LEA to ensure that services had been provided for these children. All Plans of Action were reviewed to determine the reasons for the delay, and the Indicator Manager followed up with each LEA to ensure that the noncompliance was corrected. All individual cases are resolved.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

### Required Actions

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		31.00%	76.00%	66.00%		53.00%	76.00%	77.00%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

**FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
182	182	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 and on-site monitoring 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 LEAs 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 process. The state reviewed records to determine the percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that included: 1) appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are updated annually and upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet postsecondary goals, and 2) annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs. Further, the state reviewed records for evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response**

None

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							25.50%	25.70%	25.90%	30.00%
		Data						25.30%	23.39%	25.00%	28.70%	33.42%
B	2009	Target ≥							55.50%	55.70%	55.90%	75.00%
		Data						55.30%	67.97%	68.00%	74.44%	74.25%
C	2009	Target ≥							73.80%	74.00%	74.20%	89.00%
		Data						73.60%	83.53%	86.00%	88.19%	87.65%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**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 2014 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	3176.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1084.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1243.00
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)	280.00
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).	194.00

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1084.00	3176.00	33.42%	33.00%	34.13%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	2327.00	3176.00	74.25%	76.00%	73.27%
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)	2801.00	3176.00	87.65%	90.00%	88.19%

**Was sampling used?** No

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## 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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥				75.00%	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%	55.56%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

### 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 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	8	null

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
4	8	55.56%	75.00%	50.00%

### 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 2014, Louisiana held eight resolution sessions. Therefore, Louisiana



did not meet the reporting threshold.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2014. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**Required Actions**

**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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥				82.00%						82.00%
Data		81.80%	77.00%	87.00%	50.00%	66.67%	0%	80.00%	50.00%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

Key:

**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 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	5	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	9	null

**FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3	5	9	100%	82.00%	88.89%

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations (9) held in FFY 2014. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**Required Actions**

## 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.

### Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		34.00%
Data	34.00%	40.19%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%

Key:

### Explanation of Changes

No changes were made. This data reflect targets submitted in the FFY 13 SSIP.

### Description of Measure

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the "Executive Summary" in the Louisiana FFY 13 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. Targets were not changed between FFY 13 and FFY 14, so any description of the stakeholder input will not be reflected in this year's FFY 14 SSIP report.

### Overview

Please see the Executive Summary section in the attached "Louisiana SSIP FFY 14" for this information.

## 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 FFY 13 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 FFY 13 SSIP document for this information.

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

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 FFY 13 SSIP document for this information.

### *Description*

Please see the "Component #3: State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)" section in the Louisiana FFY 13 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 FFY 13 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 FFY 13 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.

## Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Please see the Infrastructure Development section in the attached "Louisiana SSIP FFY 14 Final" for this information.

## Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Please see the Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices section in the attached "Louisiana SSIP FFY 14 Final" for this information.

## Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Please see the Evaluation section in the attached "Louisiana SSIP FFY 14 Final" for this information.

## Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Please see the Addition Support sub-section in the attached "Louisiana SSIP FFY 14 Final" for this information.

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Jamie Wong

Title: Special Education Policy Director

Email: jamie.wong@la.gov

Phone: 225-202-1250