

# LA Part B

# FFY2017 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

182

## General Supervision System:

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

## MONITORING

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

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

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

## DISPUTE RESOLUTION

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

## IEP FACILITATION

IEP facilitation is available to parents and school 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 is an independent professional, trained to assist in creating an atmosphere for fair communication who also oversees the successful drafting of an IEP for the student. Either the parent or the school 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 request with LDOE to begin a formal complaint investigation. Formal complaint investigation procedures are developed under the supervisory jurisdiction of the LDOE to address allegations that a school district is violating a requirement of Part B of the IDEA. The formal complaint investigation request is also limited by regulations to action(s) occurring within one year before the formal complaint was filed.

**MEDIATION**

Mediation is available to resolve a disagreement between parents and the school 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 independent of, before, at the same time, or after requesting a due process hearing or complaint investigation. Requesting mediation will not prevent or delay a due process hearing or complaint investigation, and participating in mediation will not impair or waive any other rights of parents.

Mediation is a method for discussing and resolving disagreements between parents and school 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 administrative law judge (ALJ) 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 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 ALJ 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 ALJ.

The decision of the ALJ is made on substantive grounds based on a determination whether the school provided the child with a free appropriate public education. An ALJ will issue a written decision and order in any due process complaint involving the identification (child find), evaluation, eligibility determination, educational placement, and/or the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for a student with a disability. An ALJ's decision on whether a school provided a student with a disability FAPE is made considering substantive grounds or procedural violations. If the request for a hearing includes or is based on alleged procedural violations, the ALJ may find that the child did not receive a free appropriate public education only if s/he 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 ALJ grants a request for a specific extension of time from the parent or the school district.

The ALJ'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.).

<b>Attachments</b>			
	<b>File Name</b>	<b>Uploaded By</b>	<b>Uploaded Date</b>
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**

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 two 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 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 LEA’s 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; and 3) Summer Content Institutes – a variety of trainings over the summer that equip Teach Leaders with content-specific support. Teacher Leaders leverage this professional development and support within their schools, not only through training and monitoring, but also through modeling lessons and instructional strategies and by encouraging data analysis to inform instruction. LDOE also expanded Teacher Leaders to incorporate targeted resources and content specifically for special education professionals including teachers, guidance counselors and special education directors. By leveraging this successful statewide program with the special education population, Louisiana is able provide access to high-quality professional development and support that helps all students achieve.

PLANNING RESOURCES

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

School System 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 2017 – 2018 school year guide is divided into five major focus areas: 1) unification of LDOE’s Early Childhood System, 2) alignment of academic standards, curriculum, assessments, and professional development, 3) quality preparation for educators and leaders in every school, 4) pathway to college or a career for every graduate, and 5) focus on struggling schools and students.

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

School System Planning Calls are scheduled throughout the school year to discuss topics and resources in the School System 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 2017, LDOE regularly integrated support for special education professionals including training and policy guidance on the alternate assessment, Louisiana’s Connector standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities, high cost services, alternative pathways to promotion and graduation, and other priorities.

More information on LDOE’s 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	Remove
<a href="#">needs assistance required action letter ffy 2017.pdf</a>	Ashley Augustine	4/22/2019 4:38 PM	

**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.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**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 the Teacher Leaders initiative to provide educators with resources and training so that they can make local, empowered decisions to support their unique students.

The Louisiana Teacher Leaders make up a group of over 5,000 outstanding educators from around the state who are focused on high expectations for students. This group was born out of three core beliefs: 1) those closest to students are best positioned to make instructional decisions, 2) the State has a role in providing resources and training directly to teachers, and 3) Teacher Leaders are a powerful voice in training fellow teachers.

LDOE offers Teacher Leaders a blend of high-quality tools and resources along with in-person and virtual trainings to help them achieve ambitious results with their students.

[Teacher Support Toolbox](#)

[Teacher Leader Library](#)

[Calendar of Teacher Leader Professional Development Events](#)

[Teacher Leader Newsletter](#)

**Teacher Leader Summit** is an annual event that brings together educators and content experts from across the state to share knowledge, learn new skills, and prepare for the upcoming school year. Educators have the opportunity to choose from a wide variety of sessions covering role-specific topics.

**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 2017 SPP/APR submission on February 1, 2019. LDOE revised its target for Indicator 8 and sought feedback from educators, parents, and other stakeholders, including the SEAP. 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 2016 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 2016 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 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

LDOE reports annually to the public on the performance of each LEA on the targets in the SPP/APR in the Students with Disabilities library on the State’s website. This information is labeled *Performance Profiles* and is located under Performance Profiles of the Data and Reporting section. LDOE also links to a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revisions. This information is labeled *LA SPP / APR* and is located under State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report of the Data and Reporting section. For more information, please click on the following web link and locate the sections titled Students with Disabilities -> Data and Reporting -> Performance Profiles and Students with Disabilities -> Data and Reporting -> State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, respectively.

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

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">clarification response table ffy 2017 spp apr louisiana.pdf</a>	Ashley Augustine	4/22/2019 5:05 PM	

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

**OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2017 and 2018 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2018 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2019, 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.

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Three of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2019. The State provided the required information.

**Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 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 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, 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.

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school 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	2014
Target ≥			18.00%	19.00%	25.00%	25.00%	40.67%	50.00%	61.00%	38.00%	40.00%
Data		13.60%	17.70%	17.10%	35.30%	34.30%	30.30%	29.30%	32.96%	36.70%	42.80%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	42.00%	44.00%
Data	44.30%	46.64%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	2,241	
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	4,269	null
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	52.50%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2,241	4,269	46.64%	46.00%	52.50%

**Graduation Conditions**

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Students in Louisiana can pursue two pathways to a Louisiana high school diploma, either the TOPS University pathway or the TOPS Tech Jump Start Career diploma. The TOPS University pathway requires that students earn 24 credits. The TOPS Tech Jump Start pathway requires that students earn 23 credits. Both options are available to students with IEPs.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? Yes

Explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Students in Louisiana can pursue two pathways to a Louisiana high school diploma, either the TOPS University pathway or a TOPS Tech Jump Start Career diploma. Both options are available to students with IEPs. However, Act 833 (2014) gives students with disabilities who have persistent academic challenges due to their disabilities the ability to pursue an alternative pathway to a regular 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. Graduation requirements for Act 833 eligible students include the following:

- 1) Meet all graduation requirements, which include earning all Carnegie units for the diploma pathway they are pursuing and demonstrating proficiency in each of the three areas traditionally assessed with End of Course (EOC) tests. If a student is unable to meet the assessment requirements through traditional means - scoring proficient on assessments - the student can meet this requirement through an alternate means as determined by the IEP team.
- 2) In addition to meeting IEP goals and objectives, students must meet at least one of three transition criteria to graduate. The criteria include: employment in inclusive integrated environments, demonstrating mastery of specific employability skills, and access to services not provided by the school, employment, or education options.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2017 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	2014
Target ≤			25.00%	23.00%	21.00%	21.00%	18.60%	16.70%	25.00%	35.00%	34.00%
Data		22.99%	28.97%	29.90%	12.20%	11.20%	6.00%	37.00%	39.15%	33.96%	27.61%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	33.00%	30.00%
Data	28.03%	28.54%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	27.00%	25.00%

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.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</a>	2,198	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</a>	452	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</a>	45	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</a>	877	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)</a>	35	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
877	3,607	28.54%	27.00%	24.31%

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 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. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level 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	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.71%	97.75%	98.70%	98.70%	98.75%	98.80%	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%	97.60%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.68%	98.70%	98.70%	98.70%	98.80%	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%	97.47%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	98.80%	98.80%
		Data	98.52%	99.31%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	98.80%	98.80%
		Data	98.46%	99.24%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	98.80%	98.80%
Math	A ≥ Overall	98.80%	98.80%

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 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	44,195	42,216	99.31%	98.80%	95.52%

**Reasons for Group A Slippage**

There was a significant drop in participation for 4th and 8th grade testers statewide for FFY 2017.

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	43,608	41,647	99.24%	98.80%	95.50%

**Reasons for Group A Slippage**

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

There was a significant drop in participation for 4th and 8th grade testers statewide for FFY 2017.

### 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:

<http://www.louisianaschools.com>

Louisiana's 2% assessment was phased out. Louisiana's Spring 2018 LEAP criterion-referenced test reports on state, district, and school achievement levels, and is inclusive of all students.

[http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/spring-2018-leap-2025-state-lea-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=86dd901f\\_7](http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/spring-2018-leap-2025-state-lea-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=86dd901f_7)

Louisiana's Special Education Data Profile (2016-2017) includes statewide assessment tables including 10 student with disabilities assessment participation for both the regular and LAA 1 (1%) assessments, 2) students with disabilities basic/good and above on regular assessments, percent by grade and subject, and 3) students with disabilities who met or exceeded standards on the LAA 1 assessment.

[http://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/2016-2017-special-education-data-profile.pdf?sfvrsn=decb911f\\_4](http://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/2016-2017-special-education-data-profile.pdf?sfvrsn=decb911f_4)

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

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

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

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

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

LDOE's "Regular and Alternative Test Summary 2015 to 2017" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternative assessments for FFY 2014 to FFY 2016.

[https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternative-test-summary-2015-to-2017.xlsx?sfvrsn=5df4931f\\_4](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternative-test-summary-2015-to-2017.xlsx?sfvrsn=5df4931f_4)

LDOE's "Regular and Alternative Test Summary 2018" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternative assessments for FFY 2017.

[https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternative-test-summary-2018.xlsx?sfvrsn=b31e9e1f\\_4](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternative-test-summary-2018.xlsx?sfvrsn=b31e9e1f_4)

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

### OSEP Response

The State's FFY 2017 data represent slippage from the FFY 2016 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2016 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

### Required Actions

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level 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	2014
Reading	A Overall	2008	Target ≥					53.50%	53.50%	65.20%	68.40%	68.40%	37.00%	37.00%
			Data					33.50%	35.20%	35.40%	36.80%	38.90%	36.98%	36.64%
Math	A Overall	2008	Target ≥					57.90%	57.90%	68.40%	65.20%	65.20%	37.70%	37.70%
			Data					36.50%	38.40%	37.00%	38.30%	37.80%	40.32%	33.96%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	38.00%	39.00%
		Data	38.21%	38.70%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	38.70%	39.70%
		Data	36.06%	35.77%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	41.00%	43.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	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 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	42,541	14,476	38.70%	41.00%	34.03%

**Reasons for Group A Slippage**

There was a significant drop in participation for 4th and 8th grade testers statewide for FFY 2017, thus decreasing the number of students reported as proficient.

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	41,918	13,938	35.77%	40.70%	33.25%

There was a significant drop in participation for 4th and 8th grade testers statewide for FFY 2017, thus decreasing the number of students reported as proficient.

**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.  
<http://www.louisianaschools.com>

Louisiana's 2% assessment was phased out. Louisiana's Spring 2018 LEAP criterion-referenced test reports on state, district, and school achievement levels, and is inclusive of all students.  
[http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/spring-2018-leap-2025-state-lea-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=86dd901f\\_7](http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/test-results/spring-2018-leap-2025-state-lea-achievement-level-summary.xlsx?sfvrsn=86dd901f_7)

Louisiana's Special Education Data Profile (2016-2017) includes statewide assessment tables including 10 student with disabilities assessment participation for both the regular and LAA 1 (1%) assessments, 2) students with disabilities basic/good and above on regular assessments, percent by grade and subject, and 3) students with disabilities who met or exceeded standards on the LAA 1 assessment.  
[http://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/2016-2017-special-education-data-profile.pdf?sfvrsn=decb911f\\_4](http://louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/2016-2017-special-education-data-profile.pdf?sfvrsn=decb911f_4)

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

Measuring Results homepage: <http://www.louisianabelieves.com/assessment>  
Data Center: <http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/data-center>

LDOE's Academic Center for Students with Disabilities, including Performance Profiles:  
<http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/academics>

LDOE's "Regular and Alternative Test Summary 2015 to 2017" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternative assessments for FFY 2014 to FFY 2016.  
[https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternative-test-summary-2015-to-2017.xlsx?sfvrsn=5df4931f\\_4](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternative-test-summary-2015-to-2017.xlsx?sfvrsn=5df4931f_4)

LDOE's "Regular and Alternative Test Summary 2018" reports on the participation and performance of students, including students with disabilities, on regular and alternative assessments for FFY 2017.  
[https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternative-test-summary-2018.xlsx?sfvrsn=b31e9e1f\\_4](https://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/default-source/academics/regular-and-alternative-test-summary-2018.xlsx?sfvrsn=b31e9e1f_4)

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

The State's FFY 2017 data represent slippage from the FFY 2016 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2016 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2014
Target ≤			21.50%	19.00%	19.00%	16.50%	13.90%	11.40%	7.00%	23.50%	21.50%
Data		26.50%	29.20%	18.80%	33.33%	16.00%	18.40%	27.30%	25.00%	31.54%	16.86%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	19.50%	17.50%
Data	14.91%	19.02%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	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 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
32	173	19.02%	15.50%	18.50%

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 2017 APR submission, the state average was 0.87%. Thus, any LEA whose percentage was greater than 1.31% was identified as having a significant discrepancy.

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2017 APR generally reflects data from school year 2017-2018. However indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2016-2017.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

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

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:

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

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

3. LDOE reviewed the self-review rubric for compliance with IDEA discipline requirements. If any rubrics indicated



**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

noncompliance with IDEA 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 2016 APR, due February 1, 2018.

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State used the total number of districts in the State as the denominator in its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, and used the number of districts that meet the State-established minimum n size as the denominator in its FFY 2017 SPP/APR, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	5.00%	5.13%	1.16%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 16

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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
16	0	150	0%	0%	0%

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 0.87. Thus, an LEA was considered significantly discrepant if any race/ethnic group whose percentage was greater than 1.31% with more than one student represented in the race/ethnic group, and had policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2017 APR generally reflects data from school year 2017 – 2018. During school year 2017-2018, Louisiana had 182 LEAs across the state. However, indicators 4A and 4B reflect data from school year 2016 – 2017. Further, a small number of LEAs were closed at the end of school year 2016 – 2017, other LEAs were opened in school year 2017 – 2018, some LEAs do not serve special education students, and some LEAs had no discipline data reported for 2016-2017. These LEAs were not included in the indicator 4A / 4B denominator. This allows to LDOE report more accurate, valid and reliable data.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will

**FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

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

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 with 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 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 2016 APR, due February 1, 2018.

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**OSEP Response**

OSEP notes that in reporting "the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size" the State reported that "a small number of LEAs were closed at the end of school year 2016 – 2017, other LEAs were opened in school year 2017 – 2018, some LEAs do not serve special education students, and some LEAs had no discipline data reported for 2016-2017. These LEAs were not included in the indicator 4A / 4B denominator". Based on the information provided by the State, OSEP cannot determine whether or not the State's practice of excluding these LEAs from the calculation is consistent with the measurement.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Educational 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	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			57.76%	60.22%	62.69%	65.15%	67.61%	62.50%	62.50%	61.50%	62.00%
		Data		57.60%	57.99%	60.39%	61.30%	60.80%	61.10%	61.20%	62.40%	62.37%	61.34%
B	2005	Target ≤			16.11%	14.53%	12.94%	11.35%	9.76%	12.50%	12.50%	13.74%	13.70%
		Data		16.70%	15.71%	14.85%	14.30%	14.10%	13.70%	13.50%	14.02%	13.90%	14.31%
C	2005	Target ≤			2.19%	2.17%	2.14%	2.11%	2.08%	1.80%	1.80%	1.31%	1.30%
		Data		1.90%	1.86%	1.74%	1.50%	1.40%	1.30%	1.30%	1.33%	1.36%	1.30%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	62.50%	63.00%
	Data	59.67%	60.72%
B	Target ≤	13.65%	13.60%
	Data	13.91%	14.71%
C	Target ≤	1.30%	1.30%
	Data	1.33%	1.25%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	63.50%	64.00%
Target B ≤	13.56%	13.50%
Target C ≤	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 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	74,588	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	45,403	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	10,935	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	269	null

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	97	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	557	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	45,403	74,588	60.72%	63.50%	60.87%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10,935	74,588	14.71%	13.56%	14.66%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	923	74,588	1.25%	1.30%	1.24%

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									25.00%	25.00%	25.00%
		Data								21.20%	23.90%	22.66%	24.29%
B	2011	Target ≤									3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
		Data								3.70%	3.20%	3.79%	3.54%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	27.00%	27.00%
	Data	23.92%	21.25%
B	Target ≤	3.00%	3.00%
	Data	3.61%	3.86%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	30.00%	31.00%
Target B ≤	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 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	9,885	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<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>	2,004	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	481	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	17	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,004	9,885	21.25%	30.00%	20.27%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	500	9,885	3.86%	2.90%	5.06%

Use a different calculation methodology

**Reasons for B Slippage**

During the year FFY 2017 there was an increase in the number of 3-5 year olds with significant disabilities served in Louisiana. Additionally, there was a 7% increase in the number of 3 year olds identified with disabilities although the number of available early childcare seats for 3-year olds in Louisiana did not increase at the same rate.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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))

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2010	Target ≥						32.00%	63.00%	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%	71.00%
		Data					24.00%	63.42%	69.60%	70.50%	73.06%	71.53%	71.54%
A2	2010	Target ≥						72.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.00%	65.00%	65.00%
		Data					75.00%	67.57%	64.90%	63.90%	65.16%	64.97%	62.94%
B1	2010	Target ≥						35.00%	63.00%	63.50%	63.50%	63.50%	72.00%
		Data					37.00%	63.01%	70.90%	71.20%	73.24%	72.06%	72.22%
B2	2010	Target ≥						80.00%	57.50%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%	58.00%
		Data					82.00%	57.84%	56.20%	55.50%	57.89%	58.45%	57.39%
C1	2010	Target ≥						38.00%	70.50%	71.00%	71.00%	71.00%	75.00%
		Data					41.00%	70.63%	74.70%	75.00%	77.49%	75.76%	75.96%
C2	2010	Target ≥						80.00%	74.00%	74.50%	74.50%	70.00%	70.00%
		Data					83.00%	74.31%	69.00%	69.00%	69.88%	69.77%	68.49%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	71.00%	71.50%
	Data	72.59%	72.90%
A2	Target ≥	65.00%	65.50%
	Data	64.05%	63.74%
B1	Target ≥	72.00%	72.50%
	Data	72.72%	73.14%
B2	Target ≥	58.00%	58.50%
	Data	57.77%	56.37%
C1	Target ≥	75.00%	75.50%
	Data	75.11%	75.96%
C2	Target ≥	70.00%	70.50%
	Data	68.31%	67.30%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	72.00%	72.50%
Target A2 ≥	66.00%	66.50%
Target B1 ≥	73.00%	73.50%
Target B2 ≥	59.00%	59.50%
Target C1 ≥	76.00%	76.50%
Target C2 ≥	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 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3,493
--	-------

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	83	2.38%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	661	18.92%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	603	17.26%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,252	35.84%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	894	25.59%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1855.00	2599.00	72.90%	72.00%	71.37%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2146.00	3493.00	63.74%	66.00%	61.44%

**Reasons for A1 Slippage**

Over the last few years, Louisiana has focused on improving educational opportunities statewide for all students. Our early childcare centers and preschool programs have used *Teaching Strategies GOLD*® to monitor child progress in all publicly funded early childhood programs (e.g. Public and private pre-k programs, Head Start Programs, and Child Care Centers) while our special education teachers were using AEPS to measure progress for students with disabilities for OSEP reporting. There was not only a misalignment of the two assessments, but this encouraged general education and special education teachers to work in isolation rather than collaborating around a common set of data to support students with disabilities. We have recently transitioned to TS GOLD for the assessment of all students age 3-5, including for OSEP purposes, and we hope to see progress in next year's data as a result.

Additionally, as we have trained special educators on the implementation of TS GOLD this year, we have become aware that many districts were not including students who were only receiving speech services in the Early Childhood Outcomes assessment data. We have addressed this issue and all students age 3-5 served for 6 months or longer in Early Childhood Special Education programs are now being captured.

**Reasons for A2 Slippage**

Over the last few years, Louisiana has focused on improving educational opportunities statewide for all students. Our early childcare centers and preschool programs have used *Teaching Strategies GOLD*® to monitor child progress in all publicly funded early childhood programs (e.g. Public and private pre-k programs, Head Start Programs, and Child Care Centers) while our special education teachers were using AEPS to measure progress for students with disabilities for OSEP reporting. There was not only a misalignment of the two assessments, but this encouraged general education and special education teachers to work in isolation rather than collaborating around a common set of data to support students with disabilities. We have recently transitioned to TS GOLD for the assessment of all students age 3-5, including for OSEP purposes, and we hope to see progress in next year's data as a result.

Additionally, as we have trained special educators on the implementation of TS GOLD this year, we have become aware that many districts were not including students who were only receiving speech services in the Early Childhood Outcomes assessment data. We have addressed this issue and all students age 3-5 served for 6 months or longer in Early Childhood Special Education programs are now being captured.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	88	2.52%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	728	20.84%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	756	21.64%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,250	35.79%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	671	19.21%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2006.00	2822.00	73.14%	73.00%	71.08%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1921.00	3493.00	56.37%	59.00%	55.00%

**Reasons for B1 Slippage**

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Over the last few years, Louisiana has focused on improving educational opportunities statewide for all students. Our early childcare centers and preschool programs have used *Teaching Strategies GOLD*® to monitor child progress in all publicly funded early childhood programs (e.g. Public and private pre-k programs, Head Start Programs, and Child Care Centers) while our special education teachers were using AEPS to measure progress for students with disabilities for OSEP reporting. There was not only a misalignment of the two assessments, but this encouraged general education and special education teachers to work in isolation rather than collaborating around a common set of data to support students with disabilities. We have recently transitioned to TS GOLD for the assessment of all students age 3-5, including for OSEP purposes, and we hope to see progress in next year's data as a result.

Additionally, as we have trained special educators on the implementation of TS GOLD this year, we have become aware that many districts were not including students who were only receiving speech services in the Early Childhood Outcomes assessment data. We have addressed this issue and all students age 3-5 served for 6 months or longer in Early Childhood Special Education programs are now being captured.

### Reasons for B2 Slippage

Over the last few years, Louisiana has focused on improving educational opportunities statewide for all students. Our early childcare centers and preschool programs have used *Teaching Strategies GOLD*® to monitor child progress in all publicly funded early childhood programs (e.g. Public and private pre-k programs, Head Start Programs, and Child Care Centers) while our special education teachers were using AEPS to measure progress for students with disabilities for OSEP reporting. There was not only a misalignment of the two assessments, but this encouraged general education and special education teachers to work in isolation rather than collaborating around a common set of data to support students with disabilities. We have recently transitioned to TS GOLD for the assessment of all students age 3-5, including for OSEP purposes, and we hope to see progress in next year's data as a result.

Additionally, as we have trained special educators on the implementation of TS GOLD this year, we have become aware that many districts were not including students who were only receiving speech services in the Early Childhood Outcomes assessment data. We have addressed this issue and all students age 3-5 served for 6 months or longer in Early Childhood Special Education programs are now being captured.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	71	2.03%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	590	16.89%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	529	15.14%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,422	40.71%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	881	25.22%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1951.00	2612.00	75.96%	76.00%	74.69%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2303.00	3493.00	67.30%	71.00%	65.93%

### Reasons for C1 Slippage

Over the last few years, Louisiana has focused on improving educational opportunities statewide for all students. Our early childcare centers and preschool programs have used *Teaching Strategies GOLD*® to monitor child progress in all publicly funded early childhood programs (e.g. Public and private pre-k programs, Head Start Programs, and Child Care Centers) while our special education teachers were using AEPS to measure progress for students with disabilities for OSEP reporting. There was not only a misalignment of the two assessments, but this encouraged general education and special education teachers to work in isolation rather than collaborating around a common set of data to support students with disabilities. We have recently transitioned to TS GOLD for the assessment of all students age 3-5, including for OSEP purposes, and we hope to see progress in next year's data as a result.

Additionally, as we have trained special educators on the implementation of TS GOLD this year, we have become aware that many districts were not including students who were only receiving speech services in the Early Childhood Outcomes assessment data. We have addressed this issue and all students age 3-5 served for 6 months or longer in Early Childhood Special Education programs are now being captured.

### Reasons for C2 Slippage

Over the last few years, Louisiana has focused on improving educational opportunities statewide for all students. Our early childcare centers and preschool programs have used *Teaching Strategies GOLD*® to monitor child progress

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

in all publicly funded early childhood programs (e.g. Public and private pre-k programs, Head Start Programs, and Child Care Centers) while our special education teachers were using AEPS to measure progress for students with disabilities for OSEP reporting. There was not only a misalignment of the two assessments, but this encouraged general education and special education teachers to work in isolation rather than collaborating around a common set of data to support students with disabilities. We have recently transitioned to TS GOLD for the assessment of all students age 3-5, including for OSEP purposes, and we hope to see progress in next year's data as a result.

Additionally, as we have trained special educators on the implementation of TS GOLD this year, we have become aware that many districts were not including students who were only receiving speech services in the Early Childhood Outcomes assessment data. We have addressed this issue and all students age 3-5 served for 6 months or longer in Early Childhood Special Education programs are now being captured.

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years?** Yes

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process?** No  
**Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."**

The ECO Center worked with Brookes Publishing and the Early Intervention Management and Research Group (EMRG) board (a not-for-profit group formed by the authors of AEPS) to empirically identify cut scores within the AEPS raw scores to identify age-expected functioning, using the recommended guidelines put forth by ECO to identify functioning comparable to same-age peers.

Two large data sets of typically developing children were compiled and expected performance of typically developing children was computed by age bands. This expected performance was used to benchmark 7 points along a range of typical development for each age band. The performance of samples of children with disabilities was compared to these benchmarks. The observed distributions of these samples were compared to expectations about distribution based on previous research and federally reported state data.

To compute the cut scores for the 7-point scale, several pieces of information about the observed distribution of scores for typically developing children were used: the mean, the standard deviation in raw score units, and the standard error in Rasch measure units. The development of the cut scores had two main steps:

Step 1: Set the upper bound for a rating of 5 (i.e., the distinction between typically developing and not typically developing) based on Rasch standard error units below the mean.

Step 2: Set the additional cut points based on standard deviation units from the mean.

Details of the analysis and conversion process are available from Brookes Publishing ("History of Cut Scores Development for OSEP Child Outcomes Reporting in AEPSi: A Technical Report," [http://www.aepsinteractive.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/aepsi\\_technical\\_report.pdf](http://www.aepsinteractive.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/aepsi_technical_report.pdf)).

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

Louisiana's LEAs use *AEPS, the 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 5 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.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In FFY 2017, Louisiana used *AEPS* to collect data for this indicator. In FFY 2018 the State transitioned to TS GOLD to collect and report data for this indicator.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%	45.00%	45.00%	34.00%	36.00%
Data		39.00%	38.00%	31.00%	36.00%	39.00%	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%	33.45%	42.60%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	38.00%	81.50%
Data	77.63%	85.38%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	82.50%	83.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

As noted in the explanation of changes above, LDOE reviewed Indicator 8 targets for possible revision during the FFY 2016 APR cycle. LDOE gathered initial stakeholder input through an online survey available to school systems, families, and other stakeholders. Based on that feedback, LDOE proposed revised targets to SEAP in January 2018. SEAP advised LDOE to revise targets for Indicators 8 for the remainder of the SPP/APR cycle from FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 based on the results from FFY 2015 and FFY 2016. Those revised targets are reflected in this APR submission.

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
671	806	85.38%	82.50%	83.25%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	4.09%	19688.00
---	-------	----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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

LDOE uses a single parent involvement survey. LEAs disseminate the survey to parents of all children with disabilities, including preschool children. LDOE's FFY 2017 data reflect both preschool and school age respondents. LDOE compares the response rate of parents of preschool children with the statewide percentage of preschool children with disabilities to ensure responses are valid and reliable. In FFY 2017, approximately 13.9% of survey respondents were parents of preschool students with disabilities, which is reflective of the statewide rate of 12.1%, ensuring valid and reliable results.

Was sampling used? Yes

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

Louisiana serves over 70,000 students with disabilities, ages 3-21, in LEAs ranging in size from single school charter schools to districts with over 40,000 students. To reach this diverse range of districts, schools, and students, LDOE

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

has developed a statistically valid sampling plan for the SPP/APR cycle. Louisiana used a two-step process to develop the sampling plan that was approved by OSEP in January 2016.

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

Louisiana went through a multi-step process that considered a number of variables to ensure that each year's sample is representative of the state as whole. Louisiana stratified the population into three groups: 1) traditional LEAs—include parish and city school districts and state special schools, 2) Type 2 charter schools, and 3) Type 5 charters and other non-traditional LEAs. Additionally, LEAs were stratified to ensure geographic (northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest) as well as urban, suburban, and rural representation across the state. Louisiana used statistical software to randomly assign LEAs to a cohort.

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

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

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

Was a survey used? Yes  
Is it a new or revised survey? No

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.** Yes

Describe the strategies the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

LDOE used enrollment data (for both students with disabilities and their general education peers) to develop a survey methodology that would produce valid and reliable data reflecting the demographics of the State. LEAs were grouped into four cohorts based on survey year: FFY 2015, FFY 2016, FFY 2017, and FFY 2018. LDOE compared each of these cohorts to statewide demographic data including exceptionality, gender, race / ethnicity, and age to ensure each year would produce valid and reliable results.

LDOE took additional steps to structure the data collection tool to ensure response data are valid and reliable. The FFY 2017 parent survey included basic demographic information, ten required questions on parent's experience with his/her child's school, and two additional optional open ended questions. Parents had to complete required sections of the survey in order for responses to be included in the final report. LDOE monitored response rates monthly and contacted LEAs to ensure surveys were distributed and parents were encouraged to complete the survey. LDOE coordinated with parent centers to assist parents with completing the survey and made interpreters available for parents with limited English skills. LDOE collected data and reviewed response rates to statewide information to ensure the data represented the demographics of the state by exceptionality, gender, race / ethnicity, and age.



## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

### OSEP Response

In its description of its FFY 2017 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State.

### Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2018 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 23

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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
6	0	159	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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

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

First, LDOE examines each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in designated populations of students. For the FFY 2017 APR submission, LDOE used the October 1, 2017 Child Count Report to extract the number of students with disabilities in each race or ethnic category. LDOE then completes a risk ratio analysis for each LEA to identify whether a particular race or ethnicity was at a disproportionately greater risk of being identified for special education and related services, excluding any LEA that did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the 159 LEAs included in the analysis, LDOE identified 6 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 6 LEAs to determine whether or not the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification through policies, practices, or procedures. These LEAs were required to fill out a Disproportionality Review Rubric- a tool designed to assist the LEAs in identifying practices, policies, and procedures that may lead to inappropriate identification of students for special education and related services. The rubric includes topics such as professional development and teacher support, instructional practices, intervention efforts, and assessment procedures. All 6 LEAs completed the review; none of the LEAs identified instances where disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification.

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

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

submitted to LDOE for review. If a rubric indicates disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification, the LEA must make revisions to its policies, practices, and procedures to address this concern.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0.94%	3.51%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.62%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 23

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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
61	0	159	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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

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

First, LDOE examines each LEA's child count data to identify disproportionate representation in any of the following six specific disability categories: Autism, Emotional Disturbance, Intellectual Disability, Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech or Language Impairment. For the FFY 2017 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, 2017 Child Count Report. LDOE reviewed the data, and excluded any LEA that did not meet the minimum n-size of 25 in the designated race or ethnic category. Of the 159 LEAs, LDOE identified 61 LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Second, LDOE conducted outreach to the 61 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 practices, policies, and procedures that may lead to inappropriate identification of students based on their race or ethnicity, by disability. All 61 LEAs completed the review, and zero LEAs determined that the instance of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

identification, the LEA must make revisions to its policies, practices, and procedures to address this concern.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**OSEP Response****Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2014
Target			100%	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%	99.14%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	98.37%	98.69%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
16,208	15,980	98.69%	100%	98.59%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	228
---	-----

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

Table 1. Range of Days Children Were Evaluated beyond the State's 60-Day Timeline

Number of Students	Delay
84	1-15 Days
65	16-30 Days
28	31-45 Days
13	46-60 Days
38	60+ Days

The majority of delayed evaluations were completed within 15 days of the deadline. LEAs identified the following primary reasons for delay:

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

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 2017 (2017-2018 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 Business Day calendar that may be generated for calculations of 45 and 60-day intervals. Data must pass electronic system edits and comparison reports before new data are stored.

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

1. LDOE gathers data from SER after the end of the 2017-2018 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 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
228	228	null	0

**FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

In FFY 2016, Louisiana reported findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 11. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State verified that LEAs corrected instances of noncompliance. The State initiated follow-up actions within the required timelines to verify corrections consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02. The State verified timeline reports from data collected in Louisiana's Special Education Reporting (SER) system which indicated correction of noncompliance. LEAs were correctly implementing specific regulatory requirements. The State ensured that measures of correction as submitted in the corrective action plan were implemented with fidelity.

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

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

**OSEP Response**

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the remaining 228 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2014
Target			100%	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%	98.47%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.59%	97.71%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,638
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	85
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,276
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	6
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	220
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	1,276	1,327	97.71%	100%	96.16%

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, or f	51
--	----

**Reasons for Slippage**

One LEA accounted for 74% of all students who did not transition from Part C to Part B in the 2017-2018 school year. There was significant staff turnover in the special education department of this LEA, including the personnel responsible for scheduling transition meetings. Staff from the LDOE are providing targeted assistance to this particular LEA in an effort to resolve the issues that caused so many of the delays.

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

Please see attached table, *Reason for Non-Compliance and Range of Days*, for an account for children included in the (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f.

**Attached PDF table (optional)**

[Reason for Non-Compliance and Range of Days](#)

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
15	13	null	2

### FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Each year, the 619 Coordinator receives a Statewide Summary Report from the SER Manager that indicates LEAs meeting compliance and those that do not meet the 100% requirement. SER calculates compliance by comparing the child's date of birth with the data entered by LEA staff for IEP Implementation and date services are started. If the date of IEP Implementation and Service Start date are not on or before the child's third birthday, the system indicates that in the report, and a finding of non-compliance is generated. The report provides compliance ratings for each quarter of the year. LEAs are notified of the non-compliance on a yearly basis by the LDOE Monitoring Division. They are asked to provide a response to a Plan of Action document. The Plan of Action must include the reason for non-compliance and the LEA's plan for correcting any future non-compliance.

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

Each year, the State verifies this by a review of a SER Compliance Statewide Summary Report. The report indicates LEAs and the levels of compliance across 4 quarters of the year. A list of all LEAs in non-compliance each year is maintained by the 619 Coordinator. State staff use the previous year's report to determine which LEAs were out of compliance for that period and compare this information with the LEA status for the current year report. Any LEA with corrected non-compliance in at least one quarter was considered having corrected that non-compliance.

### FFY 2016 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

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

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Each year, the 619 Coordinator receives a Statewide Summary Report from the SER Manager that indicates LEAs meeting compliance and those that do not meet the 100% requirement. SER calculates compliance by comparing the child's date of birth with the data entered by LEA staff for IEP Implementation and date services are started. If the date of IEP Implementation and Service Start date are not on or before the child's third birthday, the system indicates that in the report, and a finding of non-compliance is generated. The report provides compliance ratings for each quarter of the year. LEAs are notified of the non-compliance on a yearly basis by the LDOE Monitoring Division. They are asked to provide a response to a Plan of Action document. The Plan of Action must include the reason for non-compliance and the LEA's plan for correcting any future non-compliance.

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

Each year, the State verifies this by a review of a SER Compliance Statewide Summary Report. The report indicates LEAs and the levels of compliance across 4 quarters of the year. A list of all LEAs in non-compliance each year is maintained by the 619 Coordinator. State staff use the previous year's report to determine which LEAs were out of compliance for that period and compare this information with the LEA status for the current year report. Any LEA with corrected non-compliance in at least one quarter was considered having corrected that non-compliance.

### FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The LEA was notified that their program was in uncorrected non-compliance by the LDOE Monitoring Division. They were asked to submit a Plan of Action to indicate measures their LEA would take to ensure that non-compliance does not occur in the future. The uncorrected non-compliance was due to significant staff turnover in the special education department of the LEA, including the personnel responsible for scheduling transition

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

meetings. New staff were unfamiliar with procedures for ensuring transitions were occurring according to required timelines and that data entered into SER was periodically checked for accuracy. Staff from the LDOE are providing targeted assistance to this particular LEA in an effort to resolve the issues that caused so many of the delays.

**OSEP Response**

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFYs 2015 and 2016 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFYs 2015 and 2016: (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.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the remaining 2 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and the remaining 2 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (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 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 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	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		31.00%	76.00%	66.00%		53.00%	76.00%	77.00%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
251	251	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 desk audits, on-site reviews, and self-assessments. The State targeted LEAs for on-site monitoring when they scored at Quartile 1 (the highest risk) of a risk analysis rubric. The rubric considered year to year changes in ELA and Math proficiency on statewide assessments, graduation rate, drop-out rate, and Special Education LEA Determinations.

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

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

LDOE reviewed 88 records and LEAs completed self-assessments on an additional 163 records, for a total of 251 records of youth aged 16 and above reviewed for compliance.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Yes  No

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							25.50%	25.70%	25.90%	30.00%	33.00%
		Data						25.30%	23.39%	25.00%	28.70%	33.42%	34.13%
B	2009	Target ≥							55.50%	55.70%	55.90%	75.00%	76.00%
		Data						55.30%	67.97%	68.00%	74.44%	74.25%	73.27%
C	2009	Target ≥							73.80%	74.00%	74.20%	89.00%	90.00%
		Data						73.60%	83.53%	86.00%	88.19%	87.65%	88.19%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	33.00%	35.00%
	Data	36.68%	39.48%
B	Target ≥	76.00%	79.00%
	Data	72.30%	74.98%
C	Target ≥	90.00%	92.00%
	Data	87.26%	87.16%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	37.00%	39.00%
Target B ≥	82.00%	84.00%
Target C ≥	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 2017 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	3000.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1180.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1128.00
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)	214.00
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).	127.00

	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	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

		school			
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1180.00	3000.00	39.48%	37.00%	39.33%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	2308.00	3000.00	74.98%	82.00%	76.93%
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)	2649.00	3000.00	87.16%	94.00%	88.30%

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

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

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

**Was sampling used?** No

**Was a survey used?** Yes

**Is it a new or revised survey?** No

**Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Louisiana uses a census method to collect data; the State does not sample. LEAs disseminate the survey to post-school youth, and results are captured in the State's Special Education Reporting (SER) data system. In FFY 2017, LDOE collected data and reviewed response rates to determine whether the response group was representative of the statewide population. Specifically, LDOE analyzed survey results by LEA, gender, race / ethnicity and specific disabilities, comparing survey responses to the October 2017 public IDEA student count. LDOE determined the response group was representative of the State.

**Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?** Yes

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2014
Target ≥				75.00%	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%	50.00%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	75.00%	75.00%
Data	54.55%	66.67%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	8	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	16	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
8	16	66.67%	75.00%	50.00%

**Reasons for Slippage**

Due to the relatively small number of overall cases, the LDOE expects year to year variance in the number of percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. 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 is an independent professional, trained to assist in creating an atmosphere for fair communication who also oversees the successful drafting of an IEP for the student. Either the parent or the school 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.



## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

### MEDIATION

Mediation is available to resolve a disagreement between parents and the school 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 independent of, before, at the same time, or after requesting a due process hearing or complaint investigation. Requesting mediation will not prevent or delay a due process hearing or complaint investigation, and participating in mediation will not impair or waive any other rights of parents.

Mediation is a method for discussing and resolving disagreements between parents and school 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 administrative law judge (ALJ) 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 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 ALJ 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 ALJ.

The decision of the ALJ is made on substantive grounds based on a determination whether the school provided the child with a free appropriate public education. An ALJ will issue a written decision and order in any due process complaint involving the identification (child find), evaluation, eligibility determination, educational placement, and/or the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for a student with a disability. An ALJ's decision on whether a school provided a student with a disability FAPE is made considering substantive grounds or procedural violations. If the request for a hearing includes or is based on alleged procedural violations, the ALJ may find that the child did not receive a free appropriate public education only if s/he 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 ALJ grants a request for a specific extension of time from the parent or the school district.

The ALJ'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.).

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

### OSEP Response

--

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2014
Target ≥				82.00%						82.00%	82.00%
Data		81.80%	77.00%	87.00%	50.00%	66.67%	0%	80.00%	50.00%	100%	88.89%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	82.00%	82.00%
Data	33.33%	71.43%

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

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	8	null

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	4	8	71.43%	82.00%	50.00%

**Reasons for Slippage**

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. Although the State did not meet its target for this indicator, we are below the threshold for reporting. Therefore slippage and FFY 2017 target are N/A.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2017. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		36.00%	36.00%	37.00%	39.00%
Data	36.18%	36.68%	35.14%	41.72%	39.12%

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

**FFY 2018 Target**

FFY	2018
Target ≥	42.00%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

Louisiana's SiMR is to increase ELA proficiency (basic and above) rates on statewide assessments for students with disabilities in third through fifth grades, in nine LEAs across the state. The SiMR has remained the same since FFY 2013. Please see Louisiana's attached "State Systemic Improvement Plan" dated April 2019 for more details.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Please see Louisiana's attached "State Systemic Improvement Plan" dated April 2019 for more details.

**Overview**

**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).

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

[Louisiana SSIP Theory of Action](#) Louisiana SSIP Theory of Action

### 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 6 (PDF page 5) in the Louisiana SSIP 2019 document.

## Infrastructure Development

- 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.
- 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.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- 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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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

- 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.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- 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).
- 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.

# FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## 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.

## Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

## A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Please see Louisiana's attached "State Systemic Improvement Plan" dated April 2019, Summary of Phase III, for more details.

## B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Please see Louisiana's attached "State Systemic Improvement Plan" dated April 2019, Progress in Implementing the SSIP, for more details.

## C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Please see Louisiana's attached "State Systemic Improvement Plan" dated April 2019, Data on Implementation and Outcomes, for more details.

## D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Please see Louisiana's attached "State Systemic Improvement Plan" dated April 2019, Data Quality Issues, for more details.

## E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

Please see Louisiana's attached "State Systemic Improvement Plan" dated April 2019, Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements, for more details.

## F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Please see Louisiana's attached "State Systemic Improvement Plan" dated April 2019, Plans for Next Year, for more details.

## OSEP Response

**Required Actions**



**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
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 Director

Email: jamie.wong@la.gov

Phone: 225-202-1250