

Overview

During 2015-2016, the Department will pilot a risk-based, tiered monitoring process to identify local education agencies (LEAs) selected to participate in IDEA monitoring activities.

This process will allow the Department to strategically focus monitoring efforts and resources toward improving the performance of students with disabilities. Risk factors used in this process would not solely consider evidence of non-compliance, but would also include the performance of students with disabilities. One of our goals is to implement a more thoughtful, data-driven process. Through this process, we expect to reveal more about the root cause for systemic non-compliance while offering successful districts or charters a less intrusive approach.

The proposed monitoring efforts align with the principles of Louisiana Believes and support the belief that monitoring should be used to inform technical assistance and help families and educators make more informed decisions about better ways to increase student achievement.

Frequently Asked Questions

What is the purpose of the risk-based analysis process?

The risk-based analysis process is a process whereby LEAs are analyzed according to how well they are performing in comparison to an established target in an identified area of risk.

Who is responsible for completing the risk-based analysis monitoring rubric?

The rubric will be completed annually by Office of Statewide Monitoring staff.

How many areas of risk are included as part of this process for monitoring selection? What are the areas of risk?

There are a total of six risk indicators selected for the 2015-2016 IDEA monitoring process. They are: LEA Determinations, English Language Arts Proficiency, Mathematics Proficiency, Graduation Rates, Dropout Rates, and Discipline.

How were the risk indicators selected?

Risk indicators were selected from the federally required State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators which are addressed annually in Louisiana's Annual Performance Report (APR). Performance and outcomes based indicators were selected as top risk indicator priorities. Final risk indicator selections were confirmed after obtaining feedback from Special Education Director engagement calls conducted in April 2015.

What statistical methodology was used to support the scoring and ranking for the risk-based analysis monitoring selection process?

The ranking methodology for the risk-based analysis monitoring process is backed by the statistical relevance of quartiles. Once the risk-based analysis is applied, LEAs with a total score falling into quartiles 1 and 2 will likely engage in the on-site monitoring event. Total scores falling into quartile 3 will require the LEA to complete a self-assessment and/or participate in a desk audit. Total scores falling into quartile 4 will receive feedback from LDE, have the

opportunity to offer capacity building support to other LEAs, and may be recognized as a high performing or model LEA.

How was each of the risk indicator targets derived?

Targets for graduation, dropout, and ELA and Math proficiency align with the targets established by stakeholders as reported in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR). Targets may change annually as reported in the APR, and monitoring targets will be adjusted annually to align with this process.

What will risk indicators be measured against? Identify the standard for earning points and ranking in each of the categories?

Risk Indicators will be measured against the established state targets for students with disabilities in each of the respective areas. The standard for ranking and earning points is based upon the following: (1) actual performance in the risk category for the SWDs subgroup, and (2) the number of points earned once the LEA is placed into the respective quartile. For example, those LEAs performing closer to the state target and ranked in quartile 4 will receive a less intrusive form of monitoring than an LEA that performed poorly and fell into quartile 1.

How will the rubric be utilized?

The rubric will be used to:

- Determine the category of monitoring and type of monitoring experience that is best for LEAs
- Identify strengths and weaknesses in the targeted areas of risks
- Reveal the root cause for increased dropout rates, low performance on statewide assessments, declining graduation rates, and high incidences of discipline removals
- Identify specific grade level(s) and subject areas where students with disabilities are struggling
- Provide LEAs with an opportunity to learn more about specific areas in which their students with disabilities subgroups are performing
- Inform fiscal planning decisions and redirect resources to the most critical areas of need

What data will be used to complete the risk- based analysis process?

Component	Data Source
LEA Determinations	July 2015 Determinations
Graduation Rates	2013-14 Cohort Graduation Rates : Indicator 1
Dropout Rates	2013-14 Dropout Rates : Indicator 2
Statewide Assessment Proficiency	2013-14 LEAP, iLEAP & EOC assessments : Indicator 3
Discipline	2013-14 Students with Disabilities Removals >10 days : Indicator 4A

How will the rubrics analyze state-authorized charter schools that may not serve a full K-12 population?

Rubrics were developed to fit every situation. Only risk indicators which are applicable to the grades served at the school will be applied to analysis. For example, graduation and dropout will not be applied as risk indicators for a charter school that only serves K-8.

What does low risk monitoring mean?

Low risk monitoring refers to the category of monitoring that is the least intrusive. It suggests that students with disabilities in the identified areas of risks are performing at or above the established state target across most risk indicators. It may also imply the LEA has earned a favorable LEA Determination and is meeting compliance requirements.

What does moderate risk monitoring mean?

Moderate risk monitoring refers to the category of monitoring which falls in the middle. This category of monitoring must be carefully evaluated, and has proven to be very diverse and revealing. Falling into the moderate category of monitoring might suggest the LEA has met compliance requirements and has a favorable LEA Determination, but performance outcomes may be unfavorable in one or more areas of risks. It could also mean the LEA is struggling with meeting compliance requirements and has an unfavorable LEA Determination while performance outcomes are on the rise. Because we understand how diverse the moderate category may be, the monitoring staff will analyze the LEA's performance in each risk indicator to ensure monitoring efforts are targeted to the most critical areas of need.

What does high risk monitoring mean?

High risk monitoring refers to most intensive category of monitoring. This category of monitoring will almost always reveal that an LEA is struggling in both compliance and performance measures. Any LEA falling into the high risk tier will receive on-site monitoring assistance.

Can an LEA that did not fall into the high risk monitoring category receive an on-site visit? If so, give an example of a circumstance where this might be likely to occur.

Yes, under the IDEA Part B, the Department reserves the right under its general supervision and oversight responsibilities to monitor any LEA at any time. While this tiered process was developed to offer a more diverse, and cohesive monitoring experience, there may be isolated circumstances where the Department can elect to conduct an on-site monitoring. If this should occur, the Department will communicate directly with the Special Education Director.

For example, if an LEA has earned an LEA Determination of Needs Intervention (NI) or Needs Substantial Intervention (NSI), has fallen into the moderate category of monitoring, is within two points of the high risk category, and one or more areas of risk show a critical need for intervention which is unlikely to be achieved aside from on-site monitoring, the Department will recommend an on-site visit.

Can an LEA falling into the low risk monitoring category be required to engage in additional monitoring activities?

Yes. There may be a limited number of circumstances where a low risk LEA is higher performing overall, but shows substantially lower performance in one particular area. Under these circumstances, the Department is likely to engage in a teleconference with the LEA to determine the most appropriate method of addressing the isolated issue through our pilot monitoring structure.

What are the monitoring events and who is likely to fall in which category?

Category	Low Risk - Tier I	Moderate Risk – Tier II	High Risk – Tier III
LDOE Monitoring Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIER IA: Self- Assessment and capacity building support (optional) • TIER IB: Self-Assessment (optional) <p>* Higher performing LEAs; in some instances, model LEA distinction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIER IIA: Self- Assessment (mandatory) • TIER IIB: Self-Assessment and/or desk audit (mandatory) <p>* In particular circumstances, teleconference may be recommended</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIER IIIA: Desk audit and participation in teleconference with LDOE (mandatory) • TIER IIIB: On-site monitoring
Occurrence	Annually	October 2015 – March 2016	October 2015 – March 2016
LDOE Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Assessment: LDOE provides self-assessment tool to LEA with instructions for completing • Capacity Building: LDOE initiates capacity building engagement conversations with model LEAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Assessment: LDOE provides self-assessment tool to LEA with instructions for completing • Desk Audit/Self-Assessment: LDOE initiates desk audit and provided self-assessment tool to LEA with instructions for completing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Assessment: LDOE will identify specific files for audit and initiate teleconference interviews with district staff • On-Site: LDOE initiates on-site monitoring with formal notification to LEA
LEA Action Required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete Self-Assessment and participate in capacity building activities (both optional) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete Self-Assessment • Participate in desk audit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in desk audit and teleconference, if applicable • Participate in on-site monitoring activities, if applicable
<p>* As required by OSEP, the Department and all local education agencies must review data annually for Disproportionality, Child Find, Early Childhood Transition, and Secondary Transition. These activities will run concurrently with other monitoring activities. The Department will initiate outreach, provide templates for correction of non-compliance, and resources for evaluating policies, practices, and procedures where appropriate.</p>			

Will the LDE offer coordinated technical assistance?

Yes. The Department is working to offer more coordinated technical assistance as it relates to critical areas of special education which impact student achievement. Office of Statewide monitoring will be compiling the results of the risk-based analysis process and beginning conversations with LEAs to obtain feedback on the agency’s technical assistance efforts moving forward.

How does an LEA obtain a copy of its risk analysis rubric and results? If so, what steps should they take to request a copy of it?

For Summer 2015, an LEA may request a copy of the rubric by emailing Angela.Randall@la.gov. Additionally, risk-based analysis rubrics will be included in the district data releases via the FTP. All updates to this process will be communicated via the weekly newsletter.