

Louisiana Believes

Louisiana's Elementary & Secondary Education Plan
Pursuant to the Federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)



As Amended April 13, 2026

**Louisiana's Consolidated State Plan
Pursuant to the Federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)**

August 8, 2017

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position) Erin Bendily, Assistant Superintendent Policy & Governmental Affairs	Telephone (225) 342-5182
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 94064 Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064	Email Address: erin.bendily@la.gov
By signing this document, I assure that: To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct. The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304. Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.	
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) John White, State Superintendent of Education	Telephone: (225) 342-3602
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative 	Date: August 8, 2017
Governor (Printed Name) The Honorable John Bel Edwards	Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: March 15, 2017
Signature of Governor (If Applicable)	Date:

Guide to Identify Required ESSA State Plan Components

On March 13, 2017, the U.S. Department of Education released a revised ESSA state plan template and accompanying guidance. The guidance provides that states using an alternate template developed with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) must submit a table of contents or guide that indicates where the SEA addressed each requirement in its consolidated State plan.

The Louisiana Department of Education worked with CCSSO in developing this alternate template and the following guide which indicates where items included in the revised template can be found in Louisiana's draft state plan. The three new required components requested in the U.S. Department of Education's March 13, 2017 guidance are italicized.

State Plan Requirements by Program	Statutory and Regulatory Requirements	Item(s) from Revised Template	Item(s) in Louisiana's Draft Plan (Alternate Template)	Page #
Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)				
Eighth Grade Math Exception	1111(b)(2)(C); 34 CFR 200.5(b)	A.2.i-iii	3.A	33
Native Language Assessments	1111(b)(2)(F); 34 CFR 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4)	A.3.i-iv	3.B	34
Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (1111(c) and (d))				
• Subgroups	1111(c)(2)	A.4.i.a-d	4.1.B	50
• Minimum N-Size	1111(c)(3)	A.4.ii.a-e	4.1.C	51
• Establishment of Long-Term Goals	1111(c)(4)(A)	A.4.iii.a-c	1.A-C	13
• <i>How the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting long-term goals for English language proficiency and challenging State academic standards</i>	<i>USDOE guidance issued March 13, 2017</i>		1.C.i.	18
• Indicators	1111(c)(4)(B)	A.4.iv.a-e	4.1.A	36
• Annual Meaningful Differentiation	1111(c)(4)(C)	A.4.v.a-c	4.1.D; 4.1.D.vii	54; 77
• Identification of Schools	1111(c)(4)(C)(iii) and (D); 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D)	A.4.vi.a-g	4.2.A-B	78
• Annual Measurement of Achievement	1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)	A.4.vii	4.1.D.v	64

• Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement	1111(d)(3)	A.4.viii.a-f	4.2.A.ii; 4.2.B.iii; 4.3.B-D	79
Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators	1111(g)(1) (B)	A.5	5.3.B-C	83
<i>How the SEA will award subgrants to local education agencies (LEAs) under the new Student Support and Academic Enrichment Program in Title IV, Part A of the ESEA</i>	<i>USDOE guidance issued March 13, 2017</i>		6.1.B.	95
School Conditions	1111(g)(1)(C)	A.6	6.1.C	95; also see 32, 65, 75, 92-97
School Transitions	1111(g)(1)(D)	A.7	6.1.A-B	95
Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children				
Supporting Needs of Migratory Children	1304(b)(1)	B.1.i-iv	6.2.B.ii – iii; vi	102
Promote Coordination of Services	1304(b)(3)	B.2	6.2.B.iv	103
Use of Funds	1304(b)(4)	B.3	6.2.B.viii	106
Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk				
Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs	1414(a)(1)(B)	C.1	6.2.C.i	108
Program Objectives and Outcomes	1414(a)(2)(A)	C.2	6.2.C.ii	108
Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction				
Use of Funds	2101(d)(2)(A) and (D)	D.1	5.2.A	77
Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools	2101(d)(2)(E)	D.2	5.2.A; 5.3.E	78; 84
System of Certification and Licensing	2101(d)(2)(B)	D.3	5.1.A	85
Improving Skills of Educators	2101(d)(2)(J)	D.4	5.2.B	81
Data and Consultation	2101(d)(2)(K)	D.5	2.2.C-D	31; 33
Teacher Preparation	2101(d)(2)(M)	D.6	5.1.B	81
Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement				
Entrance and Exit Procedures	3113(b)(2)	E.1	6.2.D.i	111
SEA Support for English Learner Progress	3113(b)(6)	E.2.i-ii	--	18
Monitoring and Technical Assistance	3113(b)(8)	E.3.i-ii	2.2.B and D	29; 33

Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants				
Use of Funds	4103(c)(2)(A)	F.1	6.1.A-E	97
Awarding Subgrants	4103(c)(2)(B)	F.2	--	101
Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers				
Use of Funds	4203(a)(2)	G.1	6.2.E.i	112
Awarding Subgrants	4203(a)(4)	G.2	6.2.E.ii	113
Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program				
Outcomes and Objectives	5223(b)(1)	H.1	6.2.F.i	114
Technical Assistance	5223(b)(3)	H.2	2.2.D	115
Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B				
Student Identification	722(g)(1)(B)	I.1	6.2.G.i	116
Dispute Resolution	722(g)(1)(C)	I.2	6.2.G.iii	118
Support for School Personnel	722(g)(1)(D)	I.3	6.2.G.ii	117
Access to Services	722(g)(1)(F)(i)	I.4	6.2.G.v.1 and 2; 6.2.G.iv	119
Strategies to Address Other Problems	722(g)(1)(H)	I.5.i-v	6.2.G.vi	122
Policies to Remove Barriers	722(g)(1)(I)	I.6	6.2.G.vi	122
Assistance from Counselors	722(g)(1)(K)	I.7	--	123
<i>How youth will receive assistance from counselors to advise and prepare for college under the McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youths program</i>	<i>USDOE guidance issued March 13, 2017</i>		6.2.G.vii.	123
Equitable access to, and participation in, the programs included the consolidated State plan	Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act		Consolidated State Plan Assurances	126

Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

Instructions: Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan, but is eligible and still wishes to receive funds under that program or programs, it must submit individual program plans that meet all statutory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(iii).

☐ Check this box if the SEA has included all of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.

or

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below for which the SEA is submitting an individual program State plan:

D Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies

D Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

D Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

D Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

D Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students

D Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

D Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

D Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

D Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento Act): Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program

Educator Equity Extension

D Check this box if the SEA is requesting an extension for calculating and reporting student-level educator equity data under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(3). An SEA that receives this extension must calculate and report in this consolidated State plan the differences in rates based on school-level data for each of the groups listed in section 5.3.B and describe how the SEA will eliminate any differences in rates based on the school-level data consistent with section 5.3.E. An SEA that requests this extension must also provide a detailed plan and timeline in Appendix C addressing the steps it will take to calculate and report, as expeditiously as possible but no later than three years from the date it submits its initial consolidated State plan, the data required under 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(3)(i) at the student level.

Section 1. Long-term Goals

Instructions: Each SEA must provide baseline data (i.e., starting point data), measurements of interim progress, and long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency. For each goal, the SEA must describe how it established its long-term goals, including its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals, consistent with the requirements in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.13. Each SEA must provide goals and measurements of interim progress for the all students group and separately for each subgroup of students, consistent with the State's minimum number of students.

In the tables below, identify the baseline (data and year) and long-term goal (data and year). If the tables do not accommodate this information, an SEA may create a new table or text box(es) within this template. Each SEA must include measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency in Appendix A.

A. Academic Achievement.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved academic achievement, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

For the past several years, Louisiana has been very focused on reversing years of low academic performance as measured, in part, by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores and other nationally administered assessments. While some have rightly pointed out that Louisiana has a high number of students living in poverty¹ and a high percentage of students attending non-public schools as compared to other states,² the state recognizes that Louisiana's children are just as capable as any in the world and deserve an education that prepares them to successfully transition to college and the workplace – a shared recognition and expectation set forth by the federal Every Student Succeeds Act as well as Louisiana state law.³

Louisiana, like many other states, has seen impressive progress over the past decade of school support and accountability. In 1999, the state began grading schools based on student performance on the Louisiana Assessment of Education Progress (LEAP), which was created to mirror the NAEP.

¹ Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2015). 2015 Kids Count Data Book. Accessed at <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-2015kidscountdatabook-2015.pdf> .

² Kolko, J. (2014). *Where "Back to School" Means Private School*. Trulia. Accessed at <https://www.trulia.com/blog/trends/private-vs-public-school/>.

³ Louisiana Revised Statute 17:24.4. Accessed at <http://www.legis.la.gov/Legis/Law.aspx?d=80356>.

1999 LEAP 21 scores, by percent of students at each achievement level

2009 LEAP Results	Grade 4		Grade 8	
	English Language Arts	Mathematics	English Language Arts	Mathematics
Advanced (Level 5)	1	2	1	1
Mastery (Level 4)	15	8	11	4
Basic (Level 3)	39	32	31	33
Approaching Basic (Level 2)	42	24	36	21
Unsatisfactory (Level 1)	21	35	21	40


Points were initially awarded in the school rating system for scoring a Level 2 (“Approaching Basic”) on this five-level test. While this was in no way recognition of students performing at proficient levels, it was a way to motivate and reward necessary progress in the state’s many struggling schools. As time went on and the state shifted its focus to schools achieving a Level 3 (labeled “Basic” and often communicated as proficient), student achievement continued to increase, but still fell short of student achievement nationally.

In 2010, recognizing the need to equip Louisiana students with the knowledge and skills needed to successfully transition to college and the workplace and to compete nationally, the state’s top school board – the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) – adopted a plan to phase in more rigorous academic content standards and high-quality aligned assessments. The Louisiana Legislature echoed that goal through a mandate in [Act 275](#) of the 2012 Regular Session: “Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, standards-based assessments implemented by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education in English language arts and mathematics shall be based on nationally recognized content standards that represent the knowledge and skills needed for students to successfully transition to postsecondary education and the workplace.”

In 2013, the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) analyzed student performance and found that although students were making undeniable gains in achieving the Basic expectation, performance beyond that target were stagnant. Approximately 61 percent of students required developmental or remedial math courses and 42 percent of students required developmental or remedial English courses during their freshman year in college.⁴ And at the same time, state officials continued to express concerns about the preparation of workers qualified for jobs in key sectors of the economy. In keeping with nationwide trends, jobs were beginning to require some education after high school, primarily at a four-year college or at a two-year technical and community college. In 2011, 28 percent of the Louisiana workforce had a two- or four-year degree, and to meet the state’s future job needs, state workforce and economic development officials said that number needed to double. Therefore, in consultation with key stakeholders, including but not limited to educators, business and

⁴ Louisiana Board of Regents. (2017). Response to Act 619 of the 2016 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature. Accessed at <http://regents.state.la.us/assets/others/619Docs/619FinaldraftforSSrev1.pdf>.

industry partners, and policymakers, BESE once again set out to increase its expectations for teaching and learning, setting a 10-year goal of Level 4 (“Mastery”) as the new standard for what it takes to be an “A” rated public school in Louisiana by 2025.⁵ The LDE began publicly reporting student achievement not only in terms of “Basic and above,” but also “Mastery and above.”



By 2014, the state had fully implemented college and career ready standards and was measuring student learning using an aligned, nationally recognized assessment in 2014-2015 as state law required. The 2014-2015 data were to serve as a starting point or “baseline” for working toward BESE’s goal and the legislature’s mandate. However, during 2015-2016, in response to [Act 329](#), the Louisiana Legislature required BESE to undertake a review of its academic content standards. A panel of educators, content experts, and other key education stakeholders recommended some adjustments in order to ensure clarity and increased responsiveness to the expectations of college and workplace. BESE then adopted the new Louisiana State Standards effective beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, and the state made the corresponding adjustments to the LEAP to ensure full alignment and continued high quality.

⁵ Louisiana Department of Education. (2013). *Department Announces Plan to Raise Expectations Over 10 years, Provide Two Years of Time to Learn New Expectations*. Accessed at <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/newsroom/news-releases/2013/11/21/departments-announces-plan-to-raise-expectations-over-10-years-provide-two-years-of-time-to-learn-new-expectations>.

The state's Accountability Commission, which includes diverse education stakeholders and serves as an advisory panel to the LDE and BESE, has for the past few years carefully reviewed BESE's goal and the legislative mandate in order to recommend school accountability policies that support its attainment.

The commission has recommended ambitious state policy to codify the state's long-term goal, measure and report progress, and motivate and recognize schools' growth.

The Louisiana accountability system will adjust ambitiously and cautiously in order to demand immediate and high expectations of students while allowing time for schools to adjust. Beginning in 2017-2018, Louisiana's expectations for students, as outlined in the individual indices of Louisiana's system, will be updated in alignment with Louisiana's long-term goals (e.g., "Mastery" = 100 points, 90% graduation rate = 100 points, ACT of 21 = 100 points). However, the overall grading scale will be adjusted to allow schools time to respond to higher expectations. The minimum score required for an A, B, or C grade will be lowered by 10 points. In 2022, the scales will partially increase by five points each, and by 2025 the scale will return to its current ranges (e.g., 100+ = "A").

Already, Louisiana public schools have begun to respond to this goal of higher expectations. The percentage of students scoring "Mastery" on the LEAP has increased to 38 percent, up from 33 percent in 2015. By the year 2025, 12 years after BESE decided to raise standards, the expectation for an "A" in Louisiana will be consistent with expectations for A-rated performance at public schools throughout the country.

ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals in the table below.

In 2013, the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted more challenging standards for student learning and established the objective that by 2025 predominant student performance in a school rated an "A" in Louisiana would indicate full academic readiness for the next phase of education. Between 2013 and 2015, fourth grade students in Louisiana on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) gained six percentage points in the share of students scoring proficient in reading and four percentage points in math. These gains resembled those demonstrated during a similar period of time on the Louisiana Education Assessment Program (LEAP). From 2014 to 2016, Louisiana's students grew 11 percentage points at the "mastery" level on ELA and math.

The gains initiated by the adoption of more challenging standards and a more ambitious proficiency definition prompted a period of growth on multiple measures for a state that has historically struggled when benchmarked against other states. Looking toward the future, this period stands as precedent, setting a standard for what is possible in years hence.

There is also ample evidence from other states that sustaining gains on a statewide basis is possible. Fourth grade students in the nation's top performing state, Massachusetts, for example, have grown

five percentage points in the percentage of students scoring proficient on the NAEP in math from 2005 to 2015. Fourth grade students in the most improved state on the NAEP from 2005 to 2015, Indiana, grew 12 percentage points in the percentage of students scoring proficient in math.

Louisiana's long-term performance objectives are thus informed both by the most inspiring evidence of what has been proven possible in our state and by evidence from peer states that such progress can be sustained. Louisiana thus proposes annual improvement targets between 2018 and 2025 that will represent average improvement of 2.5 percentage points per year in student proficiency, as reflected in the table below.

The impact of these gains will extend beyond student learning in elementary and secondary schools, directly affecting the preparation of Louisiana's young adults for education and life after high school. In 2003, 13 percent of 4th and 8th graders in Louisiana scored at the mastery level or above on state ELA and math assessments; 12 years later, when most of these students were between 21 and 25 years old, Louisiana ranked 49th in the country in higher education attainment, with 28 percent of adults 25 or older having earned an associate's degree or higher.⁶ Were the proficiency gains below to come to fruition, radically increasing the proportion of Louisiana graduates exiting high schools academically prepared for essential higher education coursework, the skills of Louisiana's entire working population would experience a profound shift. We estimate, in fact, that if these goals are met, more than 40 percent of adults 25 or older in Louisiana would have earned an associate's degree or a bachelor's degree by 2035.

Elementary/Middle School (LEAP): Percent Mastery and Above

Subgroups	Reading/ Language Arts: % at Basic (2016)	Reading/ Language Arts: Current % at Mastery (2016)	Reading/ Language Arts: Long- term Goal (2025)	Mathematics: Current % at Basic (2016)	Mathematics: Current % at Mastery (2016)	Mathematics: Long-term Goal (2025)
All students	70	41	63.5	64	34	56.5
Economically disadvantaged students	64	33	63.5	58	27	56.5
Students with disabilities	34	12	63.5	33	12	56.5
English learners	39	15	63.5	47	20	56.5
White	81	53	63.5	76	47	56.5
Black or African American	60	28	63.5	51	21	56.5
Hispanic/Latino	65	38	63.5	63	33	56.5
Homeless (reporting to begin in 2017-2018)	55	25	63.5	47	19	56.5
Military-affiliated (reporting to begin in 2017-2018)			63.5			56.5

⁶ Analysis of EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, <https://factfinder.census.gov>

B. Graduation Rate.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

In addition to growth on state and national assessments, Louisiana's cohort graduation rate has increased more than most states over the past several years. In 2005-2006, fewer than two thirds of Louisiana's seniors who entered high school together as a cohort were graduating on time, with a graduation rate of 64.8 percent. Over the next decade, that rate increased by nearly 13 percentage points due to a number of aggressive steps taken by Louisiana educators, including but not limited to the establishment of effective ninth grade academies and dropout prevention strategies like the Jobs for America's Graduates program, improved counseling, the elimination of ineffective programs for students who were academically behind, and improved data reporting by the state's school systems. In 2009, the Louisiana Legislature also passed comprehensive legislation aimed at improving graduation rates and college and career readiness, and it included the creation of a career diploma option for students not on track or planning to transition to a four-year university.

Over the past several years, BESE and the LDE, in collaboration with the state's workforce, economic development, and post-secondary education leaders as well as local school systems, business and industry, and regional economic development authorities, have established the nation's premier career and technical education program called [Jump Start](#) that centers on the attainment of a high school diploma and a nationally recognized industry-based credential in high demand, high wage fields. By 2017-2018, students not graduating with the state's university preparatory diploma will be required to attain a Jump Start credential in order to receive a high school diploma. Additionally, the Louisiana Legislature created a path to graduation for students with disabilities that allows for [alternate means](#) to demonstrate skills and student progress, and BESE approved an alternate set of diploma requirements for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

As Louisiana continues its implementation of more rigorous academic content standards, enhances supports for struggling students and schools, and transitions to new expectations for high school counseling and graduation, the state's current graduation rate of 77.5 percent⁷ should continue to increase. The efforts underway, led the state Accountability Commission, to recommend a rigorous and ambitious goal of achieving what could be the national average graduation rate by 2025, and that is nine out of ten students entering high school graduate on time. Currently the average graduation rate among "A" rated high schools is just under 90 percent, and the national average is 83 percent.

Louisiana will work toward its goal of a statewide average of 90 percent, continuously supporting the state's high schools and annually reporting and celebrating progress toward that goal. The state's high school performance score formula will also continue to motivate and recognize progress for

⁷ 2014-2015 adjusted cohort graduation rate

students not only for graduating, but graduating with college credit and industry-based credentials that signal readiness for college and careers.

- ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in the table below.

Subgroup	Baseline (2014-2015) (A = 75%)	Long-term Goal (2025) (A = 90%)
All students	77.5	90
Economically disadvantaged students	70.8	90
Children with disabilities	44.3	90
English learners	50.2	90
White	82.7	90
Black or African American	71.4	90
Hispanic/Latino	74.9	90
Homeless (reporting to begin in 2017-2018)	59.8	90
Military-affiliated (reporting to begin in 2017-2018)	TBD	90

- iii. If applicable, provide the baseline and long-term goals for each extended-year cohort graduation rate(s) and describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements for such an extended-year rate or rates that are more rigorous as compared to the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress than the four-year adjusted cohort rate, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

Not Applicable. Louisiana does not include an extended year cohort graduation rate in its accountability system and long-term goals. Through the 2025 accountability cycle, Louisiana will reward schools for students who graduate in five or six years through the Strength of Diploma Index in high school accountability. More detail on the Strength of Diploma index is included later in this document.

C. English Language Proficiency.

- i. **Description.** Describe the State's uniform procedure, applied consistently to all English learners in the State, to establish research-based student-level targets on

which the goals and measurements of interim progress are based. The description must include:

1. How the State considers a student's English language proficiency (ELP) level at the time of identification and, if applicable, any other student characteristics that the State takes into account (*i.e.*, time in language instruction programs, grade level, age, Native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education, if any).

Increasing the expectations for the academic content that students must master in grades K-12 requires a parallel increase in expectations for English language acquisition. The Louisiana Connectors for English Learners are the English proficiency standards (ELP) that address the language needs of English Learners (ELs) for academic success. The ELP Connectors clarify and amplify the language demands of the Louisiana State Standards. Louisiana approved a comprehensive set of ELP Connectors in December 2016. Aligned with the English language proficiency assessments, the ELP Connectors describe these higher expectations by integrating language development with appropriate academic content matter. Both the English language proficiency screener and summative assessments, described below, are part of the Louisiana Connectors for English Language Learners.

The LDE is committed to assisting local school systems in meeting long-term goals for their English learners by providing training, developing resources, and supporting an ELL coaching model. To help teachers implement the Connectors and gain the skills and knowledge necessary to reach their English learner, the LDE is partnering with SC3 Comprehensive Center to train ELL teachers in becoming instructional coaches and supporting the implementation of an ELL coaching model. The job embedded, continuous professional development around the specific needs of the English Learner will have positive long term outcomes. Coaching is considered one of the most promising methods of helping teachers to change, improve, and sustain new instructional practices over time. In addition, instructional supports are being developed to specifically address the scaffolds necessary for meaningful engagement in content area practices. Finally, the LDE will build and release a comprehensive set of instructional curricular resources for teachers to use to help English Language Learners access on level content in the classroom.

English Language Proficiency Screener

The LDE adheres to USDOE's guidance in establishing a uniform procedure to identify potential English Learners and determine their level of English proficiency. A Home Language Use Survey is the first step in this procedure; it is used to identify potential English learners at the time of their initial enrollment in school. The second step is to administer the English Language Proficiency Screener within the first 30 days of school to determine an initial English proficiency level, confirm eligibility for enrollment in a specialized language program, and inform initial placement.

The screening assessment was developed from the same item bank as the summative assessment for each of the six grade bands and helps schools assess the baseline English language proficiency of incoming ELs and inform placement and instructional decisions.

The English Language Proficiency Summative Assessment

The LEAP English Language Proficiency (ELP) Connect will be administered in the spring every year beginning in 2017-2018. It is designed to measure the four language domains – listening, speaking, reading, and writing – and the academic language skills necessary to access and meet the rigorous Louisiana Student Standards. The LEAP ELP Connect assessment provides two sets of outcomes, each serving different purposes.

The first set of outcomes are intended to be used for score reporting and include a summary of performance on the four domains and a proficiency determination of Emerging, Progressing, and Proficient that is based on the pattern (or profile) of performance across the four domains. These scores are provided for use by students, educators, and parents and meet the objectives of measuring progress and determining program eligibility.

The second set of outcomes includes two growth indicators: an overall score and a comprehension score. Overall proficiency is determined through the pattern and level of performance across the four domains. Scale scores are provided for each domain, overall performance and comprehension. These scores meet the objectives for accountability.

Summary of both sets of outcomes:

	AUDIENCE	ASSESSMENT OUTCOME	PURPOSE
Reporting Scores	Students, Families, Educators (all audiences)	Domain Profiles and Levels, Domain Score	Reporting Scores, Allocating Resources, Instructional Planning
		Proficiency Determination	Determining EL Program eligibility
Growth Indicators	Students, Families, Educators (all audiences), Policymakers, Administrators	Overall Score	Evaluating Program Outcomes, Computing accountability metrics, Calculating Growth
		Comprehension Score	

Proficiency requires meeting a combination of expectations across all four domains. This expectation reflects the knowledge, skills and abilities that are required in each domain to interact with and engage in grade-level content instruction and is referred to as the “performance target.” A

determination of proficient indicates that a student has demonstrated the language skills required by the content area expectations described by the Louisiana Student Standards.

Description of the performance target for each of the four domains:

ELs demonstrate skills required for engagement with grade-level academic content instruction at a level comparable to non-ELs. For each domain...	
DOMAIN	DEFINITION
Listening	An EL can listen and comprehend spoken English at a level sufficient to fully participate in and learn from grade-level instruction, communication, and activities.
Speaking	An EL can produce speech at a level sufficient to fully participate in and learn from grade-level instruction, communication, and activities.
Reading	An EL can read and comprehend written English at a level sufficient to fully participate in and learn from grade-level instruction, communication, and activities.
Writing	An EL learner can write texts at a level sufficient to fully participate in and learn from grade-level instruction, communication, and activities.

2. The applicable timelines over which English learners sharing particular characteristics would be expected to attain ELP within a State-determined maximum number of years and a rationale for that State-determined maximum.

The LDE establishes the criteria of a maximum of seven years to attain English language proficiency, adjusted based on a student's baseline proficiency level. A determination of English Language Proficient indicates that a student has demonstrated English language skills or Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency to successfully access content area expectations as described by the Louisiana Student Standards. Taking into account the heterogeneity of the EL population, one should expect students to reach proficiency on varied timelines. The prevailing conclusion of recent literature reviews and research on this topic is that, "even in districts that are considered the most successful in teaching English to EL students, oral proficiency takes 3 to five years to develop, and academic English proficiency can take four to seven years."⁸ Thus, the criteria set by LDE of a maximum of seven years to attain English Language Proficiency is just and reasonable.

Taking into consideration the student's entry proficiency level, the LDE establishes the criteria of a maximum of seven years to attain English language proficiency when students enter at a Level 1

⁸ Hakuta, K., Butler, Y.G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* Berkeley, CA: University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Accessed at <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/13w7m06g#page-1>.

proficiency status, six years for entry Level 2, five years for entry level 3, and four years for entry level 4.

Entry Proficiency Level	Maximum Years to Proficiency Attainment
Level 1	7 years
Level 2	6 years
Level 3	5 years
Level 4	4 years

Louisiana will administer the LEAP ELP Connect for the first time in the 2017-2018 school year. However, historical data on Louisiana's previous English language proficiency assessment (ELDA) illustrates that students on average require about four years to meet the exit criteria. The number of years to meet the exit criteria has historically varied by grade level, with younger students requiring less time.

Results across grades 5-8

School Year	Number of Years Since First EL Identification			Grade Level at First EL Identification		
	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum
2012-2013	4.0	0	7	2.4	Pre-school	8
2013-2014	4.2	0	8	2.0	Pre-school	8
2014-2015	4.2	0	9	2.2	Pre-school	8
All	4.1	0	9	2.2	Pre-school	8

Results per grade

School Year	Current Grade Level	Number of Years since First EL Identification			Grade Level at First EL Identification		
		Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum
2012-2013	5	3.81	0	7	1.33	Pre-school	5
2012-2013	6	3.83	0	7	2.30	Pre-K	6
2012-2013	7	3.94	0	7	3.17	Kindergarten	7
2012-2013	8	4.65	0	7	3.53	Kindergarten	8
2013-2014	5	3.81	0	8	1.26	Pre-school	5
2013-2014	6	4.29	0	8	1.93	Pre-K	6
2013-2014	7	4.25	0	8	2.89	Pre-K	7
2013-2014	8	5.18	0	8	2.98	Kindergarten	8
2014-2015	5	3.53	0	8	1.56	Pre-school	5
2014-2015	6	3.90	0	8	2.18	Pre-school	6
2014-2015	7	4.65	0	9	2.42	Pre-school	7

2014-2015	8	5.09	0	9	3.06	Pre-K	8
All	5	3.71	0	8	1.39	Pre-school	5
All	6	3.97	0	8	2.16	Pre-school	6
All	7	4.25	0	9	2.86	Pre-school	7
All	8	4.95	0	9	3.21	Pre-K	8

Louisiana will establish annual student-level targets aligned to the timeline described above and based on a student's entry proficiency level. Following the first administration of LEAP ELP Connect in 2017-2018, Louisiana will establish a concordance table between the previous assessment (ELDA) levels and the new LEAP ELP Connect assessment levels in order to establish student-level targets on the new assessment. Student progress on LEAP ELP Connect will be measured for the first time in 2018-2019.

3. How the student-level targets expect all English learners to make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency within the applicable timelines.

Louisiana will measure school success with English language learners in two ways:

1. Progress towards English language proficiency, as measured by the LEAP ELP Connect, will be included in the school accountability formula. This indicator is described in more detail in Section 4.
2. School performance the English language proficiency indicator and English learner subgroup results on all other school performance indicators will be publicly reported on school report cards, and used as one of the subgroups leading to potential school identification (i.e. targeted schools or Urgent Intervention Required).

As detailed in Section 4, schools will be held accountable for student progress on LEAP ELP Connect. Schools will be measured in the accountability system based on whether students fall short of, meet, or exceed their annual targets and/or meet the exit criteria. Additionally, the growth of English language learners on academic assessments will be recognized within the core accountability system like all other students.

Per ESSA, recently-arrived English language learners will participate in state English, math, science, and social studies assessments in addition to LEAP ELP Connect, but their state assessment results will be excluded from accountability in the student's first year in the United States, and will be included only in the growth index (described in detail in Section 4) for ELA and math in the second year with full inclusion of all results in year three. In addition, progress to English language proficiency as measured on LEAP ELP Connect will be included in accountability beginning in students' second year.

- ii. Describe how the SEA established ambitious State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for increases in the percentage of all English learners in the State making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency based on 1.C.i. and provide the State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency.

Because Louisiana recently finalized its English language proficiency standards, and because the aligned exam will be administered for the first time in 2017-2018, Louisiana will begin reporting on the percentage of students making progress towards English language proficiency using the new standards beginning in 2018-2019. After an initial baseline year of results is available, Louisiana will work with stakeholders, the state's Accountability Commission, and BESE to define student annual targets and the progress to English language proficiency accountability indicator. The long-term and interim goals will be updated as needed.

Louisiana currently defines progress towards English language proficiency as improving at least one proficiency level in a particular year. In the most recent year, 45 percent of English learners with at least two years of proficiency results demonstrated progress of improving at least one proficiency level from the prior year. Louisiana is establishing a long-term goal of 63 percent of English learners demonstrating progress, a two-percentage point average annual increase. This goal, which is based on trends seen in other states and the advice of national experts, is ambitious but necessary in a state that has seen a nearly 80 percent increase in the number and proportion of students who are English learners over the last eight years.

Baseline: 2016	Interim: 2018	Interim: 2022	Long-term: 2025	Avg. Annual Growth
45%	49%	67%	63%	2%

Section 2: Consultation and Performance Management

2.1 Consultation.

Instructions: Each SEA must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with stakeholders in developing its consolidated State plan, consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 299.13 (b) and 299.15 (a). The stakeholders must include the following individuals and entities and reflect the geographic diversity of the State:

- The Governor or appropriate officials from the Governor's office;
- Members of the State legislature;
- Members of the State board of education, if applicable;
- LEAs, including LEAs in rural areas;
- Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State;
- Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, and organizations representing such individuals;
- Charter school leaders, if applicable;

- *Parents and families;*
- *Community-based organizations;*
- *Civil rights organizations, including those representing students with disabilities, English learners, and other historically underserved students;*
- *Institutions of higher education (IHEs);*
- *Employers;*
- *Representatives of private school students;*
- *Early childhood educators and leaders; and*
- *The public.*

Each SEA must meet the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(b)(1)-(3) to provide information that is:

- 1. Be in an understandable and uniform format;*
- 2. Be, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent; and*
- 3. Be, upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. 12102, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.*

A. Public Notice. Provide evidence that the SEA met the public notice requirements, under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(b), relating to the SEA’s processes and procedures for developing and adopting its consolidated State plan.

Following the posting of two draft ESSA frameworks, the LDE posted the draft ESSA state plan to its Internet [website](#) on February 20, 2017, and through a [press release](#) directed individuals to provide comment by emailing essalouisiana@la.gov.

B. Outreach and Input. For the components of the consolidated State plan including Challenging Academic Assessments; Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools; Supporting Excellent Educators; and Supporting All Students, describe how the SEA:

- i. Conducted outreach to and solicited input from the individuals and entities listed above, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(b), during the design and development of the SEA’s plans to implement the programs that the SEA has indicated it will include in its consolidated State plan; and following the completion of its initial consolidated State plan by making the plan available for public comment for a period of not less than 30 days prior to submitting the consolidated State plan to the Department for review and approval.

Prior to the enactment of ESSA, the LDE had already begun to engage stakeholders about the state’s remaining challenges and long-term goals with regard to early childhood through secondary education and beyond. With the enactment of ESSA, and with many shared goals including increased student achievement, elimination of achievement gaps across student subgroups, and a

well-rounded education for all children, the LDE began to consider and consult with stakeholders about ways to achieve those goals not only in compliance with ESSA, but using the federal law and its authorized programs as an opportunity to support the development, implementation, and achievement of Louisiana's long-term education plan.

The LDE began communicating with stakeholders about ESSA and the development of a state plan to address shared goals immediately after it was signed into law, through public statements, email newsletters, and presentations at public meetings around the state. The agency disseminated guidance, draft regulations, Frequently Asked Questions, and other information with LEAs and other stakeholders as it became available, through email [newsletters](#), standing advisory council meetings, and other means.

In June 2016, the LDE held meetings with school leaders, education associations, business and community leaders, civil rights organizations, and advocacy groups to review the requirements of ESSA, to receive questions and feedback, and to consider ways in which to partner on the development of a state plan. The agency also added a section to its [website](#) devoted to ESSA where the public could learn more about ESSA, contact the LDE with questions or feedback, and view a draft timeline for the state plan development and submission.

In July and early August, State Superintendent of Education John White hosted regional public town hall-like meetings around the state to discuss ESSA and the development of Louisiana's state plan. These meetings were announced through media advisories, email newsletters, social media, radio, the LDE's website, announcements at state board meetings, and direct invitations to local education agencies and state, regional, and local stakeholder organizations. Thirteen such meetings were held, in every region of the state, with many individuals attending representing at least 200 identified school systems and organizations. Attendees included but were not limited to parents, educators, school leaders, elected officials, business and industry representatives, civic organizations, representatives of professional educator associations, post-secondary education leaders and faculty, representatives of the military, state and local health and social service agencies, and advocates for children with exceptionalities and English learners. Copies of sign-in sheets and materials presented are available on the ESSA [webpage](#). The LDE compiled a [report](#) at the conclusion of this statewide tour in order to summarize the conversations with stakeholders thus far, summarize feedback received, publicize next steps in the state plan development process, and inform the public of ways they could continue to engage in the process.

At the same time, the LDE intensified consultations with the state board and numerous state advisory councils comprised of diverse stakeholders. In August, BESE held a [retreat](#), open to the public, that focused on the identification of Louisiana's most pressing education needs and opportunities, ESSA, and the development of the state's education plan. LDE staff also began facilitating numerous discussions with the state's stakeholder-led, standing [advisory panels](#) that exist to advise LDE and BESE -- the Accountability Commission, Special Education Advisory Panel, Superintendents' Advisory Council, Nonpublic Schools Commission, and Early Childhood Care and Education

Advisory Council. Additional conversations were held with numerous other state and regional partners, including but not limited to:

- Advisory Council on Student Behavior and Discipline
- American Federation for Children - Louisiana
- Associated Professional Educators of Louisiana
- Council for a Better Louisiana
- Deaf Grassroots Movement of Louisiana
- Democrats for Education Reform - Louisiana
- Equity in All Places
- Louisiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance
- Louisiana Association of Business and Industry/Education and Workforce Development Council
- Louisiana Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
- Louisiana Association of Principals
- Louisiana Association of Public Charter Schools
- Louisiana Association of School Administrators of Federally Assisted Programs
- Louisiana Association of School Business officials
- Louisiana Association of School Superintendents
- Louisiana Association of Educators
- Louisiana Federation of Teachers
- Louisiana Board of Regents
- Louisiana Center for Afterschool Learning
- Louisiana Civic Education Commission
- Louisiana Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
- Louisiana Department of Children and Family Services
- Louisiana Department of Health
- Louisiana Developmental Disabilities Council
- Louisiana Library Association
- Louisiana Psychologists Association
- Louisiana School Boards Association
- Louisiana School Counselor Association
- Louisiana School Psychologists Association
- Louisiana Youth Advisory Council
- Representatives of Louisiana military bases and school administrators serving a majority of children of military-connected families
- Representatives of Louisiana native American tribes and tribal organizations
- Representatives of Louisiana advocacy organizations that serve historically disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities, English learners, economically disadvantaged families, and racial/ethnic minorities
- Louisiana Center for Children's Rights
- Southern Poverty Law Center

- Stand for Children Louisiana
- Urban League

Several stakeholders requested more detailed information in writing that would outline the state's priorities and possible options to address lingering challenges. In September, the LDE publicly released a [draft ESSA framework](#) that outlined five main challenges and incorporated initial input received from stakeholders during the statewide tour, in advisory council meetings, through individual meetings and conversations, and via the state's ESSA email address (essalouisiana@la.gov).

Throughout the winter, using the draft framework as a guide for deeper conversations, the LDE continued working with diverse stakeholders. The Accountability Commission, in particular, held nine lengthy public meetings leading up to the drafting of the ESSA state plan to consider very detailed accountability policy options for effectively addressing state's most pressing challenges, including but not limited to long-term goals and the inclusion of growth in the school performance score formula (methodology and weighting). State Superintendent White continued discussions with school board representatives, local superintendents, and charter school leaders in formal advisory council meetings and informal task force settings to discuss long-term goals, assessments, accountability, educator preparation and support, supports and interventions for low-performing schools, funding, and more. Additional meetings with the Louisiana Board of Regents, college and university system leaders, and deans of colleges of education were held to develop plans for increasing access and overall quality of dual enrollment and early college experiences for high school students. LDE senior staff continued working with the Special Education Advisory Panel regarding diploma pathways for students with disabilities and alternate standards ("Louisiana Alternate Assessment [LAA 1]"), aligned assessments, and inclusion in the state's graduation index and graduation rate. Similar conversations and collaborations took place with the state's professionals and advocates serving English learners as updated, aligned standards were developed and opportunities for supports through ESSA were identified. LDE senior staff also continued to work with a number of state professional and advocacy organizations explore opportunities within ESSA to support a well-rounded education and to emphasize fairness of access to rigorous courses and enriching experiences within the state's plan.

In order to explore opportunities to improve low-performing schools and schools with persistent challenges, the LDE convened a school redesign [summit](#) for local superintendents and their senior staff to meet and discuss needs and opportunities with proven providers from within the state and around the country. Over 40 providers attended the event to meet with representatives from 10 charter management organizations and 45 out of 69 school districts. The event enabled Louisiana's school district leaders to identify proven providers with whom they might partner to improve school and subgroup performance through comprehensive and targeted school improvement programs within ESSA.

Based on stakeholder engagement, collaboration, and feedback, the LDE released an updated and more detailed [draft ESSA framework](#) on February 6, 2017, to identify the most promising aspects of a state plan that had emerged. The framework was disseminated through a [press release](#), posted to the LDE's website, and presented to several audiences around the state. The public was again invited to share feedback prior to the draft state plan being posted for public comment on February 20, 2017.

Following the release of the second draft framework, the LDE continued to work with the state's Accountability Commission on detailed aspects of the school accountability system, and consultation continued with LEA leaders, policymakers, advocacy organizations, and other stakeholders.

The LDE sent to Governor John Bel Edwards and posted for public comment a first draft ESSA state plan on February 20, 2017, and requested formal feedback be sent to essalouisiana@la.gov. On March 14, 2017, in response to updated guidance from the USDOE, the LDE posted a revised draft state plan. Governor Edwards offered preliminary [feedback](#) on the draft plan on March 24, 2017. A meeting was held shortly thereafter that included State Superintendent White, Governor Edwards' staff, members of the state board, and school superintendents.

On March 29, 2017, the state board held a special meeting for the purpose of considering the draft state plan. During the seven-hour public meeting, public comment was received from 115 individuals, including parents, educators, principals, superintendents, school board members, legislators, and representatives from professional educator associations, advocacy groups, and business and industry. As noted in the meeting [minutes](#), the board voted to endorse the draft state plan and directed the LDE to make several adjustments to address stakeholder feedback. Those adjustments related to the planned transition to higher academic expectations; public reporting on student achievement, growth, and subgroup performance; the use of Title I funds to support direct student services; consultation with school leaders throughout the spring and summer 2017 as the school quality/student success accountability indicator is fully developed; and continued dialogue regarding high school end-of-course tests in U.S. history and biology.

Following the BESE meeting, State Superintendent White and members of the board met several times shortly thereafter with representatives of the Governor, the leadership of the Louisiana Superintendents Association, and leaders of principal and educator associations to discuss the draft plan and the concerns that they had expressed. Additional meetings were also held with other advocates and civil rights organizations that expressed alternative views on those same issues. Final adjustments to the plan were made in an effort to address the feedback provided by all, while continuing to increase expectations for student achievement and increase public reporting of progress.

- ii. Took into account the input obtained through consultation and public comment. The response must include both how the SEA addressed the concerns and issues raised through consultation and public comment and any changes the SEA made as a result of public comment for all components of the consolidated State plan.

The LDE was able to obtain significant stakeholder input through its statewide tour, meetings of the state’s education advisory councils, dozens of meetings with representatives of education associations and advocacy organizations, and direct correspondence through the LDE ESSA email address. The LDE released an initial [summary](#) of input obtained following the statewide tour and then released a first draft framework reflecting that input. Through meaningful consultations with the stakeholder-led Louisiana Accountability Commission and the various other advisory panels and stakeholder groups noted above, the LDE revised the framework and released a second draft framework prior to publishing the ESSA state plan for public comment on February 20, 2017.

The second draft framework included a number of revisions, updates, and additional detail, based on stakeholder feedback, as follows:

- **Challenge 1 - Mastery of Fundamental Skills:** Stakeholders weighed in on the manner in which the state would gradually raise expectations such that, by 2025, “A” rated schools have a majority of students scoring at “Mastery” on state assessments, achieving a high school graduation rate of at least 90 percent, and achieving an average ACT score of 21 or above. The state’s Accountability Commission and several stakeholder groups debated the advantages and disadvantages of gradually raising expectations over time versus a more immediate increased target. Ultimately, stakeholders recommended an immediate recognition of a more appropriate college- and career-ready standard with a short-term “curve” to ensure that, while schools are being held to higher standards, their scores do not initially plummet simply due to those higher expectations. This plan reflects that recommendation.
- **Challenge 2 - Supporting Historically Disadvantaged Students:** The LDE revised what was previously a progress point system for students achieving growth, but scoring below “Basic,” with a new model that motivates and rewards progress for all students. Based on stakeholder feedback, and endorsed by the state’s Accountability Commission, a new two-step model is set to first recognize acceptable levels of growth toward the new expectation of “Mastery,” and then to also recognize growth of students relative to their peers with similar characteristics and challenges. Additionally, based on requests from the state’s Special Education Advisory Panel and disability advocates, students with significant cognitive disabilities taking the LAA 1 alternate assessment who receive a diploma will be included in the high school cohort graduation rate.
- **Challenge 3 - Increasing Student Opportunities and Supporting Their Interests:** After meeting with several diverse stakeholder groups about a number of enriching courses and experiences needed to provide students with access to a well-rounded education, the LDE proposed making these priorities and opportunities the centerpiece of the state’s non-assessment school quality/student success accountability indicator. In addition to including access to the arts, world languages, and vigorous physical activity, and rigorous advanced coursework, the LDE added access to technology and students’ digital literacy as key priorities to incent and recognize in the school accountability system. The LDE is continuing to work with stakeholders to define excellence in each of these areas, determine how best to

measure progress, and identify supports for LEAs.

- **Challenge 4 - Strengthening the Educator Profession:** As the state board considered proposed regulations during the fall of 2016 to institute competency-based expectations for educator preparation programs as well as a full-year residency, the LDE responded to requests from providers as well as LEAs regarding possible costs and financial incentives to support teacher candidates as well as their mentors. The state committed to funding to support staff costs related to the transition of preparation programs, a \$2,000 stipend for candidates completing yearlong residencies, and a \$1,000 stipend for mentor teachers hosting yearlong residents.
- **Challenge 5 - Support for Struggling Schools:** Based on feedback received from LEAs and several providers of school support and improvement services, on January 2017, the LDE hosted a [School Redesign Summit](#) to provide school system leaders with struggling schools an opportunity to network with potential partners and identify shared priorities. The state then announced planning grants to assist those LEAs with further exploration of possible partnerships to improve their schools eligible for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement. During this time, the LDE also engaged in extensive analysis of the state's struggling schools in order to more clearly identify the set of schools most in need and most likely to benefit from federally-funded supports and interventions.

Additional adjustments were made based on stakeholder input received in February and March 2017, following the release of the draft state plan and once again in response to directives of the state board. Refer to 2.1.B, Outreach and Input, above. Those adjustments included:

- **Transition to Higher Expectations:** Rather than “curving” school performance scores throughout the transition to higher expectations, Louisiana will immediately shift to defining “Mastery” as the state’s expectation for proficiency and will implement a simpler transition plan to support school systems in attaining the new expectation through 2025. Beginning in 2018, schools will earn an “A” (100 points) in the accountability formula for students scoring “Mastery” on LEAP/EOCs, for earning a 21 on the ACT and for a 90 percent or higher cohort graduation rate. Schools will earn a “C” (70 points) for students scoring Basic on LEAP/EOCs or an ACT/WorkKeys of 18/Silver. Individual indices will be updated next year (e.g., “Mastery” = 100, “Basic” = 80); however, the overall letter grade scale will be made easier in 2017-2018. The bar for earning an “A,” “B,” and “C” letter grade will rise in 2022 and one final time in 2025.
- **School Quality/Student Success accountability indicator:** This “Interests and Opportunities” accountability indicator will be measured through a “menu” approach that will allow LEAs to demonstrate a strong effort in a variety of ways. A working group predominantly made up of superintendents, principals, and other administrators, but also including experts and teachers in health, language, arts, and music, will develop long-term goals and valuable, fair ways to measure access to quality of student experiences. Louisiana’s Accountability Commission will then use the programmatic and curricular

expertise of the workgroup to propose a method for scoring these desired outcomes fairly for all school districts. BESE will approve the method for use no later than the 2019-2020 school year, with the timeline being accelerated if the pace of progress is faster than anticipated.

- **Science and social studies testing in high school:** A commitment to develop a base of research and facts regarding the use of high school science and social studies assessments, specifically U.S. History and Biology, as factors in graduating from high school and in evaluating school performance. This research will consider practices nationally and internationally and evidence based on research of course assessments. The LDE will provide share this information with stakeholders by the end of April and then facilitate focus groups with science and social studies teachers, high school principals, district administrators, and higher education leaders at which the fact base will be discussed. Lessons gleaned from both processes will inform formal recommendations to BESE regarding the continuation, discontinuation, or modification of end-of-course assessments at the board's June 2017 meetings.
- **Direct Student Services:** Beginning in the 2022-23 school year, the Louisiana State Department of Education will not set aside three percent of the state's Title I award for Direct Student Services (DSS). The three percent of the state's Title I award will be added back to the Title I formula funding for distribution to the eligible school systems. LEAs will be allowed to carry forward any prior year remaining balances of DSS funding until the expiration of the viable carryover. During this transition year, in addition to the DSS carryover funding, LEAs will use their Title I funding to support DSS programming activities. Although the state is not reserving the three percent for DSS, LEAs, based on their individual needs, will be encouraged to continue providing DSS services to students.

C. Governor's consultation. Describe how the SEA consulted in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor consistent with section 8540 of the ESEA, including whether officials from the SEA and the Governor's office met during the development of this plan and prior to the submission of this plan.

When ESSA was signed into law, Louisiana Governor John Bel Edwards and many state lawmakers were just beginning their first terms. The state legislature immediately held three legislative sessions between February and June to address the state's budget deficit and other pressing state issues. The LDE, therefore, began robust consultations with the Governor's Office and other stakeholders about ESSA in summer 2017. Shortly thereafter, the Governor convened an ESSA advisory council charged with making recommendations to inform his review of the new law and the state's draft plan prior to submission. The LDE, the Governor's staff, and members of the Governor's advisory council regularly shared information and deliberated on many aspects of the draft state plan as it was being developed, through the Governor's advisory council as well as through other BESE and LDE advisory bodies and task forces on which they serve. State Superintendent White and his staff also consulted with the Governor and his staff individually to discuss specific policy considerations of stakeholder interest. The Governor's three appointees to the state education board also participated in several briefings and conversations by the LDE as the plan was being developed.

This draft state plan was submitted to the Governor for his review on February 20, 2017 and again on March 14, 2017, adding additional components requested by the U.S. Department of Education in guidance issued to states on March 13, 2017. State Superintendent White and members of BESE continued to meet with Governor Edwards and his staff in the month following his receipt of the draft state plan. Several adjustments to the plan requested by the state board during its March 29, 2017, all of which have been incorporated into this plan, are responsive to the Governor's feedback

as well as that of other stakeholders. In particular, adjustments to Title I allocation methodology, the development of the Interests and Opportunities indicator, and the study of biology and U.S. history assessments, directly respond to specific policies addressed in writing by the Governor. Those adjustments are summarized in Section 2.1.B. above.

A summary of stakeholder consultation relative to amendments to this state plan as of March 1, 2019, are included as Appendix E.

2.2 System of Performance Management.

Instructions: In the text boxes below, each SEA must describe consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.15 (b) its system of performance management of SEA and LEA plans across all programs included in this consolidated State plan. The description of an SEA's system of performance management must include information on the SEA's review and approval of LEA plans, monitoring, continuous improvement, and technical assistance across the components of the consolidated State plan.

- A. Review and Approval of LEA Plans.** Describe the SEA's process for supporting the development, review, and approval of LEA plans in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements. The description should include a discussion of how the SEA will determine if LEA activities align with: 1) the specific needs of the LEA, and 2) the SEA's consolidated State plan.

The LDE has support teams referred to as “networks” that consist of instructional coaches and other experts to support Louisiana's LEAs and their school leaders in the instructional planning and implementation process. The networks are responsible for working with each LEA to develop plans to address the needs of their students, in particular those students who are most at risk. Networks also ensure that those plans align with the state's identified [focus areas](#). The state engages local leaders in analyzing LEA and school level data, creating strategic plans and setting goals, reviewing the implementation of college and career-ready standards, vetting the alignment and quality of classroom resources, and regularly reviewing the implementation and effectiveness of the district's

educator evaluation system. The results of this planning process are captured in the “Central Data” portion of the LEA’s ESSA consolidated application. In this section of the application the LEAs identify their goals, key planning decisions, and activities that address the needs of their students.

The ESSA consolidated application for LEAs serves as their overarching plan, much like the state’s long-term plan under ESSA. It is the vehicle by which they apply for state and federal funding. The process is designed to encourage all LEA program staff to work collaboratively to develop their own plans and to align each federal and state budgeted expenditure to the components of the LEA plan. As a part of the approval process for LEA plans, the LDE has two levels of reviews, fiscal and programmatic. Fiscal reviews ensure that LEAs are properly coding expenditures for reimbursement purposes. Program reviews ensure that each budgeted expenditure aligns with the intent and purpose of the federal program requirements and verifies that all expenditures meet the reasonable and necessary accounting requirements. Once an LEA is approved at both levels of the fiscal and program reviews, the consolidated application moves on to the final fiscal review where maintenance of effort requirements are certified.

B. Monitoring. Describe the SEA’s plan to monitor SEA and LEA implementation of the included programs to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements. This description must include how the SEA will collect and use data and information which may include input from stakeholders and data collected and reported on State and LEA report cards (under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and applicable regulations), to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward meeting the desired program outcomes.

The LDE recognizes its duty as a state education agency to ensure all statutory and regulatory requirements related to federal education programs are followed and program activities, supports, and services are achieving intended outcomes. In order to gauge both compliance and effective program implementation, the LDE will engage in regular, targeted reviews of data and differentiate supports and interventions based on identified needs.

In the 2016-2017 school year, the LDE implemented a new risk-based monitoring system following extensive consultation with stakeholders and experts and a yearlong pilot. Prior to that time, a cyclical monitoring system was used in which the state followed a multi-year monitoring schedule. Not all LEAs were analyzed for monitoring every year, and for those that were selected, the monitoring process was a standard one. As concerns would arise outside of these scheduled times, targeted monitoring would be arranged, but were often very limited to program specific issues and not with broader considerations and implications taken into account. It was not unusual that in a given year, some LEAs would not be monitored at all and some would be monitored several times.

The new monitoring system allows for an evaluation of every LEA every year for all federal programs against a set of pre-determined risk indicators. These risk indicators are determined through annual consultation with stakeholders, experts, and LDE staff who lead the state’s academic

planning, accountability, and support structures. The monitoring process addresses compliance, academic performance growth (overall and by subgroup), and fiscal risks over a two-year period. Quartiles are used for ranking and assigning points in order to distribute a set of data into four equal groups. Risk indicators are weighted, assigned points, and ranked on a rubric. The application of this rubric yields a monitoring report card for each LEA that displays data and other relevant information used to make monitoring determinations. The rubric explains how risk indicators are weighted, displays points assigned based on the data and information analyzed, and concludes with rankings that place the LEA in low-risk, moderate-low, moderate-high, and high-risk categories for monitoring purposes. The rubric, referred to as the monitoring report card (Appendix D), is also shared with LDE network teams to support coordination across the areas of program compliance and effectiveness in increasing student achievement.

Monitoring is then conducted and differentiated according to the level of risk, ranging from low intensity to high intensity. Monitoring experiences range from on-site monitoring at the most intensive level to self-assessments at the least intensive level. Comprehensive desk reviews are conducted at the moderate ranking level. The LDE utilizes state developed review protocols and self-assessment tools to ensure monitoring processes at every level are targeted, reliable, and consistent. Self-assessment results are submitted to the LDE for review and follow-up if required. The LDE may incorporate LEA staff interviews at any level of monitoring based on the discretion of the monitoring team leader. The LDE also reserves the right to make adjustments to the level of monitoring if concerns are elevated aside from this process. In some instances, cyclical monitoring may be necessary to monitor programs by which funding is provisional, competitive or discretionary.

LEAs must immediately develop and submit for LDE approval a corrective action plan for any findings of noncompliance. During the period in which the LEA is implementing the corrective action plan, the plan remains under the supervision of the LDE monitoring team, which regularly engages in conversations and collection of evidence to validate progress toward resolution. Throughout that time, LDE network teams assigned to support LEAs receive copies of corrective action plans so that they too can support and monitor progress, not only for compliance purposes, but also as part of a larger effort to ensure that all programs implemented by LEAs are achieving their goals relative to student outcomes. LEAs are also expected to brief their local school boards in open public meetings regarding any findings of noncompliance and corrective actions until all issues are resolved.

This new method of monitoring has eliminated a one-size-fits-all approach and now provides all LEAs with more timely opportunities to address non-compliance, improve program management, and ultimately increase student outcomes based on factors that have the greatest impact. The LDE will continue to work with stakeholders and experts to regularly review the effectiveness of this monitoring system in meeting the state's fiduciary responsibilities and ensuring maximum coordination toward the goals of college and career readiness for all Louisiana children.

C. Continuous Improvement. Describe the SEA's plan to continuously improve SEA and LEA plans and implementation. This description must include how the SEA will collect and use data and information which may include input from stakeholders and data collected and reported on State and LEA report cards (under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and applicable regulations), to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward meeting the desired program outcomes.

The LDE provides a variety of data, resources, tools, and support to help school systems improve, continually refine the state plan in furtherance of increased student achievement, and update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A. The cycle of support kicks off each spring with the release of the school system planning guide, which is designed to support school systems as they create academic plans for the following school year and leverage resources available by the LDE. The guide focuses on three areas:

- **Early Childhood:** Prepare every child for kindergarten
- **High Quality Classroom Teaching:** Develop high-quality teaching in every classroom from pre-K through 12th grade
- **High School Pathways:** Create a path to prosperity for every student

The guide as well as the collaborative planning process will also include ongoing reviews of data related to student behavior and discipline, prompting school leaders to identify schoolwide and subgroup needs, plan for improvement where necessary, and leverage federal funds to support such efforts.

More specifically, the school system planning guide details the key planning decisions, resources, and funds to support each focus area above. School systems: 1) use the Superintendent Profile, Educator Workforce Report, and Early Childhood Performance Profiles to identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement in school system performance and prioritize specific improvements for the following school year; 2) create a plan to implement projects and initiatives that will lead to prioritized improvements and align their budgets to fund key initiatives and projects; and 3) share their plan with key stakeholders, ensuring that each group (e.g. teachers, parents, community members) is clear on how the plan impacts them and the next steps they should take.

The LDE also provides data, resources, tools, and professional development to LEAs, principals, and teachers throughout the school year through regular meetings, phone calls, webinars, collaboration events and the Teacher Leader Summit. One hundred percent of school systems participate in one or more of these professional development opportunities. Collaboration events typically occur four times throughout the year in four locations across the state each time. Sessions vary depending on

the audience (district supervisors, principals and Teacher Leaders), but generally focus on topics related to:

- Early childhood
- Teacher preparation and talent management
- K-12 curriculum, instruction and assessment
- Special education
- High school opportunities
- Education policy
- Teacher and principal professional development
- ELL and immersion education
- Grants and federal programs

Both the Teacher Leader Summit and the collaboration events focus on providing educators with concrete tools and resources to help district and school stakeholders with decisions they are making at a particular time of year. Resources include the district support calendar, which provides dates when the LDE will provide key resources and support, and planning guides, such as the District Planning Guide, the Principal Guidebook, and the High School Opportunities Guidebook, which help districts and principals set priorities and make funding decisions for the coming year.

The LDE also provides differentiated, one-on-one support to districts based on their individual goals and needs via the network teams. Each of the three network teams has one leader and approximately five coaches to carry out the initiatives of the LDE and provide consistent hands on support to school systems. Overall, network leaders and coaches are charged with the task of being the bridge that connects the efforts of the LDE to the LEAs. More specifically, they spend the majority of their week in the field helping district leaders outline goals, assessing the quality of districts' implementation, and providing support to help districts improve their student's academic performance. Additionally, network staff share information and data about where districts are excelling and where they need additional support with other teams, which informs the content covered in the aforementioned calls, webinars, and collaboration events for district leaders and principals.

Going forward, in an effort to align academic and budget planning, support the resolution of monitoring findings, and promote a well-rounded education, the LDE will expand the scope of collaboration events and refocus the role of network teams. Through regional and one-on-one support meetings, LDE staff will support LEAs in addressing their greatest needs, as revealed by the results of needs assessments, analyses of data, and monitoring reports, and targeting funds toward those needs.

In addition to ongoing consultation with LEAs, the LDE engages in regular consultation and review of student, school, and LEA data with the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education,

stakeholder advisory councils, and individual stakeholder groups representing educators, families, and disadvantaged student populations. Efforts are made to engage diverse partners, including but not limited to teachers, principals and other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders, parents, community partners, and other organizations with relevant and demonstrated expertise in programs and activities designed to meet the purposes of ESSA. LEA leaders and stakeholder groups are provided a full briefing, including in open public meetings, whenever updated student and school results are available. Those briefings provide an opportunity to discuss where expectations were and were not achieved as well as options to adjust various components of the state's plan to ensure that the needs of students are being met effectively. In addition, the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education holds an annual public retreat in which the state superintendent provides a comprehensive overview of student and school data, an assessment of progress toward established goals, and outlines areas in which adjustments to the state's plan should be considered. The board then provides guidance and acts as needed to adjust state regulations or to advocate for changes in state law as appropriate.

D. Differentiated Technical Assistance. Describe the SEA's plan to provide differentiated technical assistance to LEAs and schools to support effective implementation of SEA, LEA, and other subgrantee strategies.

The LDE is committed to equipping every LEA with the necessary resources and tools to be successful, and network teams are a crucial piece of the differentiated support that the LDE provides. Each of the three regional networks consists of one leader and approximately seven coaches who support all 64 parishes across Louisiana. Network staff members spend the vast majority of their time in the field working one-on-one with LEAs and place special emphasis on working with historically struggling schools and LEAs. Networks' visits are differentiated and are tailored to meet the individual needs of superintendents, principals and teachers. Throughout the school year, network leaders and coaches:

- Diagnose LEAs' specific needs by analyzing student performance results and conducting school visits;
- Help districts and schools set goals, plan and revise their plans based on particular gaps and trends;
- Provide individualized coaching to district staff and school staff;
- Connect district and school staff with additional resources, tools and professional development that meet their needs; and
- Monitor progress towards differentiated goals and priorities.

Section 3: Academic Assessments

Instructions: As applicable, provide the information regarding a State's academic assessments in the text boxes below.

A. Advanced Mathematics Coursework. Does the State: 1) administer end-of-course mathematics assessments to high school students in order to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA; and 2) use the exception for students in eighth grade to take such assessments under section 1111(b)(2)(C) of the ESEA?

☐ Yes. If yes, describe the SEA’s strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 C.F.R. § 200.5(b)(4).

☒ No.

The LDE provides and hosts trainings on Sample Middle School Accelerated Plans, guidance for districts to accelerate students starting in either sixth or seventh grade. This guidance helps school systems provide students the opportunity to accelerate into Algebra I by eighth grade and ensures that the accelerated students have the opportunity to master all middle school standards.

In addition, the LDE is building a series of advanced math and STEM progressions to support student acceleration. This includes piloting courses in advanced statistics, engineering, and computer science. The LDE is working to build the curricular tools needed for these courses and will pilot with hundreds of teachers in the 2017-2018 school year, providing a year of professional development to prepare teachers to implement these advanced courses.

Through the 2025 accountability cycle, Louisiana will provide incentives in the accountability plan for schools to accelerate students into Algebra I in middle school. In addition to earning assessment index points for the student's Algebra I score, middle schools earn up to 50 incentive points based on the student's proficiency level. The following table shows eighth grade enrollment in Algebra I and Geometry for the past three school years. Over 90 percent of those who took Algebra I demonstrated proficiency on the end of course Algebra I assessment. Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle, Louisiana will allow students in 8th grade to accelerate into Algebra I or geometry but will not incentivize it through the accountability system.

Course Name	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Algebra I	6431	6982	8153
Geometry	229	216	232
Total	6660	7198	8385

NOTE: Only 8th grade students taking Algebra I are exempted from also taking the grade-level examination in math, in accordance with ESSA.

B. Languages other than English. Describe how the SEA is complying with the requirements in section 1111(b)(2)(F) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. §200.6(f) in languages other than English.

- i. Provide the SEA’s definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” consistent with 34 C.F.R. §200.6(f)(4), and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

Louisiana defines “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” as those languages spoken by greater than 1% of all students statewide. In Louisiana, the only language meeting that definition is Spanish. Thus, Louisiana’s math examination is provided in Spanish.

However, even for languages not meeting the state’s definition, students may have the mathematics examination administered with a translator (e.g., Vietnamese). Additionally, standardized directions for all assessments are available in the seven most commonly spoken languages (Arabic, Cantonese, Mandarin, French, Spanish, Urdu and Vietnamese). Finally, a Limited English Proficiency Accommodation Form is available for providing accommodations to students with limited English proficiency in the classroom and on assessments.

- ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

The Louisiana Education Assessment Program (LEAP) 2025 for grades 3-8 and end-of-course (EOC) tests for high school have the mathematics sessions available in Spanish. Schools may translate the math assessment to any other language using a translator as needed (e.g., Vietnamese).

- iii. Indicate the languages other than English identified in B.i. above for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

Not Applicable

- iv. Describe how the SEA will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population by providing:
 - 1. The State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(f)(4);

As noted above, Louisiana does provide translated exams in Spanish, and the state’s translation policy ensures all students’ language needs are met, even for languages that are not present to a significant extent. The LDE will continue to monitor the frequency with which translators are used annually, as well as the annual population makeup of the overall state as well as specific LEAs. As populations change and needs arise, Louisiana will work with its assessment vendor to offer expanded translations.

- 2. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to

public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and

The LDE engaged advocacy organizations serving English language learners through the statewide ESSA listening tour and through individual meetings. Conversations focused on the ways in which they and the LDE can better partner to address the needs of EL students and their families as they receive information related to testing, student assessment results, school report cards, and more.

The LDE analyzed data to determine the predominant languages spoken by EL students and worked with vendors to translate testing instructions into multiple languages. The LDE also supports LEAs that may need the help of translators in additional languages.

Through its assessment hotline and through email, as well as through its annual survey to district test coordinators, the LDE will receive and respond to comments by the public and practitioners regarding the need for additional translated materials.

3. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

The LDE has been able to meet the vast majority of EL student needs through the above means, but will continue to consult EL advocacy organizations, educators, and the public to determine if additional supports are needed.

Section 4: Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12-200.24 and section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

4.1 Accountability System.

- A. Indicators.** Describe the measure(s) included in each of the Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency, and School Quality or Student Success indicators and how those measures meet the requirements described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(a)-(b) and section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the ESEA.
- The description for each indicator should include how it is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State, as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(c).
 - To meet the requirements described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(d), for the measures included within the indicators of Academic Progress and School Quality or Student Success measures, the description must also address how each measure within the indicators is supported by research that high performance or improvement on such

- measure is likely to increase student learning (e.g., grade point average, credit accumulation, performance in advanced coursework).
- For measures within indicators of School Quality or Student Success that are unique to high school, the description must address how research shows that high performance or improvement on the indicator is likely to increase graduation rates, postsecondary enrollment, persistence, completion, or career readiness.
 - To meet the requirement in 34 C.F.R. § 200.14(e), the descriptions for the Academic Progress and School Quality or Student Success indicators must include a demonstration of how each measure aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18 by demonstrating varied results across schools in the State.

Through the 2025 accountability cycle, following system will be in place:

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
i) Academic Achievement	Elementary schools: • Elementary school Assessment Index (ELA and math) Middle schools: • Middle school Assessment Index (ELA and math) High Schools: • High school End-of-Course (EOC) Index (ELA and math) • High school Growth Index for ELA and math	The assessment and EOC indices capture student achievement on grade 3-8 and high school state assessments (EOCs) in English language arts and math. The academic achievement indicators used by the LDE allow for objective, valid, reliable, and comparable results across LEAs in the state, as all assessments are scored following national best practices executed by expert assessment vendors and overseen by psychometricians. In addition, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is utilized to address and resolve measurement and technical issues to ensure that assessments are valid and reliable. All students participate in the same assessments by grade level and subject. Test scores are used in the SPS as an index (average), which in turn makes results more reliable. Prior to calculation of school performance scores and subgroup performance, all data are reviewed

		and certified by schools and LEAs. NOTE: The high school growth index measures student growth on ELA and math EOC assessments as measured by growth towards proficiency OR student growth percentile using Louisiana's nationally-recognized value-added model, which is detailed below in full.* Using this index for student growth relies on the same reliable, valid, and comparable assessment instruments used in the Academic Achievement Index, but it provides different information: how well a school helps its students grow from one year to the next. Please refer to Section D below for a full description of this indicator and all others.
ii) Academic Progress	Elementary school Growth Index Middle school Growth Index	This indicator captures student growth on ELA and math grade 3-8 state assessments as measured by growth towards proficiency OR student growth percentile using Louisiana's nationally-recognized value-added model, which is detailed below in full.* Using this index for student growth relies on the same reliable, valid, and comparable assessment instruments used in the Academic Achievement Index, but it provides different information: how well a school helps its students grow from one year to the next. Please refer to Section D below for a full description of this indicator

		and all others.
iii) Graduation Rate	High school Graduation Rate: • Graduation Rate Index • High school graduation rate within Strength of Diploma Index	This indicator measures the four-year cohort graduation rate as outlined in federal regulations and in state board regulations. The rates are comparable across Louisiana schools, as well as all other U.S. schools that calculate rates using federal guidelines. Please refer to Section D below for a full description of this indicator and all others.
iv) Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	English Language Proficiency Indicator (ELP is its own measure, but weight comes from relationship to academic content assessments; see academic achievement indicator for weights)	This indicator awards points for all English learners making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency as defined by meeting exit criteria and/or meeting or exceeding annual targets based on a student's baseline proficiency level. This indicator will be included in the assessment index of every school beginning in 2018-2019 after implementation of Louisiana's new ELP assessment in 2017-2018 for every English learner and results will be publicly reported for any school serving at least ten English learners. The progress to English language proficiency indicator used by the LDE allows for objective, valid, reliable, and comparable results across LEAs in the state as the LEAP ELP Connect was developed using an Evidence-Centered Design (ECD) framework with test items that are aligned to the Louisiana Connectors for English Learners. The specifications are tightly linked

		to the definitions of evidence that stem from the ECD process which ensures its reliability and validity. A description of how this indicator is included in the overall accountability system is included in Section 4.D <i>Annual Meaningful Differentiation</i> .
v) School Quality or Student Success (all grade levels)	Interests and Opportunities will be added after further development in 2017-2018. For now, it is not included within the weightings for schools. An updated plan will be provided to the USDOE prior to implementation for review and approval.	See full description below**
vi) School Quality or Student Success (elementary and middle schools)	Elementary schools: Science and social studies assessments as measured in the assessment index Middle schools: Science and social studies as measured in the assessment index, and the Dropout Credit Accumulation Index	Science and social studies exams are administered in grades 3-8. Like ELA and math, results from these exams are included in an assessment index for elementary and middle schools. The Dropout/credit accumulation index measures credit accumulation through the end of 9th grade year (used to measure 8th grade schools). Bulletin 111.⁹ This measure is not captured by performance on state assessments. Instead, it measures the degree to which middle schools have prepared students to be successful in high school based on

⁹ Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2016). Bulletin 11: The Louisiana School, District, and State Accountability System, §413. Accessed at <http://bese.louisiana.gov/documents-resources/policies-bulletins>.

		their quality of work at the class level. Research shows that students who are under-credited at the end of the first year of high school are at-risk of not graduating on time.¹⁰ Students are only included in the DCAI if they are also full academic year in their ninth-grade year, which prevents middle schools from being penalized for students who exit early and cannot earn the required credits. The index includes a dropout penalty to encourage schools to take responsibility for assuring an uninterrupted transition to high school. Please refer to Section D below for a full description of this indicator and all others.
vii) School Quality or Student Success (high schools)	Measures for high schools: • Strength of Diploma credentials • Science and social studies	Strength of diploma awards points based on the attainment of credentials beyond just a high school diploma (i.e., more credits = higher points). It awards points for graduates who earn associate's degrees, passed AP/IB/CLEP exams,¹¹ earned credit in

¹⁰ Allensworth, E. M. & Easton, J. Q. (2007). *What Matters for Staying On-Track and Graduating in Chicago Public High Schools: A Close Look at Course Grades, Failures, and Attendance in the Freshman Year*. Consortium on Chicago School Research at The University of Chicago. Accessed at <https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/07%20What%20Matters%20Final.pdf>.

¹¹ Murphy, D. & Dodd, B. (2009). *A Comparison of College Performance of Matched AP® and Non-AP Student Groups*. College Board. Accessed at <https://research.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/publications/2012/7/researchreport-2009-6-comparision-college-performance-matched-ap-non-ap-student-groups.pdf>.

	EOCs • ACT/WorkKeys	AP/IB/dual enrollment courses,^{12, 13, 14} earned industry credentials,^{15, 16} graduated in 5 or 6 years, and completed a HiSET equivalency diploma. Above and beyond the graduation rate, this indicator recognizes the benefits to students when schools provide an array of opportunities for advanced coursework and credentials that promote a successful transition to college or a career. A Biology EOC and a U.S. History EOC further allow for a more complete measure of student success in high school, and are incorporated into the EOC index. All juniors take the ACT, and students may also take the WorkKeys. Students' highest scores through their senior year are included in the ACT/WorkKeys index. Please refer to Section D below for a full description of this indicator and all others.
--	--	--

Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle, the following system will be in place:

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description (See Section D for additional information)
i) Academic Achievement	The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in English Language Arts	The assessment indicators capture student proficiency on grade 3-8 and high school state assessments-in English language arts and math. The academic achievement indicators used by the LDOE allow for objective, valid, reliable, and comparable results across LEAs in the

	The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in Mathematics	state, as all assessments are scored following national best practices executed by expert assessment vendors and overseen by psychometricians. In addition, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is utilized to address and resolve measurement and technical issues to ensure that assessments are valid and reliable. All students participate in the same assessments by grade level and subject. Test scores are used in the SPS as an index (average), which in turn makes results more reliable. Prior to calculation of school performance scores and subgroup performance, all data are reviewed and certified by schools and LEAs.
ii) Academic Progress	The percent of students growing in English Language Arts The percent of students growing in Mathematics English Language Arts growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students Math growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students	This indicator captures student growth on ELA and math grade 3-high school state assessments, recognizing growth when a student: 1. increases at least one achievement level in the Math/ELA; 2. scored below the mastery achievement level in Math/ELA for the prior year and advances from a subcategory within basic, approaching basic, or unsatisfactory achievement levels (table below) to a higher level in the current year; 3. scored at the mastery achievement level in Math/ELA both the prior year and the current year and earned a scaled score greater in the current year than in the prior year; 4. scored at the advanced achievement level in the current year. Using these components for student growth relies on the same reliable, valid, and comparable assessment instruments used in the Academic Achievement Index, but it provides different information: how well a school helps its students grow from one year to the next.
iii) Graduation Rate	High school Graduation Rate	This indicator measures the four year cohort graduation rate as outlined in ESEA requirements and in state board regulations. The rates are

		comparable across Louisiana schools, as well as all other U.S. schools that calculate rates using federal guidelines.
iv) Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	The percent of English Learners making progress in English Language Acquisition	This indicator awards points for all English learners making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency as defined by meeting exit criteria and/or meeting or exceeding annual targets based on a student's baseline proficiency level. The progress to English language proficiency indicator used by the LDOE allows for objective, valid, reliable, and comparable results across LEAs in the state as the ELPT was developed using an Evidence-Centered Design (ECD) framework with test items that are aligned to the Louisiana Connectors for English Learners. The specifications are tightly linked to the definitions of evidence that stem from the ECD process which ensures its reliability and validity.
vi) School Quality or Student Success (elementary and middle schools)	The percent of students demonstrating proficiency in Science. The percent of students demonstrating proficiency in social studies assessments	Science and social studies exams are administered in grades 3-8. Like ELA and math, results from these exams are included in an Assessment indicator for elementary and middle schools.
vii) School Quality or Student Success (high schools)	The percent of students demonstrating proficiency in Science. The percent of students	Science and social studies assessments are administered once in high school and are included in the assessment component for high schools. The nationally recognized assessment component is measured by ACT® of 20+, SAT® of 1040+, Classical Learning Test of 67+, WorkKeys®

	demonstrating proficiency in social studies. Student performance on nationally recognized assessments Student preparedness for college and career acceleration	Gold or Platinum, or 59%+ on the ASVAB (AFQT). Students who are on a University diploma path are required to take one of the listed assessments other than the ASVAB or the WorkKeys® and may take one of the others. The college and career acceleration component is based on the percentage of students who earned a passing score on an acceleration examination (qualifying AP, IB, or CLEP), earned a passing grade in a dual enrollment course that qualified for college credit (and are college ready according to nationally recognized exams), participated in work-based learning or apprenticeships, earned an industry certification, or have signed up to serve in the US military or will attend a military service academy.
--	---	--

¹² Warne, R. T., Larsen, R., Anderson, B., & Odasso, A. J. (2015). *The Impact of Participation in the Advanced Placement Program on Students' College Admissions Test Scores*. The Journal of Educational Research. Accessed at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00220671.2014.917253>.

¹³ IB Continuum. Nd. *Key findings from research on the impact of IB programmes in the Americas*. Accessed at <http://www.ibo.org/globalassets/publications/ib-research/Research-IBA-en.pdf>.

¹⁴ Hanover Research. (2014). *Dual Enrollment as a Bridge to Higher Education: A Research-Driven Perspective*. Accessed at <http://www.hanoverresearch.com/2014/09/24/dual-enrollment-as-a-bridge-to-higher-education-a-research-driven-perspective/>.

¹⁵ Hyland, R. (2016). *It's Time to View Industry Credentials Through the Lens of Student Success*. The Evollution. Accessed at http://evollution.com/revenue-streams/workforce_development/its-time-to-view-industry-credentials-through-the-lens-of-student-success/.

¹⁶ Southern Regional Education Board. (2015). *Credentials for All: An Imperative for SREB States*. Accessed at <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/SREBCredentialsforAll.pdf>.

***ii) Growth Index (Academic Progress) (25 percent of elementary/middle score; 12.5 percent of high schools’ score) – Through the 2025 accountability cycle:**

Louisiana is focused on ensuring that students ultimately achieve “Mastery” on state assessments, as this level of performance signals true mastery of fundamental skills. However, two additional questions are also important to consider when evaluating schools:

- If students are not yet achieving “Mastery,” are they on track?
- Are students outperforming similar peers?

Louisiana’s new growth index will consider both questions.

Question 1: On Track to Mastery?

First, it is a goal of elementary and middle schools to have all children achieving at “Mastery” by the eighth grade and for all high schools by the tenth grade. Therefore, every student scoring below “Mastery” will receive a simple, clear growth target for the following year that illustrates the scaled score growth required to be “on track” to scoring at the “Mastery” level by eighth grade (elementary/middle schools) or tenth grade (high schools) in English language arts and in math. These clear targets will guide educator planning, but also provide parents – for the first time – with a clear, measurable, meaningful target for all students who are not yet proficient.

If students achieve the target, the school will earn 150 points, or an A+, for achieving the desired target in the growth index. However, if a student does not achieve the target, then Louisiana will consider the following second important question.

Question 2: If not on track to Mastery, are students outperforming peers with similar needs?

Using Louisiana’s value-added model, it is possible to compare students’ individual performance to that of peers – students with similar prior scores, students with similar attendance and discipline records, and even students with the same disabilities or income status where relevant.

As part of question 2, Louisiana will calculate an expected score for each student based on the characteristics described above. Then, student results will be ranked based on the degree to which individual students’ results exceeded or fell short of the expected scores. Schools will earn points based on students’ percentile rankings as compared to peers.

Student Growth Percentile	Index Points
80 to 99th percentile	150
60 to 79th percentile	115
40 to 59th percentile	85
20 to 39th percentile	25
1-19th percentile	0

How can high achieving students show growth? For students scoring Advanced (the highest possible rating) in the prior year:

- If they maintain a score of “Advanced,” the school automatically earns 150 points or an A+.
- If the student drops to “Mastery,” the school is awarded points based on the student’s performance compared to similar peers (Question 2).

For students scoring “Mastery” in the prior year:

- If the student scores “Advanced,” the school earns 150 points or an “A+”.
- If the student maintains a score of “Mastery,” but is on track to score “Advanced” by eighth grade (elementary/middle schools) or tenth grade (high schools), the school earns 150 points.
- If the student scores below “Mastery,” the school is awarded points based on the student’s performance compared to similar peers (Question 2).

For students scoring Mastery in the current year, schools will earn up to 150 points, but no fewer than 85 points in the progress index, including students who score in the 1st to 39th percentiles of the value-added model.

The growth of all individual students will be averaged together – across two years – to calculate the final growth index which counts for 25 percent of the overall elementary/middle school score and 12.5 percent of the overall high school score.

In addition, to ensure that all schools have an opportunity to demonstrate academic growth of students, if a school ends at 3rd grade, for purposes of calculating a progress index, that school will be paired with the school that most of its students attend next in order to receive a progress index.

Although Louisiana schools will continue to receive one official school letter grade that is inclusive of growth, the LDE will annually report, for informational purposes, a school letter grade equivalent based on achievement and also one based on growth. This additional reporting was requested by stakeholders who expressed the importance of parents, educators, and the public being able to easily understand the school’s overall achievement and as well as progress over time.

Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle:

Growth Indicator (Academic Progress)

Louisiana is focused on ensuring that students ultimately achieve “Mastery” on state assessments, as this level of performance signals true mastery of fundamental skills.

However, two additional questions are also important to consider when evaluating schools:

- Are all students growing?
- Are schools successfully growing the students with the greatest academic gaps?

Louisiana’s new growth index will consider both questions.

Question 1: Are all students growing?

First, it is a goal of all schools to achieve “Mastery” and for non-proficient students they are expected to grow by one half an achievement level each year. Students already demonstrating proficiency should continue to be challenged.

The growth indicator answers the question, “What percentage of students are growing?” Schools earn growth credit for each student qualifying in one of the following ways: -

- Scoring at the “Advanced” level.
- Scoring at the “Mastery” level for both the previous and current year, with the current year scaled score at least one point higher than the previous year score.
- Growing from one achievement level to a higher achievement level.
- Growing one achievement subcategory from a lower level the previous school year. The subcategory scale is determined by dividing the scale of each achievement level into two equal parts.

The percentage of students growing in ELA and math will constitute the scores for the ELA and math growth indicators, respectively.

Question 2: Are schools successfully growing the students with the greatest academic gaps?-

This indicator measures and reports how well schools address the academic needs of the students for whom those needs are the greatest.

Based on their prior year scores, the lowest-performing 25% of students in each subject, by school or district, will constitute the denominator for this component. The numerator will be the number of students who grow, measured using the same means described above. The percentage of the lowest-performing 25% students growing in ELA and math will constitute the scores for the ELA and math lowest-25 growth indicators, respectively.

This section will be removed beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle. Through the 2025 accountability cycle:

v) Interests and Opportunities Indicator (will be 5 percent of all schools’ scores beginning in 2019-2020; further details will be provided to the USDOE as the measure is developed collaboratively with stakeholders during the 2017-2018 school year)

Louisiana already has three non-academic achievement measures of school quality and student success included in its school accountability system, pursuant to ESSA. The first, the Dropout Credit Accumulation Index, applies only to schools with an eighth grade and measures credit accumulation through the ninth grade. The second, the Strength of Diploma Index measurement of credentials above and beyond the cohort graduation rate, is included in the scores of all schools with a

graduating class and provides an indicator of student participation and performance in rigorous coursework such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and dual enrollment, as well as receipt of rigorous career credentials. Third, Louisiana measures student success on science and social studies annually for grades three through eight, and through EOCs (Biology and U.S. History). In addition to these existing indicators, Louisiana will develop a measure called the Interests and Opportunities Indicator during the 2017-2018 school year in consultation with stakeholders and for consideration by USDOE in advance of implementation.

A voluminous series of rankings and reports, as well as self-reported data from Louisiana school systems, indicates that some Louisiana students have struggles not only in academic endeavors traditionally measured by the state, but also in areas important for a productive and healthy life after high school. Education should involve the development of interests, habits, and relationships that endure after high school, yet too often the opportunities for young people to develop in these ways are sparse.

The interests and opportunities indicator (five percent of each school's score) will measure whether schools are providing students with access to a well-rounded education, exposing them to diverse areas of learning in which they can develop their skills and talents, including visual and performing arts, foreign language, technology, co-curricular activities, advanced coursework, health/PE, career pathways, etc. Per BESE's motion, this will be measured through a "menu" approach that will allow districts to demonstrate a strong effort in a variety of ways. This indicator will also measure the extent to which schools are providing students the opportunity to take courses needed to successfully transition to postsecondary studies, including courses for college credit and those that lead to a recognized industry credential.

All elementary and middle settings should offer every Louisiana student access to quality visual and performing arts,¹⁷ foreign language instruction,¹⁸ technology consistent with current standards,¹⁹ and a variety of co-curricular activities (academic, athletic, and special interest clubs), all of which are supported by research-based evidence.

High schools should offer all Louisiana students access to all courses required for receiving TOPS University and TOPS Tech scholarships, a variety of statewide Jump Start training pathways leading to advanced credentials, or an associate's degree aligned to top-demand occupations.

A workgroup comprised of superintendents, principals, educators, practitioners, and experts will provide 2025 goals for this component and will identify fair ways of measuring access to these quality student experiences. Louisiana's Accountability Commission will use the programmatic and curricular expertise of the workgroup to propose a method for scoring these desired outcomes for all schools. BESE will approve the measure in advance of the 2019-2020 school year.

¹⁷ American Institutes for Research. (2016). Arts Integration: A Promising Approach to Improving Early Learning. Accessed at <http://www.wolftrap.org/~media/files/pdf/education/arts-integ-brief-2016-final.pdf?la=en>.

¹⁸ American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2015). Studies Supporting Increased Academic Achievement.

Accessed at <https://www.actfl.org/advocacy/what-the-research-shows/studies-supporting>.

¹⁹ U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2017). Reimagining the Role of Technology in Education: 2017 National Education Technology Plan Update. Accessed at tech.ed.gov/files/2017/01/NETP17.pdf

Based on stakeholder feedback, the LDE will adhere to the following timeline for implementation:

- Summer 2017: Convene workgroup
- 2017-2018: Collect all data necessary
- Summer 2018: Outline pilot index for measuring success
- 2018-2019: Pilot interests and opportunities indicator for all schools; report publicly with no consequences; BESE approves measure
- 2019-2020: Interests and opportunities indicator included in school performance scores

B. Subgroups.

- i. List the subgroups of students from each major and racial ethnic group in the State, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2), and, as applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students used in the accountability system.

Louisiana's major student subgroups include those who are economically disadvantaged (71%), identified as white (45%), identified as black/African American (43%), have disabilities (12%), identified as Hispanic/Latino (6%), are English learners (3%), identified as homeless (2.3%), and are military-affiliated (reporting to begin in 2017-2018).

- ii. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedure for including former children with disabilities in the children with disabilities subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data based on State assessment results under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of the ESEA and as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(b), including the number of years the State includes the results of former children with disabilities.

Louisiana has not included students formerly classified as a student with a disability in its "students with disabilities" subgroups. However, beginning in 2017-2018 and beyond, Louisiana will include any student currently classified as having a disability and any student formerly classified as having a disability (in any of the prior two years) in the overall subgroup.

- iii. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedure for including former English learners in the English learner subgroup for purposes of calculating any indicator that uses data based on State assessment results under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) of the ESEA and as described in 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(1), including the number of years the State includes the results of former English learners.

The LEP subgroup will include former LEP students for two years after they are no longer considered LEP according to state regulations. These two years coincide with the two years that students are monitored after they exit LEP status. These students will not count toward the minimum

“n” for the LEP subgroup.

iv. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:

- ☐ Exception under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(3)(i) or
- ☐ Exception under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(3)(ii) or
- ☐ Exception under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(c)(4)(i)(B). If selected, provide a description of the uniform procedure in the box below.

C. Minimum Number of Students.

- i. Provide the minimum number of students for purposes of accountability that the State determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a).

Through the 2025 accountability cycle:

Louisiana will continue with its minimum “n” of ten students for reporting subgroups of students, as has been the practice in Louisiana historically and as has been long-approved per Louisiana’s accountability workbook and Louisiana’s ESEA waiver. An n-size of 10 for subgroup protects the confidentiality of students and, at the same time, includes a majority of the students in subgroup accountability. In order to receive a subgroup performance score, a school must have in the subgroup a minimum of 10 students included in each index included in the school’s overall performance score calculation.

Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle, Louisiana will utilize a minimum “n” of fifteen students for reporting subgroups of students. An n-size of 15 for subgroup protects the confidentiality of students and, at the same time, includes a majority of the students in subgroup accountability. In order to receive a subgroup performance score, a school must have in the subgroup a minimum of 15 students included in at least one indicator included in the school’s overall performance score calculation.

Below is a table summarizing the number of students in each subgroups and what percent of students that would not receive a subgroup score because the number of students in the subgroup is below 15.

- ii. If the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for purposes of accountability, provide that number consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(2)(iv).

Not applicable

- iii. Describe how the State's minimum number of students meets the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1)-(2);

Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle, an n-size of 15 for subgroup protects the confidentiality of students and, at the same time, includes a majority of the students in subgroup accountability.

- iv. Describe how other components of the statewide accountability system, such as the State's uniform procedure for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), interact with the minimum number of students to affect the statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data and to ensure the maximum inclusion of all students and each subgroup of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.16(a)(2);

Louisiana does not use averaging to calculate or report subgroup performance.

Although the use of a low minimum number assures that a greater percentage of students are included in accountability, it does risk a higher standard of error. However, the consequences attached to subgroup performance require two or more years of low performance, which lowers the risk of over- or under-identifying schools with low-performance.

- v. Describe the strategies the State uses to protect the privacy of individual students for each purpose for which disaggregated data is required, including reporting under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and the statewide accountability system under section 1111(c) of the ESEA;

Louisiana employs disclosure avoidance techniques whereby all subgroup data tied to assessment and performance are suppressed. Counts representing less than 10 students are identified by a <10 and subsequent cells of disaggregated data will be redacted. Additionally, Louisiana will utilize complementary suppression when the number that has been suppressed can be calculated using other information in the row or column.

- vi. Provide information regarding the number and percentage of all students and students in each subgroup described in 4.B.i above for whose results schools would not be held accountable under the State's system for annual meaningful differentiation of schools required by 34 C.F.R. § 200.18;

Nearly all (99%+) small school populations are included in the accountability system. Just 15 school sites were excluded in 2015-2016 and 13 in 2014-2015 due to insufficient data.

Furthermore, even if a subgroup cannot be reported because it represents fewer than 10 students, all students from that subgroup are still included in the overall accountability result. The students who are identified in the table below from the 2015-2016 school year were excluded only for subgroup calculations due to privacy concerns, but were included in the overall school scores.

	Total Participants	Number Excluded from Subgroup Reporting ONLY (Students were still included in the overall school score)	Percent Excluded
All Students	348,502	1,626	0.5%
White	160,373	989	0.6%
African American	153,414	1,514	1.0%
Hispanic	19,932	2,493	12.5%
Native American	2,415	501	20.7%
Asian	25,130	1,628	6.5%
Students with Disabilities	38,606	1,011	2.6%
Limited English Proficient	9,201	2,115	23.0%
Economically Disadvantaged	249,622	1,499	0.6%

Beginning with the publication of school performance scores for the 2018-2019 school year, scores will be calculated for every school with 120 units or approximately 30 students, unless the school is subject to the state's modified accountability formula for alternative schools for state accountability purposes only.

Nearly all small school populations are included in the accountability system. Even if a subgroup cannot be reported because it represents fewer than 15 students, all students from that subgroup are still included in the overall accountability result. The students who are identified in the table below from the 2023-2024 school year were excluded only for subgroup calculations due to privacy concerns, but were included in the overall school scores.

	Total Participants	Number Excluded from Subgroup Reporting ONLY (Students were still included in the overall school score)	Percent Excluded
All Students	512338	625	0.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	367150	623	0.2%
White	219537	2075	0.9%

Black or African American	209464	1487	0.7%
Students with Disabilities	67408	1709	2.5%
Hispanic/Latino	54592	4844	8.9%
English Learner	29006	4190	14.4%
Asian	8586	3739	43.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2811	1480	52.7%

- vii. If an SEA proposes a minimum number of students that exceeds 30, provide a justification that explains how a minimum number of students provided in 4.C above promotes sound, reliable accountability determinations, including data on the number and percentage of schools in the State that would not be held accountable in the system of annual meaningful differentiation under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18 for the results of students in each subgroup in 4.B.i above using the minimum number proposed by the State compared to the data on the number and percentage of schools in the State that would not be held accountable for the results of students in each subgroup if the minimum number of students is 30.

Not Applicable.

D. Annual Meaningful Differentiation. Describe the State’s system for annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, including public charter schools, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12 and 200.18.

Through the 2025 accountability cycle:

Louisiana’s ESSA draft framework proposes three critical shifts in the design of the accountability system.

1. Ensuring an “A” in Louisiana’s letter grade system signals mastery of fundamental skills. This will be achieved by raising expectations for what is required in order for a school to earn “A”-level points based on student achievement and attainment.
2. Adjusting school rating calculations to value more the progress of every individual child, including (a) measuring whether students are on a path to master fundamental skills; and (b) measuring how effectively students are advancing relative to their peers. This growth index will

replace the current progress point system.

3. Adding an Interests and Opportunities measure the extent to which each school is supporting a well-rounded education (five percent of score).

Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle:

Louisiana’s ESSA draft framework proposes three critical shifts in the design of the accountability system.

1. Ensuring an “A” in Louisiana’s letter grade system signals mastery of fundamental skills by removing credit for non-proficient outcomes.
2. Adjusting school rating calculations to more highly value the progress of every individual child, including measuring whether students are on a path to master fundamental skills
3. Objectively measuring and reporting the degree to which students are prepared for postsecondary success.

For Elementary and Middle schools, the total number of components available is nine. For High schools, the total number of components available is twelve. The chart below outlines all federal measures, by category and by school type. The fractions in the chart are estimates of how much each federal measure is weighted, assuming sufficient data for all components, in the performance score for a school. Required indicators have both substantial and significant weighting within the formula.

	<i>Beginning in 2025-2026</i>		
Federal Measure	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
Academic Achievement	2/9 The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in English Language Arts The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in Mathematics	2/9 The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in English Language Arts The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in Mathematics	2/12 The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in English Language Arts The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in Mathematics

Other Academic Indicator	4/9 The percent of students growing in English Language Arts/□ The percent of students growing in Mathematics English Language Arts growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students Math growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students	4/9 The percent of students growing in English Language Arts The percent of students growing in Mathematics English Language Arts growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students Math growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students	4/12 The percent of students growing in English Language Arts The percent of students growing in Mathematics English Language Arts growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students Math growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students
Graduation Rate	N/A	N/A T	1/12 High school Graduation Rate
English Language Proficiency	1/9 The percent of English Learners making progress in English Language Acquisition	1/9 The percent of English Learners making progress in English Language Acquisition	1/12 The percent of English Learners making progress in English Language Acquisition
School Quality or Student Success	2/9 Science and social studies assessments as measured by the percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in Science and in Social Studies	2/9 Science and social studies assessments as measured by the percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in Science and in Social Studies	4/12 The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in science and in social studies Student performance on nationally

			recognized assessments Student preparedness for college and career acceleration
--	--	--	---

Describe the following information with respect to the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation:

- i. The distinct and discrete levels of school performance, and how they are calculated, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(2) on each indicator in the statewide accountability system;

Through the 2025 accountability cycle:

See below for a chart outlining all measures, by category and by school type:

	Beginning in 2017-2018		
Indicator	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
Academic Achievement	50% ELA/math (see Assessment Index below)	46.67% ELA/math (see Assessment Index below)	20.83% ELA/math and growth (see Assessment Index and Growth Index below)
Other Academic Indicator	25% growth (see Growth Index below)	25% growth (see Growth Index below)	N/A
Graduation Rate	N/A	N/A	41.67% (see Graduation Index and Strength of Diploma Index below)

ELP Measure	ELP is its own measure but weight comes from relationship to academic content assessments. Because content assessments are substantially weighted via the academic achievement indicator, so too is the ELP measure. (see ELP section below)	ELP is its own measure but weight comes from relationship to academic content assessments. Because content assessments are substantially weighted via the academic achievement indicator, so too is the ELP measure. (see ELP section below)	ELP is its own measure but weight comes from relationship to academic content assessments. Because content assessments are substantially weighted via the academic achievement indicator, so too is the ELP measure. (see ELP index below)
Student Success	25% for science and social studies (see Assessment Index below)	28.33% total (23.33% for science and social studies; 5% for dropout/credit accumulation (DCAI)) (see Assessment Index and DCAI below)	37.5% total (4.17% for science and social studies EOCs; 25% for ACT/WorkKeys; 8.33% for Strength of Diploma credentials) (see Assessment Index, ACT/WorkKeys and Strength of Diploma below)

Elementary/Middle School Assessment Index and High School End-of-Course Assessment Index (Including English Language Proficiency with equal, substantial weight equal to that of the content assessment weights; see below for more details)

Recognizing Louisiana’s lingering challenges, the state will continue the practice of weighting English language arts and math assessments twice, and weighting science and social students once in grades 3-8 for all students.²⁰ The Assessment Index comprises:

- 75 percent of elementary school scores (50 percent Academic Achievement [ELA and math], 25 percent Student Success [science and social studies]);
- 70 percent of middle school scores (46.67 percent Academic Achievement [ELA and math], 23.33 percent Student Success [science and social studies]); and
- 12.5 percent of high school scores (8.33 percent Academic Achievement [ELA and math]; 4.17 percent Student Success [science and social studies]).

The Assessment Index awards a graduated scale of points, beginning at level 3 (Basic), such that an “A” school is one that is on track to meet Louisiana’s long-term goal of students scoring level 4 (“Mastery” or above).

In April, the LDE will develop a base of research and facts regarding the use of high school science and social studies assessments, specifically U.S. History and Biology, as factors in graduating from high school and in evaluating school performance. This research will consider practices nationally

and internationally and evidence based on research of course assessments. The LDE will then facilitate focus groups with science and social studies teachers, high school principals, district administrators, and higher education leaders at which the fact base will be discussed. Lessons gleaned from both processes will inform formal recommendations to BESE regarding the continuation, discontinuation, or modification of end-of-course assessments at the board's June 2017 meetings.

Louisiana will include a measure of English learner progress towards English language proficiency beginning in 2018-2019 as outlined in more detail later in this section. Louisiana uses a consistent averaging method across all schools, and the assessment index can (and is) disaggregated by subgroup.

Achievement Level	2016-2017 Index	2017-2018 Index and beyond
Advanced / Level 5	150	150
Mastery / Level 4	125	100
Basic / Level 3	100	80
Approaching Basic / Level 2	0	0
Unsatisfactory / Level 1	0	0

When calculating the K-8 assessment index for the 2018-2019 school year, either the 2016-2017 or 2018-2019 science assessment index, whichever yields the higher school performance score, will be used as the science component of the overall assessment index and will be weighed by the 2018-2019 science assessment index tested population in order to limit the impact of population changes from prior years.²¹

²⁰ Schools receive a zero for any instance of nonparticipation thereby ensuring the required participation rates.

²¹ An averaging approach will be used for purposes of federal accountability.

Progress to English Language Proficiency

Louisiana is committed to:

- (a) measuring the progress to English language proficiency for ALL students who are English learners, and
- (b) to reporting publicly English learner performance for ALL schools with 10 or more students in the subgroup.

Louisiana's plan ensures a substantial weight for the EL indicator, and further ensures accountability for all EL students, thereby going above and beyond the legal requirements regarding the measurement of English language proficiency.

How does accountability for English language proficiency work in Louisiana?

- 1. Every English learner is included in the school performance score – whether the school serves one or 500 English learners.
- 2. Every English learner's performance on the English language proficiency exam counts in equal weight to all other exams – English language arts, math, science, and social studies.

3. Every school with at least 10 English learners has the performance of English learners reported separately from the rest of the school, in addition to the school performance score which already includes English learner results in equal weight to core academic exams.

Following the first administration of English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT) in 2017-2018, Louisiana will create a concordance table between the previous assessment (ELDA) levels and the new ELPT assessment levels in order to establish student-level targets on the new assessment. Student-level targets will vary based on students' baseline proficiency level, with a maximum of seven years to reach proficiency and fewer years for students with a higher baseline aligned to the state-determined timeline defined in A.4.iii.c.1.

English learners achieve English language proficiency when they are able to demonstrate language skills at a level sufficient to participate in and learn from grade-level instruction, communication and activities in each of the four language domains (Listening Speaking, Reading and Writing). This is defined as achieving scores of Level 4 or 5 on all four language domains on ELPT.

The progress to English language proficiency indicator used by the LDE allows for objective, valid, reliable, and comparable results across LEAs in the state as the ELPT was developed using an Evidence-Centered Design (ECD) framework with test items that are aligned to the Louisiana Connectors for English Learners. The specifications are tightly linked to the definitions of evidence that stem from the ECD process which ensures its reliability and validity.

EL student progress on ELPT for all EL students will be measured and included in school accountability across all LEAs and the SEA for the first time in 2018-2019. Schools will earn up to 150 points in the elementary/middle school and high school assessment indices for each English learner who meets exit criteria and/or meets or exceeds his or her student-level performance target. All ELs in all grades are included in the calculation, regardless of N size. In other words, the assessment index calculation will be as follows:

$$\text{Assessment Index} = \frac{\text{All Academic \& ELP Test Units} \times \text{Academic \& ELP Points Earned}}{\text{Total Academic \& ELP Test Units}}$$

The ELP indicator will be weighted by six such that it is equal to the weight of all academic units (ELA x2, math x2, science, and social studies) to ensure proportional representation for English learners. For example, if 100 percent of students in a school were English learners, the progress to ELP indicator would make up half of the total Assessment Index.

A key difference between ELA and math (and other assessments) is that ELs will be included in the all students group irrespective of whether or not there are a sufficient number of ELs to create a separate subgroup. Using an EL progress index included as a separate weighting step excludes all EL progress in schools that do not meet the minimum N because there is no All Students group as a

fallback option. By including the EL progress indicator directly into the academic indicator (assessment index), ELs will be included in every case in the All Student calculations. Given that the majority of schools do not meet the minimum (fewer than one-third) including EL progress ensures that all EL progress is monitored and counted towards a schools overall monitoring.

Minimum N size would cause the majority schools to be excluded from EL progress monitoring. Also, attempting to reduce the minimum N sufficiently to include as many schools as possible decreases the reliability and stability of the index and risks student privacy, especially as Louisiana's n-size is already 10. Including EL progress directly into academic achievement increases the overall number of assessments used in that indicator, increasing both the reliability and stability. It also ensures that EL is included at the maximum weight.

Including EL progress directly into academic achievement explicitly places the importance of EL progress assessment results on par with ELA and mathematics assessments as EL progress results contribute equally to other assessments in the calculation.

Additionally, so long as the minimum n-size is reached (10), EL performance will be reported directly on the school report card to identify a line item for EL progress. This would be the same as if results were calculated in separate indices.

Directly including EL progress within the Assessment Index ensures the ELP indicator is substantially weighted within the formula and all English learners are included, as well as ensuring the EL representation is commensurate with the proportion of ELs in the school. In contrast, a separate index would only in rare cases be equal to the proportion of ELs in a school. Using a separate index, when the number of ELs is below the minimum N, the weight is zero. Additionally, when the number of ELs results in their representation being greater than the weight of the separate index, EL representation in the overall model will be less than the proportion of ELs in the school. Including EL progress within the Assessment Index as proposed creates a continuous weighting scheme from zero ELs to 100 percent ELs.

The following is an example of the EL calculation. Points are awarded as follows:

1. Award index points for each core academic assessment score based on the achievement level, and to each English language proficiency (ELP) assessment score based on progress from the baseline.
2. Weight each subject index score by the table below. **ELP is weighted by six such that it is equivalent to the number of core academic assessment units for each student who is an English learner.**
3. Sum all weighted index scores and divide by the sum of all weights applied from the table.

Area	Unit Weight
Core academic content (ELA x 2, Math x 2, science and social studies)	6
English language proficiency	6

Example School A:

- School A has 100 total students, 50 of whom are ELs.
- All 100 students will take all core academic content tests, weighted at six units per student ($100 \times 6 = 600$). The 50 ELs will also have an ELP measure, weighted six times per EL student ($50 \times 6 = 300$).
- The total number of test units is 600 content tests + 300 ELP tests = 900 total tests. Thus, ELs make up two-thirds of the total assessment index ($[(300 \text{ core academic (33\%)} + 300 \text{ ELP (33\%)}) / 900 = 67\%$).
- ELP results make up one-third of the assessment index ($300 \text{ ELP results} / 900 = 33\%$).

Example School B:

- School B has 100 total students, 9 of whom are ELs. ELP results are included in the calculation but not reported separately because the n-size is less than 10.
- All 100 students will take all core academic content tests, weighted at six units per student ($100 \times 6 = 600$). The 9 ELs will also have an ELP measure, weighted six times per EL student ($9 \times 6 = 54$).
- The total number of test units is 600 content tests + 54 ELP tests = 654 total tests. Thus, ELs make up 16.5% of the total assessment index ($[(54 \text{ core academic tests (8.25\%)} + 54 \text{ ELP (8.25\%)}) / 654 = 16.5\%$).
- ELP results make up 8.3% of the assessment index ($54 \text{ ELP results} / 654 = 8.3\%$).

Progress to English Language Proficiency

English language proficiency progress results will be calculated but not included in 2018-2019 school performance scores. However, as required by ESSA, performance on the English language proficiency progress measure will be used for the purposes of identifying schools requiring comprehensive intervention in 2019-2019.

For the purpose of measuring progress on the ELPT assessment, overall proficiency scores will be

organized into five levels.

- a. Emerging: All domain scores are 1 or 2.
- b. Progressing 1: At least one domain score of 3 and the lowest domain score is 1.
- c. Progressing 2: At least one domain score of 3 and the lowest domain score is 2.
- d. Progressing 3: At least one domain score of 3 and the lowest domain score is 3.
- e. Transitioning: All domain scores are 4 or 5.

Each English learner's expected trajectory to proficiency will be determined as follows, both through and beyond the 2025 SPS calculation.

- a. The initial proficiency level for each English learner will be determined based on the ELPT assessment results from the school year in which the student was first enrolled in a Louisiana public school and participated in the ELPT assessment.
- b. If a student exits the United States for one or more school years following the initial ELPT assessment and later re-enrolls in Louisiana, the student will be considered a new student for the purposes of determining the initial proficiency level.
- c. For students first identified in grades PK-5, the initial ELPT proficiency level and number of years identified, as defined in the table below, will be used.

Trajectory to English Language Proficiency: Students First Identified in Grades PK-5				
Initial ELPT Proficiency Level	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5 & Beyond
Emerging (E)	P1	P2	P3	T
Progressing 1 (P1)	P2	P3	T	T
Progressing 2 (P2)	P3	T	T	T
Progressing 3 (P3)	T	T	T	T
Transitioning (T)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

For students first identified in grades 6-12, the initial ELPT proficiency level and number of years identified, as defined in the table below, will be used.

Trajectory to English Language Proficiency: Students First Identified in Grades 6-12						
Initial ELPT Proficiency Level	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7 & Beyond
Emerging (E)	P1	P2	P2	P3	P3	T
Progressing 1 (P1)	P2	Pe	T	T	T	T
Progressing 2 (P2)	P3	T	T	T	T	T
Progressing 3 (P3)	T	T	T	T	T	T
Transitioning (T)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

An ELPT score exceeds the trajectory if it is at least one level higher than expected and meets the trajectory if it is the same level as expected based on the tables above.

The level of progress on the ELPT assessment will be included in the K-8 Assessment Index for each English learner according to the table below.

ELPT Progress Assessment Index Points	
Outcome	ELP Index Points
ELPT level exceeds trajectory	150
ELPT level meets trajectory	100
ELPT level is at least one above the prior year	80
ELPT level is the same or lower than the prior year	0

ACT/WorkKeys Index

As part of its high school Student Success indicators, Louisiana measures the college and career readiness of all students by requiring access to the ACT for all juniors in Louisiana. Additionally, students may take the WorkKeys. Students' highest results through their grade 12 year are included in the school's ACT/WorkKeys index – worth 25 percent of all high school scores.

Louisiana uses a consistent averaging method across all schools, and the ACT/WorkKeys index can (and is) disaggregated by subgroup.

ACT Composite/WorkKeys	2016-2017 Index	2017-2018 Index and beyond
0-17	0	0
18/Silver	100	70.0
19	102.8	80.0
20	105.6	90.0
21	108.4	100.0
22	111.2	103.4
23	114	106.8
24/Gold	116.8	110.2
25	119.6	113.6
26	122.4	117.0
27	125.2	120.4
28	128	123.8
29	130.8	127.2
30	133.6	130.6

31/Platinum	136.4	134.0
32	139.2	137.4
33	142	140.8
34	144.8	144.2
35	147.6	147.6
36	150.4	150

Dropout/Credit Accumulation Index

The transition from middle school to high school is of great importance to reducing students' likelihood to dropout and increasing their likelihood to graduate on time.²¹ Therefore, as part of its student success indicator for middle schools, schools with an eighth grade are held accountable for the successful transition of students to high school, as measured by Carnegie credits earned through the end of ninth grade. This measure, used since 2013, is worth only five percent of middle school scores but it encourages thoughtful transition planning across schools and further encourages middle schools to offer credit-bearing courses earlier. Louisiana uses a consistent averaging method across all schools, and the Dropout/Credit Accumulation Index can (and is) disaggregated by subgroup.

9th Grade Credits Earned	2016-2017 Index	2017-2018 Index and beyond
7 or more	150	150
6.5	150	125
6	150	100
5.5	125	75
5	100	50
4.5	75	25
4 or less	50	0
3rd year 8th grader	25	0
Dropout	0	0

Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle:

Achieve Indicators

The Achieve Indicators answer the question, “What percentage of students are proficient in each of the core content areas?”

LEAP assessments in grade 3-8 and high school, along with literacy and numeracy screening in kindergarten through grade 2, are administered to all students. Each content area indicator is equally weighted, resulting in measures of core content proficiency constituting over 44% of elementary and middle school school performance scores, and over 33% of high school

performance scores. More heavily weighting proficiency in the formula will communicate high prioritization of content mastery for all students.

Progress to English Language Proficiency

Louisiana is committed to:

- (a) measuring the progress to English language proficiency for ALL students who are English learners, and
- (b) to reporting publicly English learner performance for ALL schools with 15 or more students in the subgroup.

How does accountability for English language proficiency work in Louisiana?

1. Every English learner's performance on the English language proficiency exam counts in equal weight to all other exams – English language arts, math, science, and social studies.
2. Every school with at least 15 English learners has the performance of English learners reported separately from the rest of the school, in addition to the school performance score which already includes English learner results in equal weight to core academic exams.

English learners achieve English language proficiency when they are able to demonstrate language skills at a level sufficient to participate in and learn from grade-level instruction, communication and activities in each of the four language domains (Listening Speaking, Reading and Writing). This is defined as achieving scores of Level 4 or 5 on all four language domains on ELPT.

The progress to English language proficiency indicator used by the LDE allows for objective, valid, reliable, and comparable results across LEAs in the state as the ELPT was developed using an Evidence-Centered Design (ECD) framework with test items that are aligned to the Louisiana Connectors for English Learners. The specifications are tightly linked to the definitions of evidence that stem from the ECD process which ensures its reliability and validity.

EL student progress on ELPT for all EL students will be measured and included in school accountability across all LEAs and the SEA for the first time in 2018-2019. The score for the English Learner Proficiency indicator will be the percentage of English Learners achieving or making progress toward proficiency with the English language by meeting or exceeding their growth trajectory.

Cohort Graduation Rate Index

As one of two methods for measuring graduation for high schools, the cohort graduation rate index measures the percentage of the cohort graduating in four years, per federal rule and consistent across all schools. Through the 2025 accountability cycle, it is included as 25 percent of the score for high

schools. The points awarded based on cohort graduation rates are such that schools must be on track to Louisiana’s long-term goal in order to earn an “A”. The cohort graduation rate index can (and is) disaggregated by subgroup.

Cohort Graduation Rate	2017-2018 through 2024-2025 (100 = 90%)
0-75%	CGR × 0.9
76-90%	CGR x 1.111112
91-100%	+5 points per percent increase (91=105, 92=110)

²¹Allensworth, E. M. & Easton, J. Q. (2007). *What Matters for Staying On-Track and Graduating in Chicago Public High Schools: A Close Look at Course Grades, Failures, and Attendance in the Freshman Year*. Consortium on Chicago School Research at The University of Chicago. Accessed at <https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/07%20What%20Matters%20Final.pdf>.

Students with disabilities pursuing a diploma through traditional TOPS University or Jump Start Career Pathways are factored into the accountability system based on the same criteria and with the same weights as their non-disabled peers, and students assessed using the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 (LAA 1) are included in the graduation index for the year in which they graduated or the year in which they exited, whichever is first.

Through the 2025 accountability cycle:

Strength of Diploma Index

The strength of diploma index (25 percent total) measures not just whether a student receives a diploma, but the strength of the diploma received. It informs two indicators for high school -- Graduation Rate (16.67 percent) and Student Success (8.33 percent), as 100 out of 150 points are awarded based on whether a student graduates on time, as measured by cohort, and the remaining 50 points (101 to 150) are awarded based on credentials. For example, graduating having passed an AP exam indicates a much greater likelihood of success in postsecondary.²²

Louisiana uses a consistent averaging method across all schools, and the strength of diploma index can (and is) disaggregated by subgroup.

Cohort Graduation Outcomes	Index Points
HS Diploma plus Associate’s Degree	160
HS Diploma plus (a) Passing AP/IB/CLEP score OR (b) Advanced statewide Jump Start credential *Students achieving both (a) and (b) will generate 160 points.	150
HS Diploma plus (a) At least one passing course grade for TOPS core curriculum credit of the following type: AP, college credit, dual enrollment, or IB OR (b) Basic statewide Jump Start credential *Students achieving both (a) and (b) will generate 115 points.	110 67
Five-year graduate (HS Diploma) with Associate’s Degree	150
Four-year graduate	100
HS Diploma earned through pathway for students assessed on the LAA1	100
Five-year graduate with any diploma *Five-year graduates who earn a passing AP/IB/CLEP score will generate 140 points	75
Single semester with a passing grade	50

²¹ Murphy, D. & Dodd, B. (2009). *A Comparison of College Performance of Matched AP® and Non-AP Student Groups*. CollegeBoard. Accessed at <https://research.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/publications/2012/7/researchreport-2009-6-comparison-college-performance-matched-ap-non-ap-student-groups.pdf>.

Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle:

Nationally Recognized Assessment Indicator

The nationally recognized assessment indicator reports success with an objective measure of postsecondary readiness. Students earn credit for this indicator by achieving one of the following:

- ACT composite score consistent with the Taylor Opportunity Program for Students scholarship requirement in Louisiana Revised Statute 17:5024 but not lower than 20;
- Classical Learning Test score of 67 or higher;
- SAT score of 1040 or higher;
- WorkKeys score of Gold; or
- ASVAB AFQT of 59% or higher.

The percentage of graduation cohort members earning one of the above constitutes the score for this indicator.

Acceleration Indicator

The acceleration indicator reports the extent to which schools are setting up students for success with postsecondary pursuits through an experience. The score for this indicator is determined by the percentage of graduation cohort members earning acceleration credit through one of the following pathways.

- University acceleration pathway - earn a college ready score on a nationally recognized assessment and one or more of the following:
 - Minimum of six college credits with a grade of C or better in one or more academic dual enrollment courses;
 - Score of 3 or higher on an AP exam;
 - Score of 4 or more on an IB exam;
 - ACT mathematics sub-score of 25 or higher or SAT mathematics sub-score of 590 or higher;
 - ACT English sub-score of 26 or higher or SAT Writing and Language score of 33 or higher; or

- Three CLEP exams with course enrollment and a minimum score recognized by the Louisiana Board of Regents flagship university for college credit.
- Career acceleration pathway - earn one or more of the following:
 - Two years of fully aligned Fast Forward registered apprenticeship;
 - Industry based credential or bundle of credentials determined to be of high value by the Louisiana Workforce Commission in addition to completion of a work-based learning experience in alignment with state policy; or
 - Certificate of technical studies in a high-wage, high-demand industry.
- Military acceleration pathway - earn one of the following:
 - Signed letter of commitment to military service or
 - Acceptance to a military service academy.

The acceleration credit pathways are independent of diploma type and represent the range of opportunities available to well-prepared students following high school. High-quality work-based learning opportunities are not yet widely available to all Louisiana students, although the business and industry community in the state has expressed a need for and commitment to expansion of work-based learning statewide. The accountability formula accounts for this by acknowledging the present state of availability and incentivizing expedited expansion of quality programming for students. In the initial year of the indicator, work-based learning experience will be optional for students earning career acceleration through an industry-based credential. However, for schools in which at least 25% of career acceleration students do complete a work-based learning experience, a 5-point incentive will be added to the acceleration indicator score. The expectation will increase by 5% each year until it reaches 65%, at which time the incentive will expire and work-based learning will be required for the IBC qualification route to earning career acceleration credit.

In selecting the student outcomes to comprise each acceleration pathway, consideration was given to whether the outcome represents a valid means of demonstrating that a student is ready to be successful in post-secondary pursuits. Regardless of whether a student plans to pursue college, embark on a career, or serve our nation through the military, a tangible demonstration of success is required for schools to earn credit for this indicator. Taking into account the different ways in which students earn college transfer credit, a variety of options were included based on the requirements of Louisiana's flagship university to be counted successful as a university accelerator. To earn career accelerator credit, students must demonstrate proficiency in a skill associated with a high-wage, high-demand industry in Louisiana, often accompanied by a supervised work-based learning experience. The Louisiana Workforce Commission serves as the designator of quality for credentials, approving some credentials for advanced status and approving other credentials in bundles vetted through industry partners as valuable in a variety of economic sectors. Finally, for the first time, Louisiana acknowledges through its accountability system the value of preparedness for military service, which requires meeting specific requirements according to the branch of service.

By differentiating opportunities to demonstrate readiness while still requiring a tangible means of demonstrating success, the acceleration pathways acknowledge the array of opportunities available to well-prepared students following a quality secondary education. All students in the graduation cohort each year will be considered for this indicator, and results for subgroups as well as pathways will provide the public with a transparent means of understanding the degree to which schools are preparing students for postsecondary success.

Academic Growth

Through the 2025 accountability cycle:

Louisiana will measure student growth on English Language Arts and math assessments in grades 3-10 using the growth index methodology previously described. The Growth Index will count as the Other Academic Indicator (25 percent of the score) for elementary and middle schools, and within the Academic Achievement Indicator or 12.5 percent of the score for high schools.

Louisiana uses a consistent averaging method across all schools, and the growth can (and will be) disaggregated by subgroup. Points are awarded as follows:

Student Growth	Points Awarded
Advanced (Level 5) in current and prior year	150
Mastery (Level 4) in prior year and current score is on track to reach Advanced by 8th grade (elementary/middle schools) or 10th grade (high schools)	150
Basic (Level 3) or below in prior year and current score is on track to reach Mastery by 8th grade (elementary/middle schools) or 10th grade (high schools)	150
If student did not earn points above, points are awarded based on the student's value-added growth percentile.	
80 to 99th percentile	150
60 to 79th percentile	115
40 to 59th percentile or Mastery (Level 4) in current year and in the 1-39 th percentile on VAM	85
20 to 39th percentile	25
1-19th percentile	0

Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle:

The growth indicators answer the question, “What percentage of students are growing?” Schools earn growth credit for each student qualifying in one of the following ways:

- Scoring at the “Advanced” level.
- Scoring at the “Mastery” level for both the previous and current year, with the current year scaled score at least one point higher than the previous year score.
- Growing from one achievement level to a higher achievement level.
- Growing one achievement subcategory from the previous school year. The subcategory scale is determined by dividing the scale of each achievement level into two equal parts.

The percentage of students growing in ELA and math will constitute the scores for the ELA and math growth indicators, respectively.

The lowest-25 growth indicators measure and report how well schools address the academic needs of the students for whom those needs are the greatest. The lowest-performing 25% of students in each subject, at each grade level, in each school or district, who remain in the school and test again the following year will constitute the denominator for this component. The numerator will be the number of students who grow, measured using the same means described above. The percentage of the lowest-performing 25% students growing in ELA and math will constitute the scores for the ELA and math lowest-25 growth indicators, respectively.

Interests and Opportunities Indicator (Through the 2025 accountability cycle)

The interests and opportunities indicator will serve as Louisiana’s school quality/student success indicator and will be fully developed in advance of the 2019-2020 school year with significant stakeholder input. The specific measurement has not yet been defined. However, it will be measured consistently across all schools and will allow for disaggregation by subgroup. The Interests and Opportunities Indicator’s influence on the weightings of all other indicators will be updated prior to implementation. A five percent weight is anticipated and weightings of other measures will be adjusted accordingly in Louisiana’s updated submission to the USDOE at that time.

Alternative Education Schools

In 2019, Louisiana’s state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, following months of extensive stakeholder engagement, adopted policy revisions which established a modified state accountability formula for alternative education schools that predominantly serve students who have been suspended, expelled, dropped out and returned to school, or have self-enrolled due to extenuating life circumstances. Such formula will not be used for federal accountability purposes.

- ii. The weighting of each indicator, including how certain indicators receive substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate,

consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(b) and (c)(1)-(2).

As outlined in the chart below, the Academic Achievement indicators, the Other Academic indicators, the Graduation indicators, and ELP indicators are each given substantial weight individually. Further, together, they represent a much greater total weight than the Student Success indicator for each school type.

Indicator	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
Academic Achievement	50% ELA/math	46.67% ELA/math	20.83% ELA/math and growth
Other Academic Indicator	25% growth	25% growth	N/A
Graduation Rate	N/A	N/A	41.67%
ELP Measure	ELP is its own measure but weight comes from relationship to academic content assessments. Because content assessments are substantially weighted via the academic achievement indicator, so too is the ELP measure.	ELP is its own measure but weight comes from relationship to academic content assessments. Because content assessments are substantially weighted via the academic achievement indicator, so too is the ELP measure.	ELP is its own measure but weight comes from relationship to academic content assessments. Because content assessments are substantially weighted via the academic achievement indicator, so too is the ELP measure.
Student Success	25% for science and social studies	28.33% total (23.33% for science and social studies; 5% for dropout/credit accumulation (DCAI))	37.5% total (4.17% for science and social studies EOCs; 25% for ACT/WorkKeys; 8.33% for Strength of Diploma credentials)

When a school does not meet the minimum n-size for an indicator, the school is measured only on the available indicators (e.g., if a high school does not yet have a graduating class, they will be measured on ACT/WorkKeys and EOCs until such time that the graduation measures can be utilized).

iii. The summative determinations, including how they are calculated, that are provided to schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(a)(4).

Through the 2025 accountability cycle:

Schools receive a School Performance Score of 0-150 based on the calculations described above. School Performance Scores translate to letter grades based on the following scale.

Beginning in 2017-2018 (and through 2021)

School Performance Score	Letter Grade
90.0-150.0	A
75.0 – 89.9	B
60.0 – 74.9	C
50.0 – 59.9	D
0-49.9	F

Beginning in 2021-2022 (and through 2024)

School Performance Score	Letter Grade
95.0 – 150	A
80.0 – 94.9	B
65.0 – 79.9	C
50.0 – 64.9	D
0-49.9	F

Beginning in 2024-2025 and beyond

School Performance Score	Letter Grade
100-150	A
85-99.9	B
70-84.9	C
50-69.9	D
0-49.9	F

Going forward, local school systems will be expected to increase communications with students’ parents and the public about school performance, including the public posting of school report cards on school and district websites and advertised public meetings to discuss school performance and any improvement efforts underway.

Beginning with the 2026 accountability cycle:

Calculation of school and district performance scores is an average of the applicable indicators.

Elementary and Middle School Indicators	High School Indicators
Growth in English Language Arts (ELA) Growth in Math Growth in ELA for the lowest-performing 25% Growth in Math for the lowest-performing 25% Growth in English language proficiency Proficiency in ELA Proficiency in Math Proficiency in Science Proficiency in Social Studies	Growth in English Language Arts (ELA) Growth in Math Growth in ELA for the lowest-performing 25% Growth in Math for the lowest-performing 25% Growth in English language proficiency Proficiency in ELA Proficiency in Math Proficiency in Science Proficiency in Social Studies Graduation Rate Nationally Recognized Assessment Acceleration

Schools and districts earn letter grades based on the school and district performance scores. The target is a ten-point letter grade scale. In preparation for the implementation of the new formula, cut scores will be set using a distribution of scores simulated through fall 2024 data such that 10% of elementary schools, 10% of high schools, and 10% of districts earn an A, 20% earn a B, 40% earn a C, 20% earn a D, and 10% would earn an F if the system were fully implemented using 2024 data. These cut scores will remain in place until 50% of schools or districts on each scale earn an A or B, at which time they will increase by 5 points. This responsive increase will repeat until the ten-point scale is attained.

iv. How the system for meaningful differentiation and the methodology for identifying schools under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19 will ensure that schools with low performance on substantially weighted indicators are more likely to be identified for comprehensive support and improvement or targeted support and improvement, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(c)(3) and (d)(1)(ii).

Public School Choice

Louisiana will continue its longstanding policy of requiring LEAs to offer public school choice to schools that are F-rated (“academically unacceptable”). The LEA must notify parents of school choice options by the beginning of the school year, offering more than one choice if more than one school is eligible to receive students. The LEA must take into account the parents’ preferences among the choices offered, or the LEA may allow parents to make the final school selection decision.

Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

In Louisiana, any Title I school rated “D” or “F” in the state accountability system for three consecutive years or with an adjusted cohort graduation rate less than 67 percent in the most recent year will be classified as a comprehensive support school – labeled “comprehensive intervention required” – in a given year. This definition includes but is not limited to Title I schools. Louisiana will begin identifying schools for comprehensive support in 2017-2018.

Schools Identified for Targeted Support and Improvement

All schools demonstrating subgroup performance (those with subgroup N= 15 or higher) that is, on its own for that subgroup population, equivalent to what would be a “D” or “F” rating for an entire school population, will be identified and reported as “Urgent Intervention Needed” for that subgroup. Though no interventions will be legally required in the district’s consolidated plan, this system allows for both public and in-school awareness of needs to be addressed.

All schools having subgroup performance at the equivalent of an “F” rating for two consecutive years will be identified and reported as “Urgent Intervention Required” (Louisiana’s identification for targeted schools). Any such school that is also a Title I school will be eligible for school improvement (targeted) funds and will be required to submit a plan outlining how it intends to improve outcomes for the struggling subgroup(s) of students.

Schools will first be identified for required Urgent Intervention, or targeted support, in 2017-2018. Schools are expected to meet the exit requirements within three years. Schools that do not exit targeted support for a period of three years will be identified as requiring Comprehensive Intervention.

Substantial Weighting of Indices

The LDE is proposing an accountability system where the Academic Achievement indicators, the Other Academic Indicators, the Graduation indicators, and ELP indicators are each given substantial

weight individually. Further, together, they represent a much greater total weight than the Student Success indicator for each school type (see chart on page 59).

Schools that show low performance of these substantially weighted indicators will be significantly more likely to be identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, as they constitute the vast majority of the score from which comprehensive and targeted schools are identified.

Results of Schools to Be Identified

As Louisiana transitions to higher standards, F-rated elementary/middle schools under the 2017-2018 and beyond standards have an average of 13 percent of students scoring “Mastery” or above, and D-rated schools average 21 percent of students scoring “Mastery” or above. Students in schools rated “D” or “F” grade are often falling behind their peers, and, on average, fewer than one in four students is on track to reach “Mastery” by eighth grade.

High schools rated “F” under the 2017-2018 and beyond standards had just two percent of students scoring Excellent on the four-level EOC assessments and 42 percent of students graduated in four years. High schools rated “D” averaged seven percent of students scoring Excellent and 66 percent of students graduated on time.

- v. **Participation Rate.** Describe how the State is factoring the requirement for 95 percent student participation in assessments into its system of annual meaningful differentiation of schools consistent with the requirements of 34 C.F.R. § 200.15.

The state maintains student enrollment in a statewide student information system. In accordance with ESSA and in order to maintain a valid system of school accountability, all students who are enrolled in grades three through eight by the first week of testing are required to participate in testing. For high school, all students who complete a class for which there is an end-of-course (EOC) test must take the corresponding EOC test. All high school students must take the English II and Algebra I tests by the third year of high school enrollment. (NOTE: This will shift to the English I test for students entering high school in 2017-2018 through tests administered in the Spring of 2027). For the calculation of the school and district performance scores, when students who are required to participate in state testing fail to do so, the school receives scores of zero on all relevant indices (status and growth). The zero is factored into the calculation of the school performance score. Beginning with the 2027-2028 school year, for students who entered high school during the 2026-2027 school year and thereafter, one English and mathematics exam will be administered at the end of their second year in the high school cohort, usually 10th grade. Science and social studies will continue to be assessed through end-of-course timed examinations.

- vi. **Data Procedures.** Describe the State’s uniform procedure for averaging data, including combining data across school years, combining data across grades, or both, in a school as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.20(a), if applicable.

Louisiana does not use averaging to calculate or report subgroup performance. Averaging is only used in the calculation of the participation rate. To determine if a subgroup meets the 95 percent participation rate test, Louisiana calculates the participation rate of students within the subgroup during the current year, during the current and previous year (a two-year aggregate), and during the current year and two previous years (a three-year aggregate). The highest of the three rates is used to determine if the subgroup has met the participation criteria.

vii. **Including All Public Schools in a State's Accountability System.** If the States uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in D above for any of the following specific types of schools, describe how they are included, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.18(d)(1)(iii):

- a. Schools in which no grade level is assessed under the State's academic assessment system (e.g., P-2 schools), although the State is not required to administer a standardized assessment to meet this requirement;

Schools that have no grades assessed are paired with another school, and they receive the same school performance score and letter grade that is assigned to the paired school. Schools that open with no assessed grades, but are adding a grade level every year, are subject to accountability when they have a testing grade.

- b. Schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., P-12 schools);

Louisiana has three school types: K-8 schools (any combination of grades from K to 8), high schools (any combination of grades from 9 through 12), and combination schools (at least one grade from K-8 and one grade from high school). The combination school has a school performance score calculated for the K-8 student population and a school performance score calculated for the high school student population. These scores are combined using a weighted average, with weighting based on the percentage of the population represented in each of the two scores.

- c. Small schools in which the total number of students who can be included in any indicator under 34 C.F.R. §200.14 is less than the minimum number of students established by the State under 34 C.F.R. § 200.17(a)(1), consistent with a State's uniform procedures for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. §200.20(a), if applicable;

Schools with fewer than 40 units do not receive a publicly reported school performance score or letter grade. A unit is defined as a single subject test for assessment. A student who takes four subject tests contributes four units. Additionally, each graduation cohort member of a school counts as four units. The assessment results for these schools are reported publicly if there are at least ten students in a grade. Schools with fewer than 40 units will be identified for comprehensive or targeted

support based on the available test units. Beginning with the publication of school performance scores for the 2018-2019 school year, scores will be calculated for every school with 120 units or 30 students, unless the school is subject to the state's modified accountability formula for alternative schools. This policy will not be used for purposes of federal accountability.

- d. Schools that are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings; students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, including juvenile justice facilities; students enrolled in State public schools for the deaf or blind; and recently arrived English learners enrolled in public schools for newcomer students); and

ESSA provides an opportunity for states to reconsider the way they measure and report on the performance of alternative schools that serve traditionally disadvantaged student populations with unique needs. Quality alternative education can provide students who are struggling or who have left their traditional school an opportunity to achieve in a new learning environment. The LDE convened a study group of key external stakeholders representing local school systems, student and family advocacy organizations, student behavior and discipline experts, and juvenile justice stakeholders during spring 2017 in order to identify quality indicators of effective alternative education and to recommend accountability measures appropriate for such schools. The measures recommended and ultimately adopted by Louisiana's state education board will be used for purposes of state accountability and reporting, providing parents, educators, and the public with more nuanced information about the performance and progress of alternative schools. The state will use the same accountability system in place for all public schools for federal accountability purposes.

- e. Newly opened schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a State's uniform procedure for averaging data under 34 C.F.R. §200.20(a), if applicable, for at least one indicator (e.g., a newly opened high school that has not yet graduated its first cohort for students).

Schools receive accountability determinations in the first year of operation based on all reportable indices, so long as they have the required number of test units. For example, the high school performance score is based on four indices, which are equally weighted as 25 percent of the score; for high schools without a graduation cohort, assessments would carry greater weight in the school performance score.

4.2 Identification of Schools.

A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

- i. The methodologies, including the timeline, by which the State identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a) and (d), including: 1) lowest-performing schools; 2)

schools with low high school graduation rates; and 3) schools with chronically low-performing subgroups.

In Louisiana, any school rated “D” or “F” in the state accountability system for three consecutive years or with an adjusted cohort graduation rate less than 67 percent in the most recent year will be classified as requiring Comprehensive Intervention, making it a comprehensive support school in a given year. This Comprehensive Intervention definition includes but is not limited to Title I schools. Schools will be added to the list on an annual basis. They will first be identified in 2017-2018. Schools labeled “Urgent Intervention Required” may not earn an “A” overall letter grade. Additionally, schools that do not exit the Urgent Intervention Required category for a period of three years will be identified as needing Comprehensive Intervention. Based on 2014, 2015, and 2016 school accountability results and draft simulations of the 2018 accountability model, an estimated 17 percent of schools could be identified as needing Comprehensive Intervention.

Going forward, local school systems will be expected to increase communications with students’ parents and the public about school performance, including the public posting of school report cards that identify the school as needing comprehensive or targeted support on school and district websites. School systems will also be expected to convene public meetings to discuss improvement efforts to address the needs of schools identified as requiring comprehensive support and intervention.

- ii. The uniform statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement established by the State, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, under section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(1).

A school will have to achieve a C-rating for two consecutive years in order to be exited from comprehensive support and improvement. Schools are expected to meet the exit criteria within a period of four years; failure to do so will result in more rigorous interventions.

B. Targeted Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

- i. The State’s methodology for identifying any school with a “consistently underperforming” subgroup of students, including the definition and time period used by the State to determine consistent underperformance, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(1) and (c).

All schools having subgroup performance (those with subgroup N=10 or higher) at the equivalent of a “D” or “F” rating will be identified and reported as “Urgent Intervention Needed,” though this does not have a legal bearing on the LEA’s consolidated plan.

All schools having subgroup performance at the equivalent of an “F” rating for two consecutive years will be identified and reported as “Urgent Intervention Required” (Louisiana’s identification

for targeted schools). Any such school will be eligible for school improvement (targeted) funds, through a competitive process, and will be required to submit a plan outlining how it intends to improve outcomes for the struggling subgroup(s) of students.

Based on 2015 and 2016 school accountability results and draft simulations of the 2018 school accountability model, 7 percent to 43 percent of schools meeting the minimum N size would be identified as needing Targeted Support and Improvement.

Subgroup Identification	Students with Disabilities	Racial/Ethnic Minorities	Economically Disadvantaged	English Learners	Any Subgroup
Total Urgent Intervention Required	503	104	96	59	550
Percent Urgent Intervention Required	43%	8%	7%	23%	42%

Schools will be added to the list on an annual basis. Schools will first be identified as “Urgent Intervention Required” for 2019-2020 in the 2018-2019 school year. Schools are expected to exit targeted support within three years. Schools that do not exit this identification status for a period of three years will be identified as needing Comprehensive Intervention.

Consequences attached to subgroup performance require two or more years of low performance, which prevents over-identification or under-identification of subgroups.

- ii. The State’s methodology, including the timeline, for identifying schools with low- performing subgroups of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(2) and (d) that must receive additional targeted support in accordance with section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA.

Schools with low-performing subgroups of students will be identified annually using the methodology described above for “consistently underperforming” subgroups.

- iii. The uniform exit criteria, established by the SEA, for schools participating under Title I, Part A with low-performing subgroups of students, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.22(f).

To exit the Urgent Intervention Required category, schools must not have any subgroup scores that are performing at the equivalent of an “F” rating and must have an out-of-school suspension rate above the relevant standard for identification as needing Targeted Support and Improvement for two consecutive years. Schools must meet these criteria for a period of two years; failure to do so will result in identification for comprehensive intervention and support.

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools.

- A. School Improvement Resources.** Describe how the SEA will meet its responsibilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.24(d) under section 1003 of the ESEA, including the process to award school improvement funds to LEAs and monitoring and evaluating the use of funds by LEAs.

Louisiana will award a significant portion of the state’s seven percent set-aside to make competitive grants to LEAs with the strongest plans for school redesign according to the research standards entailed in ESSA. Each LEA with a school identified as needing Comprehensive Intervention and/or Urgent Intervention Required will submit one plan describing the goals, strategies and monitoring processes it will use to address the challenges at all of its schools identified as needing such support.

In reviewing LEA plans in order to award school improvement funds, the LDE will prioritize those that propose to partner with a proven provider that is capable of supporting improvement in the areas identified through a comprehensive needs assessment. Already, the LDE has hosted a School Redesign Summit, attended by proven non-profit operators and support organizations from across the nation, for purposes of due diligence by LEAs in Louisiana. The LDE and BESE have also already issued a series of planning grants to LEAs in the nascent phases of partner selection and plan creation. In selecting potential partners, LEAs will be expected to ensure and codify through a multi-year agreement the alignment of goals, holistic supports to be provided, clear performance metrics to determine effectiveness, and roles of each party.

Each school identified as being in need of comprehensive support and improvement will have a point of contact at the LDE—the Regional Turnaround Support Manager (RTSM). The RTSM will manage a portfolio of LEAs to monitor for effectiveness of implementation. The RTSM will be responsible for ongoing site visits, will receive ongoing reports from the school and the LEA and will monitor the improvement of students within each school designated as in need of comprehensive support.

- B. Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions.** Describe the technical assistance the SEA will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, including how it will provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure the effective implementation of evidence-based interventions, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(b), and,

if applicable, the list of State-approved, evidence-based interventions for use in schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans consistent with § 200.23(c)(2)-(3).

In school systems with a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, the LDE will support school leaders in building a plan for improvement based on unique needs. That support could include, but is not limited to, completing a comprehensive needs assessment, advising on system-wide resource allocation, identifying effective support partners, and building a plan for system-wide management of the improvement plan. The needs assessment will be based on unique school system and school profiles that will disaggregate each subgroup's performance in key academic areas. The LDE will then run a competitive grant each year to support the most promising plans to support the learning of targeted student subgroups.

As school systems develop these plans, the LDE will provide focused resources for each subgroup. This will include a framework of support for each unique subgroup, a definition of excellence within that framework, key resources to support improvements in that subgroup, and recommended high quality support providers who can help districts improve that sub-group's performance. School systems will be able to, but are not required to, leverage the tools and support providers the LDE recommends as they build their plan and submit proposals for the competitive funding opportunity.

C. More Rigorous Interventions. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii).

Louisiana initiates urgent interventions for low-performing schools and schools with low-performing student subgroups immediately after a school is identified at a specific level. Economically disadvantaged students attending C, D, and F-rated schools have the ability to enroll in the state's non-public school choice program. Students attending D and F-rated schools have access to inter- and intra-district public school choice. The state also provides an expedited state approval process for high-quality charter schools to open and begin serving students in D and F-rated districts.

Beginning with a school's identification as needing comprehensive support and improvement, which occurs when a school is rated "D" or "F" for three consecutive years, additional mandatory interventions go into effect. The LEA is required to submit an improvement plan for state approval using a rigorous evaluation rubric. Once approved, the LDE monitors the implementation of such plan through regular reviews of student data and in coordination with the agency's ongoing district planning/network interactions with LEA leadership. The LDE's role increases where schools are not making progress. The LDE may enter into agreements with LEAs to provide for specific improvement strategies, as was recently announced with the Caddo Parish School System.

If a school has been identified for comprehensive support or improvement after four consecutive

years, the LDE and BESE, if applicable, will increase the level of interventions using one of the options available within state laws and BESE regulations. A school that is F-rated (“academically unacceptable”) for four consecutive years is eligible for placement within the jurisdiction and direct control of the RSD. This allows the LDE and BESE to enact a diverse set of strategies for radical school improvement in the schools where conventional improvement strategies have not generated needed gains. Such strategies could include direct operation of the school or approval of a proven provider to operate the school as a charter school under the state’s supervision. For schools not placed under the jurisdiction of the RSD, the LDE will intervene and determine what restrictions on federal fund expenditures or academic programming should be implemented to improve student outcomes.

In New Orleans, the RSD, in partnership with the Orleans Parish School Board, has created new charter schools of choice in place of historically struggling traditional schools using one of the strongest charter school authorization practices in the country.²⁵ Tulane University’s Education Research Alliance and Stanford University’s Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) have published studies validating the impact of charter schools in Louisiana:

“Compared to the educational gains that charter students would have had in a traditional public school, the analysis shows on average that students in Louisiana charter schools make larger learning gains in both reading and mathematics. This amounts to 50 more days of learning in reading and 65 more days in math.” -- Stanford University’s Center for Research on Education Outcomes²⁶

“The performance of New Orleans students shot upward after the reforms. In contrast, the comparison group largely continued its prior trajectory. Between 2005 and 2012, the performance gap between New Orleans and the comparison group closed and eventually reversed, indicating a positive effect of the reforms of about 0.4 standard deviations, enough to improve a typical student’s performance by 15 percentage points... We are not aware of any other districts that have made such large improvements in such a short time.” -- Tulane University²⁷

As of July 1, 2018, New Orleans turnaround charter schools authorized by BESE will be placed under the charter authorization of the Orleans Parish School Board, allowing for a novel reinvention of school governance in that city, for a competition of decade-long cycle of state-led intervention, and for the lessons of New Orleans to be applied, in different ways, to varying environments experiencing similar changes.

In Baton Rouge, for example, the LDE and RSD have created the Baton Rouge Achievement Zone,

²⁵ National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (2015). “Measuring Up: A Tool for Comparing State Charter School Laws and Movements.” Accessed at <http://www.publiccharters.org/get-the-facts/law-database/states/LA/>.

²⁶ Center for Research on Education Outcomes. (2013). *Charter School Performance in Louisiana*. Accessed at https://credo.stanford.edu/documents/la_report_2013_7_26_2013_final.pdf.

²⁷ Harris, D. N. (2015). *Good News for New Orleans: Early Evidence Shows Reforms Linking Student Achievement*. Education Next. Accessed at http://educationnext.org/files/ednext_XV_4_harris.pdf.

a focused public-private partnership to create schools of choice as either replacements for or alternatives to persistently struggling schools. The Zone includes 14 charter schools authorized by BESE, with ongoing expansion through schools authorized at state and local levels. Partners to state and local authorized involved in the Achievement Zone include Building Excellent Schools, Celerity Schools Louisiana, Collegiate Academies, Democracy Prep, Friendship Schools, Geo Prep Academy, Idea Public Schools, Inspire Charter Schools, and Thrive Academy.

In Shreveport, the LDE and RSD have partnered with the Caddo Parish School Board to create the Transformation Next Zone, a network of the 14 lowest performing schools in the district. The Transformation Next Zone has a designated leader and an advisory board that oversees the establishment of Zone goals and monitors progress towards those goals in open, public meetings. The Zone also creates optimal and unprecedented conditions for school improvement through transparent performance objectives, high levels of principal autonomy and decision making, radical incentive pay for effective principals and teachers, and adoption of the research-based Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) model of school improvement.

Each year, the RSD will re-evaluate the state's most chronically failing schools and determine the strongest path to successful intervention in each context.

D. Periodic Resource Review. Describe how the SEA will periodically review, identify, and, to the extent practicable, address any identified inequities in resources to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement consistent with the requirements in section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(a).

Pursuant to the requirements of ESSA, the LDE will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA that has a significant number of CSI and TSI schools. To the extent practicable, the LDE will address any identified inequities in resources that are having a negative impact on those schools and their students. Reviews will be conducted to examine equitable per pupil expenditures, distribution of staff, and access to high quality prekindergarten, enriching experiences, and rigorous coursework.

The LDE conducts a number of regular reviews to examine equitable resource allocation and provides related information to school leaders and the public. Pursuant to Act 310 of the 2009 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature, the LDE annually publishes school-level information on per-pupil expenditures, a breakdown of expenditures by category (e.g. instruction, administration, transportation) and average staff salaries. The reports also provide a side-by-side comparison of LEA expenditures compared to state averages.

In order to address the equitable distribution of educators, the LDE published an educator equity

profile comparing certain characteristics of educators in schools with high and low concentrations of students from low-income families and minority students. This profile led to the development of an educator equity plan to guide the work of the state and LEAs in ensuring that students have equitable access to capable educators. The LDE produces annual workforce reports for use by LEAs and the LDE network teams that includes equity gap data, and annually calculates and publicly reports equity gaps.

Through state laws enacted beginning in 2012, the LDE now has oversight over all publicly funded early childhood programs in the state and has organized them into community networks around the state that are coordinated at regional and local levels by a designated lead agency. The LDE produces and publishes profiles that illustrate both access and quality of early childhood programs within each community network. Each network receives a rating that is based 50 percent on CLASS scores and 50 percent access for at-risk four year olds. The profiles also include an indicator showing the percentage of at-risk three year olds served. The state then oversees a system of coordinated enrollment within each community network, designed to give all eligible families access to available openings. Community networks access funding, including federal preschool expansion grant funds, from each of the state's early childhood programs through a coordinated funding request. An overview of the coordinated enrollment and funding systems can be accessed [here](#).

Going forward, the LDE will also annually provide superintendents, principals, and charter school leaders with information regarding students' access to enriching experiences and rigorous coursework, including but not limited to the arts, world languages, vigorous physical activity during the school day, college-level courses, and workforce-based training leading to an industry credential. Progress in increasing access and reducing disproportionality will make up five percent of a school's performance score as measured in the state's school and district accountability system. The LDE will annually publish data on these measures as well as chronic absenteeism. LEAs may use Title I and Title IV funds to supplement local and state funds in addressing these needs.

Section 5: Supporting Excellent Educators

5.1 Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement.

Instructions: Consistent with sections 2101 and 2102 of the ESEA, if an SEA intends to use funds under one or more of the included programs for any of the following purposes, provide a description with the necessary information.

- A. Certification and Licensure Systems.** Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs for certifying and licensing teachers and principals or other school leaders?

☐ Yes. If yes, provide a description of the systems for certification and licensure below.

DNo.

As part the LDE's ongoing effort to strengthen the educator workforce, the SEA will use Title II funds to support the development and expansion of yearlong teaching residencies that result in certified teachers and leaders. Funds will be used to support stipends and training for mentor teachers, support for educator preparation providers, and other costs associated with yearlong teaching and leadership residencies.

Teacher preparation programs in Louisiana play a key role in ensuring access to effective educators: over 70 percent of the teachers prepared in Louisiana go on to teach in Louisiana. Yet a [2014 survey](#) of over 6,000 teachers and administrators from teacher preparation programs across the state found that many teachers do not feel adequately prepared for their first year of teaching. Of all teachers with one to five years of experience surveyed, 50 percent indicated they were not fully prepared for the realities of a classroom, 41 percent indicated they were not prepared to teach students how to read, and 42 percent indicated they were not prepared to teach students with diverse needs.

Based on extensive stakeholder engagement following that survey, including focus groups conducted across the state, the LDE identified key areas for improvement, including the expansion of a statewide effort to align teacher preparation programs with LEA needs so that Louisiana programs better prepare pre-service teachers for the partner schools' expectations, and so that the certification areas in which teachers are prepared meet rural LEA workforce needs.

The need for stronger alignment between teacher preparation and schools' expectations for teachers is evident in a number of areas, including schools' focus on using student achievement data to set learning goals and analyzing data to inform instruction and monitor progress toward those goals.

In addition to the need to align preparation to meet expectations in schools, pre-service programs are not preparing enough teachers in every content area to meet staffing needs. LEAs experience shortages of teachers in specific subject areas but typically do not work closely with preparation programs to recruit in these subject areas. Sixty-seven percent of LEA leaders report that preparation programs do not produce enough teachers to meet staffing needs in certain certification areas and schools, while 48 percent of preparation program faculty members say they do not get enough information about LEA staffing needs to inform recruiting and selection. In 2015-2016, out-of-field or uncertified teachers taught 20 percent of secondary math and science classes and 23 percent of special education classes in Louisiana public schools. As reported in Louisiana's Equity Plan, and as evidenced in the equity data reported in this plan, schools with high percentages of economically disadvantaged and/or minority students are more likely to be taught by uncertified or out-of-field teachers.

Principals and LEA leaders agree that stronger alignment with preparation programs will help promote a strengthened educator workforce, including more equitable access to effective educators. When asked what supports and tools would be most helpful in terms of teacher recruitment and retention, 70 percent of principals statewide identified "support in developing or building relationships with teacher preparation programs."

In response to these challenges and opportunities, in 2014 Louisiana launched the [Believe and Prepare](#) program, designed specifically to strengthen pre-service preparation by providing aspiring teachers with more time to practice through yearlong residencies under the tutelage of expert mentors, and to better meet LEA staffing needs. This program is centered on close partnerships between LEAs and preparation programs in order to improve preparation and produce more qualified candidates. Believe and Prepare includes 41 Louisiana school systems and 24 preparation providers, and has impacted 1,204 aspiring and mentor teachers and over 26,000 students statewide. Through this grant program, districts and their preparation partners have been awarded a total of \$4.89 million to prepare aspiring teachers through full-year teaching residencies, build a cadre of trained mentor teachers, and meet staffing needs in high-need areas, such as special education.

Based on the success of the [nationally recognized](#) Believe and Prepare pilots, and based on a significant body of [research](#), BESE adopted in October 2016 landmark regulations concerning the preparation of aspiring teachers. These regulations will provide teacher candidates with a full-year classroom residency alongside an experienced mentor teacher, coupled with a competency-based curriculum that will provide them with the knowledge and skills needed for their first day of teaching.

The changes, backed by the Louisiana Board of Regents (BoR), were informed by two years of public discussion and input through over fifty meetings and focus groups with hundreds of teacher preparation stakeholders. Teacher candidates admitted into programs in the 2018-2019 year will be the first cohort to experience the required yearlong residency and new competency-based curricula.

The regulations are accompanied by a plan from the LDE for financial support for school systems and preparation programs that includes immediate support through:

- \$7.3 million in transitional funding through 2019 for university administration costs, teacher resident stipends, and mentor teacher stipends and training. The source of funding will include IDEA and Title II funds, in addition to state funds.
- Funding for rural school systems and their preparation partners through the LDE's five-year, \$66.8 million Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant.

Long-term funding commitments include the use of state's Title II set-aside to support stipends and training for mentor teachers.

With regard to certification and licensure of principals and other school leaders, the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education has enacted the following state regulations:

- *Bulletin 746 - Louisiana Standards for State Certification of School Personnel* (includes requirements for superintendents, principals, and other school leaders)
- *Bulletin 125 - Standards for Educational Leaders in Louisiana*
- *Bulletin 996 - Standards for Approval of Teachers and/or Educational Leader Preparation Programs*

To provide ongoing support to school leaders, the LDE has developed a Principal Support Library

that includes guidance and information about training and professional development, planning, educator evaluations, collaboration, use of data, and more.

The LDE will engage with stakeholders over the next year with regard to the need for any enhancements to Louisiana's system of certification and licensing of school leaders, as well as ongoing supports.

B. Educator Preparation Program Strategies. Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs to support the State's strategies to improve educator preparation programs consistent with section 2101(d)(2)(M) of the ESEA, particularly for educators of low-income and minority students?

☐ Yes. If yes, provide a description of the strategies to improve educator preparation programs below.

☒ No.

Yes, the SEA will use Title II funds to support the State's strategies to improve educator preparation programs but supporting the development and expansion of yearlong teaching and leader residencies.

As noted in 5.1.A, Louisiana is on a multi-year path to substantially strengthening educator preparation. This includes a statewide policy mandate for all teacher preparation programs to offer a yearlong teaching residency and competency-based design by July 2018.

The Louisiana [competencies](#) for initial teacher certification, adopted by BESE in October 2016, define what a teacher candidate must know and be able to do in order to be eligible for certification upon completion of a BESE-approved teacher preparation program beginning in July 2018. The competencies were developed in collaboration with content experts, elementary and secondary educators, and postsecondary education leaders. Preparation providers and their school system partners will co-construct preparation experiences that develop these competencies through quality practice experiences, including a yearlong teaching residency.

In order to solicit feedback on the teacher preparation competencies from current educators, teacher educators, and parents, the LDE partnered with Louisiana State University's Public Policy Research Lab to develop and administer a feedback survey. For each of the competencies, respondents were asked if competencies identified essential knowledge and skills for teaching all students and could be measured through performance with students and through impact on student learning.

The competencies are aligned to current expectations for students and teachers and are broadly focused on the aspiring teachers' ability to:

- Design and deliver effective instruction to all students, including students with exceptionalities and students in need of academic and non-academic intervention in a regular

- education setting;
- Communicate and collaborate with students, colleagues, families, and community members to support students' learning and development.

The competencies specifically include expectations relative to:

- Aspiring teachers' ability to serve students with special needs in a regular education setting, a priority consistently indicated by the Special Education Advisory Council;
- The need for new teachers to be culturally responsive in their teaching practice.

Subject-specific competencies were developed for content areas in which the state has adopted new standards for students or in which there has been significant development over the past several years. These areas include: Early Childhood, English/Language Arts, Mathematics, and Special Education.

To support preparation providers and their LEA partners, the LDE has organized and will continue to organize biannual Believe and Prepare community meetings. These convenings of preparation leaders and their PK-12 partners have included sessions led by Louisiana preparation providers and by national experts in teacher preparation, including the [U.S. PREP National Center](#) and Teacher Prep Inspection-US (TPI-US). Sessions are focused on establishing strong district-preparation partnerships, and on developing competency-based teacher preparation programs that include a yearlong teaching residency. [Meeting materials](#) are publicly available.

Title II, Part A funds will be one source of funding for this ongoing program of support. Preparation providers that partner with high-need rural LEAs participating in the LDE's TIF grant will receive additional funds and a tailored program of support from the U.S. PREP National Center.

In addition to supporting teacher preparation providers and their district partners through Believe and Prepare community meetings, the LDE has piloted the [inspectorate model](#) with ten of Louisiana's 27 teacher preparation providers. The teacher preparation inspectorate model, which has been in place in the United Kingdom since 1984, focused on the preparation experience—the content of program coursework, the connections the program makes to practice, the quality of feedback candidates receive. The program inspection offers actionable feedback that providers can use to ensure all new Louisiana teachers are prepared to teach all students effectively from day one of their teaching careers.

During a program inspection, a team of four to five trained, experienced preK-12 educators and teacher educators work for three to four days to gather evidence and provide feedback on the four key aspects of the teacher preparation experience. Inspection team members consider the following guiding questions as they observe courses, candidates' and program completers' teaching, interview faculty and partner school leaders, and review existing program documentation: How well are preK-12 students learning in classes led by a program's student teachers and recent graduates? How well do programs ensure that candidates learn the content and teaching skills needed for successful practice? How much is the program learning about its own performance—and what steps are being taken to improve it? At the end of each day while on site, the team holds a team meeting to discuss

the day's evidence. A program representative attends each meeting in order to offer clarifications when needed and stay fully apprised on the inspection process and findings.

At the conclusion of the inspection, the collected evidence is combined and compared to identify program performance patterns—to ensure judgments capture typical aspects of the program across multiple pieces of relevant evidence. For example, evidence gathered through an interview with the principal of a recent elementary program completer, observation of a Teaching Reading course for elementary candidates, and state reading assessment results for student of recent completers are used to reach a judgment about the program's elementary teaching methods instruction.

Upon completion of the inspection and while on site, the inspection team leader provides an oral summary of findings and follows up within a month of the on-site inspection with a brief written

report. The LDE has secured philanthropic funding commitments in order to expand this pilot to ten additional preparation providers in Louisiana. Additionally, the inspection model is under consideration as a significant component of Louisiana's accountability system for teacher preparation providers.

To continue their commitment to improving teacher quality in Louisiana, BESE and BoR have been charged with developing an accountability system for teacher preparation providers in order to provide preparation leaders with information for improvement, and potential students and employers with information regarding program quality. BESE and BoR established a committee in fall 2016. The committee consists of local and national teacher preparation and PK-12 education experts, and was facilitated by Dr. Robert C. Pianta, Dean of the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia. After meeting throughout the 2016-2017 year, the committee has offered recommendations relative to the establishment of a multi-measure, Higher Education Act-compliant accountability and improvement system for teacher preparation providers, to be phased in over five years, starting in 2017-2018.

The proposed accountability system for teacher preparation providers includes an on-site review modeled on the inspectorate system, which has been piloted across the state, and will take into account the value-added results of teacher preparation program completers. Significant weight will be given to the extent that teacher preparation providers meet state workforce needs. Specifically, teacher preparation providers will be rewarded for placing yearlong teaching residents in rural and high-need schools, and in high-need subject areas. BESE is expected to consider related regulations in summer 2017, after several months of public discussion.

C. Educator Growth and Development Systems. Does the SEA intend to use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs to support the State's systems of professional growth and improvement for educators that addresses: 1) induction; 2) development, consistent with the definition of professional development in section 8002(42) of the ESEA; 3) compensation; and 4) advancement for teachers, principals, and other school leaders. This may also include how the SEA will work with LEAs in the State to develop or implement systems of professional growth and improvement, consistent with section 2102(b)(2)(B) of the ESEA; or State or local educator evaluation and support systems consistent with section 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) of the ESEA?

☐ Yes. If yes, provide a description of the educator growth and development systems below.
DNo.

Title II funds will be used to offer differential compensation and training for mentor teachers, who play a key role in preparation and induction.

5.2 Support for Educators.

Instructions: Consistent with sections 2101 and 2102 of the ESEA, if the SEA intends to use funds

under one or more of the included programs for any of the following purposes, provide a description with the necessary information.

A. Resources to Support State-level Strategies. Describe how the SEA will use Title II, Part A funds and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of funds provided under those programs, to support State-level strategies designed to:

- i. Increase student achievement consistent with the challenging State academic standards;

The LDE has a clear and concrete set of beliefs that informs all work regarding student achievement. Classroom instruction is most impacted by three components: curriculum, assessments, and teacher professional development around curriculum and assessments. Many classrooms, schools, and districts in the country treat these as separate components. The underlying theory of action at the LDE and the basis for all academic work is that these three components must be tightly aligned for maximum impact on student learning.

The LDE places particular emphasis on the importance of curriculum as it drives the day-to-day interactions between students and the disciplinary content. Recent studies show that high quality

curriculum can have significant positive impacts on student achievement and the benefits are even greater for weaker teachers.^{28,29} Following the adoption of rigorous academic standards, the LDE led the nation in conducting extensive, detailed curriculum reviews. These reviews support school systems in choosing quality, aligned curriculum. The LDE also provides training and support to school systems around both the specific curriculum reviews and strategic implementation of quality curriculum. These efforts have led to over 80 percent of systems choosing high quality curriculum in math and/or ELA.

In addition to ensuring local education agencies have access to the highest quality instructional materials, teachers, principals, and other school leaders should spend a majority of their time learning how to effectively implement those materials to ensure all students improve academically. To ensure teachers, principals, and other school leaders have access to professional learning based on high-quality curriculum, the LDE developed a [curriculum implementation scale](#). This [scale](#) identifies the levels of implementation, including setting a vision for the highest level of implementation, and includes details about the scaling of professional development that supports implementation of high-quality curriculum. Principals and other school leaders use this scale to increase their awareness of their current level of curriculum implementation and identify steps for improving the implementation. The LDE has also provided a series of trainings during supervisor and principal collaborations around the use of this scale. The trainings incorporate case studies for principals and other school leaders to have examples and non-examples of quality professional development of high-quality curriculum implementation.

Assessments and data from assessments are often the driving force behind school, district, and state-level instructional decisions. The LDE recognizes the importance of having high quality, aligned assessments readily available to all teachers, schools, and school systems as well as the importance of classroom, school, and district-level assessments aligning to the quality curriculum being used daily in the classroom. It has historically been challenging to locate assessments that meet these criteria. Therefore, the LDE created an assessment system (LEAP 360) that includes quality assessment items available to all classroom teachers in the state, and diagnostic and interim assessments available to all districts in the state. These assessments, where applicable, have been aligned to the quality curriculum chosen by a large majority of school systems in the state.

As described in detail below, the LDE strategically provides professional development to school systems around quality curriculum and the quality assessment system available to teachers and school systems. In addition, the LDE supports school systems and schools in aligning their own professional development plans to ensure the system (curriculum, assessments, and professional development) is strategically coherent.

²⁸ Boser, U., Chingos, M., and Straus, C. (2015). The Hidden Value of Curriculum Reform: Do States and Districts Receive the most Bang for their Curriculum Buck. Center for American Progress. Accessed at <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/06111518/CurriculumMatters-report.pdf>.

²⁹ Jackson, C.K., and Makarin, A. (2016). Can Online Off-The-Shelf Lessons Improve Student Outcomes? Evidence from A Field Experiment. Accessed at <http://www.nber.org/papers/w22398>.

- ii. Improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders;

The LDE provides resources and support for more than 5,000 Teacher Leaders – approximately three teachers per school across Louisiana. Teacher Leaders, who are selected by their school and/or school system, receive monthly newsletters, participate in webinars, and attend quarterly collaboration events and the annual Teacher Leader Summit where they receive information and training on curricula and tools provided by the state. Teacher Leaders are charged with sharing what they learn at state webinars and in-person meetings and trainings with other teachers at their schools.

Teacher Leader Advisors, a subset of approximately 80 Teacher Leaders, also are engaged in reviewing instructional materials, writing interim assessment items, and leading trainings. By doing so, they plan an instrumental role in creating resources and tools to support fellow educators while also receiving rich professional development to improve their own practice.

In 2016-2017, the LDE released the professional development vendor guide to help LEAs identify organizations that can provide content-and curriculum-focused professional development to their teachers. The LDE invites those vendors to present at regional collaboration events held throughout the year and at the LDE's Teacher Leader Summit held annually in June. This helps reduce the overall cost of training for individual districts and it gives teachers, principals, and other school leaders the chance to test out the training to ensure it appropriately fits their needs before investing in the training.

To increase the availability of high-quality professional development for teachers that is focused on content and curriculum in 2017-2018, the LDE is planning provide: 1) professional development modules focused on helping teachers implement curriculum effectively; 2) training for 300-500 local content leaders trainings who would re-deliver the content modules capitalizing on districts' pre-existing structures (professional development days, professional learning communities, etc.). These local content leaders would potentially receive a certification through the vendor to legitimize the process and make it more attractive to teachers while also incentivizing districts to send teachers to all parts of the training. The LDE would pilot this plan with TIF districts in year 1 and then expand to at least 50 percent of districts in 2018-2019.

The LDE provides educators with the Compass system, which includes processes for principal and teacher goal setting, observation and feedback. It is designed to facilitate the professional growth of principals and teachers, thus increasing the academic achievement of students. Educators reflect and act upon questions such as the following: How do we know if all students are growing academically toward meeting or surpassing a year's growth? What evidence do we have that all teachers are increasing their capacity and thus improving student learning as a result of analyzing student work and adjusting instruction to meet the needs of their students? What tells us that opportunities for strong collaboration and professional growth, in regard to content and curriculum-based strategies, are impacting student achievement?

Goal-setting among principals and teachers takes the form of Student Learning Targets (SLTs). Academic achievement goals are established for students based on their achievement history and a diagnosis of where they begin a new school year in regard to their level of mastery of essential knowledge, skills, and standards. The LDE provides teachers with goal setting templates and strong models for SLTs, the format for which has teachers determine student readiness for learning and formatively assess student progress throughout the course of the school year. Diagnostic and interim assessments for this purpose are made available by the LDE to all school systems in the state. Individual student growth, in relation to rigorous goals aligned to high quality curriculum, is the expected outcome. The LDE provides principals with data about student achievement and growth of similar schools, which allows them to plan for and implement high quality professional development focused on content and curriculum and also create growth targets for their schools.

The observation and feedback cycle is enhanced by the LDE empowering districts and schools to make decisions about implementing observation rubrics based on critical reflection of their needs. This may include but is not limited to the need for content specific pedagogy, improving goal setting and measuring progress along the way, or encouraging the development of a pipeline of leaders. By providing choice and tools and resources for support, like the Louisiana Principals' Teaching and Learning Guidebook, school systems can focus on improving quality and effectiveness.

To ensure that the process of goal setting and the observation and feedback cycle produce results, the LDE provides opportunities for principals to participate in a fellowship program designed by the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL). This is an example of intensive professional development for school leaders throughout the state who engage in learning twice each month for sixteen months, focusing on topics such as being a driver of change, a strategic thinker, a coach and mentor, and a visionary leader. The first cohort included 130 administrators from 26 districts with the second cohort including 112 administrators from 27 districts.

Another example of leadership development provided to school leaders is the ability for districts to implement TAP, The System for Teacher and Student Advancement. This system's structures for creating multiple career paths, ongoing applied professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and performance-based compensation, are proven to produce results. Currently, 40 schools representing 11 local education agencies participate in the TAP system.

- iii. Increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; and

As previously mentioned, the LDE provides resources and support for more than 5,000 Teacher Leaders – approximately three teachers per school across Louisiana, who, in turn, disseminate those resources and support to their peers. Driven by its success, the Teacher Leader program has grown over time and will continue to expand in the future. Increasing the number of Teacher Leaders will not only mean that more teachers are receiving resources and professional development directly

from the LDE, but it will also have an exponential effect given the role that each Teacher Leader plays in expanding the web of support for peers at their schools and in their districts who are not identified as Teacher Leaders.

The LDE also plans to expand the number of Teacher Leader Advisors to include those focused on creating and reviewing resources and professional development for special education, science and ELL.

Based on the successes of principals who have participated in the Principal Fellowship and schools that have excelled as a result of being part of the TAP system, the LDE plans to expand these programs.

Provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders consistent with the educator equity provisions in 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c).

B. Skills to Address Specific Learning Needs. Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in identifying students with specific learning needs and providing instruction based on the needs of such students, consistent with section 2101(d)(2)(J) of the ESEA.

The LDE has a demonstrated commitment to identifying and providing instruction for students with different exceptionalities. Students respond to each learning task based on their level of academic readiness and personal interest, as well as their unique learning profile. The LDE's approach, under continuous refinement, is to endow teachers and leaders with skills to identify the specific strengths and needs of individual students and determine the "just right" entry point for teacher planning and instructional delivery.

The focus of the LDE's current work is in supporting educators to provide full access to the content they teach to students, with multiple pathways for making sense of that content and for demonstrating learning mastery. Specific work that the LDE is undertaking includes better supports for early and accurate identification of students with needs. This includes piloting streamlined and high quality screening instruments and providing better guidance to school systems to implement these tools. In addition, the LDE will provide improved supports for early identification of students before they arrive to kindergarten, and improved supports to determine if a student is gifted or talented and the nature and extent of special education and related services the student needs.

Instructionally, the LDE is providing curricular supports created for guidance in English language arts. The LDE has created a complete grade 3 through 12 English language arts curriculum and is currently disseminating embedded modifications for struggling readers and English language learners. These embedded modifications allow teachers to provide more meaningful and differentiated instruction to students, provides teachers the tools immediately for their classroom, and models a more integrated experience for all students, allowing faster access to on-level content

where appropriate. In addition, the LDE has released and will continue to deepen a host of remediation resources for educators in mathematics. This includes self-led and teacher-led instructional tools for students who are behind grade level in elementary and middle school and unique courses in high school for students who arrive significantly behind level or with unique disabilities. Through ongoing professional development for teachers and leaders and a broad and deep cache of instructional materials, teachers are better prepared to deliver research-based, scaffolded instruction. The work, which has originated in aligning standards and providing access for English language learners and students with the most pronounced exceptionalities, will ultimately serve all teachers across the instructional continuum. From the smallest adjustments such as providing hooks to inspire student interest in a topic, to deeper alterations such as planning alternative activities and differentiated learning artifacts, teachers and leaders will be equipped to champion individualized learning in the everyday classroom.

While the identification routines employed by the state are effective and continuously improving, the supports enumerated above will provide the additional benefit of prioritizing ongoing assessment for student learning. More formative checks for understanding will provide teachers and leaders with real-time data they need to assess progress and plan for making the most of individual student strengths and interests. This system for ongoing assessment turns from global categorization of students to identifying specific standards-aligned gaps in the knowledge and skills being called upon for successful mastery. In doing so, these data support teachers in identifying issues and making decisions about that which is required for student mastery – whether additional time-on-task, teaching through multiple modalities, or remediation in fundamental content and skills. Louisiana’s state regulations for addressing the needs of gifted and talented students are contained within the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Bulletin 1706, Subpart Two. The LDE is currently examining gifted best practices across the nation in order to enhance current state regulations and better serve Louisiana’s gifted students. That analysis will lead to recommendations and reworking of statewide requirements, assessments, and gifted identification processes. The LDE will continue to identify and will enhance reporting on LEAs having inequitable gifted access, and will incorporate discussions and planning on the same as part of the ongoing district planning process with LEAs.

The continuum for gifted and talented students include regular classroom with supplemental aids and services, a resource center or class, a self-contained class, and preschool services. At the Individualized Education Program meeting, the school system’s representative and the parent determine the program that best meets the individual needs of the student as indicated by the evaluation report.

5.3 Educator Equity.

Definitions. Provide the SEA’s different definitions, using distinct criteria, for the following key terms:

Key Term	Statewide Definition (or Statewide Guidelines)
----------	--

Ineffective teacher	An ineffective teacher is any teacher who received a transitional student growth rating ³⁰ of Ineffective or Effective: Emerging
Out-of-field teacher*+	An out-of-field teacher does not hold a license in their current teaching assignment. Teachers who work in charter schools are not included in this category because charter schools are not required to hire certified teachers.
Inexperienced teacher*+	An inexperienced teacher is any teacher in their first year of teaching in the classroom.
Low-income student	Students eligible for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Medicaid, awaiting foster care, migrant, and incarcerated children.
Minority student	Student who is a member of a minority race or ethnicity (African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander/Alaskan Native)

*Definitions of these terms must provide useful information about educator equity.

+Definitions of these terms must be consistent with the definitions that a State uses under 34 C.F.R. § 200.37.

B. Rates and Differences in Rates. In Appendix B, calculate and provide the statewide rates at which low-income and minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers compared to non-low-income and non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A using the definitions provided in section 5.3.A. The SEA must calculate the statewide rates using student-level data.

C. Public Reporting. Provide the Web address or URL of, or a direct link to, where the SEA will publish and annually update, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(4):

- i. The rates and differences in rates calculated in 5.3.B;
- ii. The percentage of teachers categorized in each LEA at each effectiveness level established as part of the definition of “ineffective teacher,” consistent with applicable State privacy policies;
- iii. The percentage of teachers categorized as out-of-field teachers consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.37; and
- iv. The percentage of teachers categorized as inexperienced teachers consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.37.

³⁰ Transitional student growth data are calculated using a value-added model.

This information can be accessed at <http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/closing-the-equity-gap>.

D. Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences. If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, describe the likely causes (*e.g.*, teacher shortages, working conditions, school leadership, compensation, or other causes), which may vary across districts or schools, of the most significant statewide differences in rates in 5.3.B. The description must include whether those differences in rates reflect gaps between districts, within districts, and within schools.

The rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by ineffective teachers are *lower* than the rates at which non-low-income/non-minority students are taught by ineffective teachers.

- The rate at which minority students are taught by ineffective teachers is 9.44 percentage points lower than non-minority students.
- The rate at which low-income students are taught by ineffective teacher is 8.98 percentage points lower than non-low-income students.
- The rate at which minority students are taught by out-of-field teachers is 7.98 percentage points higher than non-minority students.
- The rate at which minority students are taught by inexperienced teachers is 7.66 percentage points higher than non-minority students.

- The rate at which low-income students are taught by out-of-field teachers is 5.70 percentage points higher than non-low-income students.
- The rate at which low-income students are taught by inexperienced teachers is 5.46 percentage points higher than non-low-income students.

The rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by out-of-field and less experienced teachers are attributable to recruitment and retention challenges disproportionately faced by school systems and schools that serve high percentages of these student populations. Many of these schools are in rural communities, which face significant recruitment and retention challenges. These school systems and schools are less geographically proximate to teacher preparation programs and, oftentimes, offer less competitive compensation packages than nearby, urban LEAs.

E. Identification of Strategies. If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, provide the SEA's strategies, including timelines and Federal or non-Federal funding sources, that are:

- i. Designed to address the likely causes of the most significant differences identified in 5.3.D and
- ii. Prioritized to address the most significant differences in the rates provided in 5.3.B, including by prioritizing strategies to support any schools identified for

comprehensive or targeted support and improvement under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19 that are contributing to those differences in rates.

Likely Causes of Most Significant Differences in Rates	Strategies (Including Timeline and Funding Sources)
Limited partnerships between districts and teacher preparation programs	Strengthen partnerships between districts and teacher preparation programs through a grant program (Believe and Prepare) that provides funds for districts and teacher preparation programs to co-design and expand competency-based, yearlong residencies that meet LEAs' staffing needs. Sixteen participating rural districts will receive additional funds to support the development of residencies and to implement more competitive compensation structures through the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grant. Establish a teacher preparation accountability system that rewards teacher preparation providers for placing residents in rural and high-need schools. Timeline: The Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education approved policies in the fall of 2016 that require teacher preparation programs to begin implementing yearlong residencies by July 2018. Funding sources: IDEA, Title II, TIF In summer 2017, BESE will consider proposed regulations establishing a five-year transition to a teacher preparation accountability system that rewards teacher preparation providers for placing yearlong teaching residents in rural and high-need schools.
Challenges around retention for new and experienced teachers	Strengthen the career ladder for teachers by establishing a mentor teacher role. This will also increase the retention of new teachers, who will be inducted into the profession by the state's experts. Timeline: BESE will be asked to consider policies that formalize the mentor teacher role in the 2017-2018

	school year. Funding sources: IDEA, Title II, TIF Rural LEAs implement sustainable and competitive compensation structures that take into account performance and demand (2019) Funding sources: TIF
--	--

F. Timelines and Interim Targets. If there is one or more difference in rates in 5.3.B, describe the SEA's timelines and interim targets for eliminating **all** differences in rates.

Difference in Rates	Date by which differences in rates will be eliminated
Low-income and minority students are taught at a higher rate by out-of-field and inexperienced teachers	2025
Interim targets, including date by which target will be reached	
LEAs review their workforce data on an annual basis and develop plans to strengthen partnerships with teacher preparation programs and to support out-of-field teachers along the path to certification <i>Timeline: annually, beginning Spring of 2017.</i> Teacher preparation programs adapt competency-based pre-service curriculum to: ● include a year-long residency for all teacher candidates; and ● ensure alignment with and focus on new assessments and goal setting. <i>Timeline: Development began in the 2016-2017 academic year. Residencies will be implemented by July 2018.</i> Align preparation curriculum to current expectations for teachers, including skills needed to use assessments and assessment data to inform instruction and accelerate student learning. This will better prepare teachers, thereby increasing retention. <i>Timeline: Development began in 2016-2017; curriculum will be fully aligned by July 2018.</i> LEAs and preparation program partners will work together to adapt curricula to prepare pre-service teachers for the expectations of the partner LEA. This will include preparing pre-service teachers in all of the components of Compass, including the competencies described in instructional rubrics, using assessments to set goals, and analyzing data to inform instruction and monitor progress toward goals. <i>Timeline: Development begins in the 2016-2017 academic year, with curriculum fully aligned by</i>	

July 2018.

Where pre-service programs are undergraduate programs, provide the necessary support and resources to ensure they include yearlong residencies in partner LEAs' schools.

Timeline: July 2018

BESE will enact regulations establishing an accountability system for teacher preparation providers that places significant weight on the extent that teacher preparation providers meet state workforce needs. Specifically, teacher preparation providers will be rewarded for placing yearlong teaching residents in rural and high-need schools, and for preparing teachers in high-need subject areas.

Timeline: Regulations passed by fall 2017 and phased in over five years, with public reporting beginning after the first accountability cycle, 2018-2019 and 2019-2020

Strengthen the role of the mentor teacher. Strong mentor teachers are essential to the success of the residency year and in many schools also provide critical support to first-year teachers, thereby improving retention of new, effective teachers and closing gaps between LEAs with respect to access to effective educators. To strengthen this component, the Department will complete the following:

- i) Codify the essential elements of the mentor role and the knowledge and skills a mentor must possess.
- ii) Support LEA/provider partnerships to identify and select more mentor teachers who have demonstrated success per Compass and who demonstrate leadership skills.
- iii) Develop a more robust approach to training mentor teachers. This will include ensuring mentor teachers are highly skilled in the use of the assessment system for goal-setting, as well as other components of Compass, and that they develop the coaching and feedback skills needed to build the knowledge and skills of new and aspiring teachers.

Timeline: 2019

Determine budget for, select, train and match mentor teachers to teacher residents. Based on feedback from program participants and outcomes data, identify improvements and modifications to incorporate into the teacher preparation program, and communicate program best practices at quarterly collaborations and Believe and Prepare community meetings.

Work with rural LEAs to offer differentiated compensation to mentors and teacher residents so as to increase retention.

Timeline: Compensation plans developed, refined, and finalized in the 2016-2017 academic year. Compensation plans implemented beginning in the 2017-2018 academic year.

Section 6: Supporting All Students

6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students.

***Instructions:** When addressing the State’s strategies below, each SEA must describe how it will use Title IV, Part A funds and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of fund provided under those programs, to support State-level strategies and LEA use of funds. The strategies and uses of funds must be designed to ensure that all children have a significant opportunity to meet challenging State academic standards and career and technical standards, as applicable, and attain, at a minimum, a regular high school diploma.*

The descriptions that an SEA provides must include how, when developing its State strategies, the SEA considered the academic and non-academic needs of the following specific subgroups of students:

- *Low-income students;*
 - *Lowest-achieving students;*
 - *English learners;*
 - *Children with disabilities;*
 - *Children and youth in foster care;*
 - *Migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school;*
 - *Homeless children and youths;*
- *Neglected, delinquent, and at-risk students identified under Title I, Part D of the ESEA, including students in juvenile justice facilities;*
- *Immigrant children and youth;*
- *Students in LEAs eligible for grants under the Rural and Low-Income School program under section 5221 of the ESEA; and*
- *American Indian and Alaska Native students.*

- A.** The State’s strategies and how it will support LEAs to support the continuum of a student’s education from preschool through grade 12, including transitions from early childhood education to elementary school, elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to post-secondary education and careers, in order to support appropriate promotion practices and decrease the risk of students dropping out; and

Louisiana has adopted rigorous college and career ready academic content [standards](#) in prekindergarten and in elementary and secondary education. The development of these standards included educators, content experts, higher education faculty, parents, advocacy groups, and representatives of business and industry, as required by state [law](#), and were designed to prepare all Louisiana children for successful transition to post-secondary education and the workplace. Following the development of standards, the LDE developed a classroom support [toolbox](#) to assist

educators in school leaders in teaching the standards and ensuring all students' mastery of them, given their individual needs. Early childhood supports can be accessed [here](#).

The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education enacts [regulations](#) governing student promotion and placement, and the LDE annually collects and reviews each LEA's pupil progression plan. While state law provides for high-stakes promotion requirements in the fourth and eighth grades, in 2013, the state board authorized the placement of academically struggling eighth graders in a [transitional ninth grade](#) to support their remediation and progress toward either a career diploma, which in addition to state graduation requirements, also requires the attainment of a nationally recognized industry credential, or a university preparatory diploma. This decision was based on an extensive review of student data, which showed that the state's eighth grade promotion requirement was not adequately serving the needs of many struggling students, who are disproportionately economically disadvantaged or racial/ethnic minorities.

At the same time, Louisiana began full implementation of the state's [Jump Start](#) career and technical education program, designed to provide students with an opportunity to earn a high school career diploma and a nationally recognized industry based credential simultaneously. While this diploma pathway is appropriate for all students, it is serving a large percentage of students who enter high school through transitional ninth grade.

The state board temporarily suspended fourth grade high-stakes promotion requirements as public schools began to implement more rigorous college and career ready academic content standards in 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. During that time, placement decisions, based on LDE [guidance](#), have been made according to locally approved pupil progression plans, which are required to outline the evidence of student learning used to make promotion decisions. Such evidence must include, but not be limited to, performance on classroom assignments or benchmark assessments. The LDE will soon begin the process of consulting with LEAs and other stakeholders in order to recommend long-term promotion policies to the state board that will best support successful completion of high school and reduce the possibility of students dropping out of school.

In 2014, in order to better meet the needs of students with disabilities, the Louisiana Legislature passed [Act 833](#), which established alternate pathways to achieve a high school diploma. The state board also enacted regulations to ensure that students with significant cognitive disabilities have access to a high school diploma. Information about supports and graduation policies for students with disabilities can be accessed [here](#).

A full summary of state graduation requirements, diploma pathways, and school counselor resources can be accessed [here](#).

- B.** The State's strategies and how it will support LEAs to provide equitable access to a well-rounded education and rigorous coursework in subjects in which female students, minority students, English learners, children with disabilities, or low-income students are

underrepresented. Such subjects could include English, reading/language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, or physical education.

A voluminous series of rankings and reports, as well as self-reported data from Louisiana school systems, indicates that some Louisiana students have struggles not only in academic endeavors traditionally measured by the state, but also in areas important for a productive and healthy life after high school. School should involve the development of interests, habits, and relationships that endure after high school, yet too often the opportunities for young people to develop in these ways are sparse.

- Elementary and middle school students in [half](#) of Louisiana’s school districts are not being exposed to or provided instruction in a second language like their peers in most other states.
- More than one-third of Louisiana eighth grade students attend a school that does not offer Algebra I. Among high schools with student bodies that are majority African-American students, approximately 25 percent do not offer chemistry, 70 percent do not offer advanced mathematics courses like calculus, 20 percent do not provide Algebra II, and 90 percent do not provide advanced science courses such as physics.
- While two-thirds of Louisiana students are classified as being economically disadvantaged, only one-third of students identified as “gifted” or “talented” are economically disadvantaged.
- A recent [study](#) revealed that Louisiana has the nation’s highest rate of adult obesity and the fourth highest rate of childhood obesity.
- A task force of Louisiana music educators and statewide arts [organizations](#) reported earlier this year vast differences in music education and performing arts offerings to elementary school students across and within school districts in our state.
- Only half of economically disadvantaged students attend a high school that offers access to dual enrollment coursework, compared with 65 percent of non-economically disadvantaged students. And out of the total population of students participating in dual enrollment, just over one-third are economically disadvantaged and even fewer are racial/ethnic minorities.
- Louisiana school systems reported that more than 61,000 students, as young as pre-K, spent time outside of school for disciplinary reasons last year. Of these students, low-income students, African-American students, and students with disabilities were disproportionately impacted.
- While 21st Century Community Learning Centers provide after-school and summer learning programs to almost 22,000 students across the state, 19 percent of Louisiana students—147,333 school age children—are on their own during the hours after school.³¹

³¹ Afterschool Alliance. (2016). *Afterschool Fostering Student Success in Louisiana*. Accessed at <http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/documents/LA-afterschool-facts.pdf>.

- Though Louisiana ranks near the bottom among states in annual household income, fewer than half of all Louisiana high school graduates apply for financial aid to fund higher education or workforce training.
- In 2012, the U.S. Census Bureau reported that only 67.7 percent of Louisiana residents 3 years and older reside in a home with Internet access.³²

The lack of fair access to advanced and enriching courses and experiences not only places Louisiana students at a disadvantage compared to their peers nationally, but also impacts their eligibility to attain Louisiana merit based [TOPS scholarship](#). Consider, for example, that of the 183 high schools that have a racial minority student population of 50 percent or higher, nearly 20 percent do not offer Algebra II, a required course for Louisiana's TOPS University Diploma and TOPS scholarships.³³

Each of these challenges illuminates a larger issue: schools can have a significant influence over a wide range of interests, habits, and skills that help students thrive throughout their educational journey and are important to living a productive and healthy life, but student access to enriching experiences varies widely.

Current efforts

The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) and the Louisiana Legislature have taken steps to bolster state support of schools and districts pursuing increased access to critical, non-traditional coursework and experiences.

- Arts: BESE convened a task force to study elementary student exposure and access to music coursework, the [findings](#) from which are being implemented statewide. The study revealed vast differences in music education offerings across and within local school systems.
- World languages: The Legislature recently earmarked funds to support the expansion of dual language programs across the state. The Legislature also called on BESE to [study](#) the feasibility of establishing two-way dual language immersion programs and to provide greater [incentives](#) for local school systems to offer quality language immersion education to students.
- Nutrition and physical activity: Over the past several years, the legislature has enacted several laws, supported pilot programs and other supports, and elevated public attention to the availability of healthy and fresh foods and beverages at public schools and providing regular, vigorous physical activity for students during the school day.
- Student behavior and discipline: The Legislature established a 24-member [advisory council](#) to provide advice and guidance as to the use of appropriate, effective behavioral interventions and expansion of best practices. The council will meet at least three times per year to review

³² U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). *Reported Internet Usage for Individuals 3 Years and Older, by State*. Accessed at <http://www.census.gov/data/tables/2012/demo/computer-internet/computer-use-2012.html>.

³³ Louisiana Department of Education Student Transcript System. (2016). Accessed at <http://www.regents.la.gov/page/student-transcript-system>.

school discipline data, study best practices, and make recommendations on more effectively addressing students' behavioral needs.

- Career education access: Louisiana developed a career education initiative, Jump Start, as well as a diverse course delivery program known as Course Choice. Using funds won through the [New Skills for Youth grant](#), Louisiana conducted an inventory of every pathway offered in every high school in the state. Further grant funding will in part go toward bolstering connections among employers, higher education, and high schools. Students with disabilities eligible to pursue a high school diploma via an alternate pathway may also select a Jump Start pathway to earn a career diploma and a recognized workforce credential. All Jump Start pathways are accessible to these students, with the student's IEP team setting alternate exit and performance criteria.
- Early college coursework: [House Concurrent Resolution 141](#) and [Senate Resolution 182](#) of the 2016 Regular Session call for BESE and the Board of Regents to design statewide systems of expanded early college access for eligible students and to report back to the legislature by February 2017.
- Increased access to technology and digital learning: In the Technology Readiness Survey most recently conducted in December of 2016, 93.4 percent the state's public schools meet the state's minimum 5:1 student-to-computer and connectivity model required for offering a reasonable level of technology-based instruction. Nearly 350 schools have begun shifting their instruction to a digitally interactive model by implementing 1:1 student-to-computer programs, and 49 school systems have adequate access to broadband Internet capacity. [Act 722](#) of 2014 urged Louisiana's state agencies, elementary and secondary school systems, and post-secondary education systems to pursue innovative, collaborative public-private partnerships to expand access to broadband Internet.
- School Culture and Discipline: Louisiana supports training for school systems in the use of positive behavior intervention supports (PBIS), which are evidence-based, proactive approaches for developing positive student behavior and a positive climate where all students in a school can achieve social, emotional and academic success.
- Afterschool programming: The LDE is partnering with the Louisiana Center for Afterschool Learning and other stakeholders to foster quality afterschool programs and data driven professional development through the use of a program quality initiative tool kit. The LDE will also emphasize middle school programs in future 21st Century Community Learning Center requests for proposals, in order to more effectively serve this high-need student population.

The LDE will support LEAs in identifying Title I and Title IV investments that can help to reduce chronic absenteeism and excessive out-of-school discipline; provide access to challenging coursework; and increase access to enriching experiences that foster lifelong interests. The LDE has also clarified for LEAs that Title II funds can be used to support training and professional development beyond classroom teachers, including other school professionals whose work is critical to supporting unique student needs and a well-rounded education for all students.

As part of its ESSA plan, Louisiana will begin the development of an "Interests and Opportunities"

indicator, designed to promote the expansion of experiences through which students develop well-rounded and enduring interests and habits. This indicator will seek to measure and evaluate, for example, the extent to which elementary and middle schools are exposing students to high quality arts and foreign language experiences. Similarly, it will seek to measure the evaluate high school's efforts to expand access to advanced courses in both applied and academic fields. In all schools, the Interests and Opportunities index aspires to measure not only the expansion of such experiences for students but also the extent to which students of all backgrounds experience the offerings fairly. The Interests and Opportunities indicator will be developed over a period of three years. For more information, see the description of the indicator in section 4.1.D.i.

The state will also make two changes to the “strength of diploma” index of the high school accountability system as part of this plan. The attainment of a HiSET credential (formerly known as a GED), when coupled with a high-wage industry credential, will see an increase in its value within the index. Similarly, attainment of 30 college credit hours also will be rewarded more prominently in the state's accountability system. See section 4.1.D.i for greater detail.

Newly authorized in ESSA are two distinct programs meant to increase student access to challenging courses and enriching opportunities – Direct Student Services (DSS) and Student Support and Academic Enrichment grants (SSAE). The two programs offer the flexibility to tailor investments based on the needs of their unique student populations, particularly students attending schools identified in need of comprehensive or targeted support where enriching experiences and challenging coursework are too rare today.

Direct Student Services

Congress has provided the opportunity for states to target up to three percent of the state's total Title I allotment for grants to geographically diverse local school systems, prioritizing those with greatest needs, to support students in gaining access to academic courses, credentials, and services that are not currently available at their schools. These student experiences include:

- Advanced courses such as dual enrollment coursework;
- Career and technical education courses;
- Credit recovery and academic acceleration courses that lead to a high school diploma;
- Examinations used to validate learning and earn college credit;
- High-quality academic tutoring;
- Transportation to enable students to receive instruction at another public school; and
- Post-secondary transition support.

Beginning in the 2022-23 school year, the Louisiana State Department of Education will not set aside three percent of the state's Title I award for Direct Student Services (DSS). The three percent of the state's Title I award will be added back to the Title I formula funding for distribution to the eligible school systems. LEAs will be allowed to carry forward any prior year remaining balances of DSS funding until the expiration of the viable carryover. During this transition year, in addition to the DSS carryover funding, LEAs will use their Title I funding to support DSS programming activities. Although the state is not reserving the three percent for DSS, LEAs, based on their individual needs, will be encouraged to continue providing DSS services to students.

Assurances must be completed with the Title I application that will include the use of Title I funding to support DSS programming activities. The LDE will continue to monitor the expenditures of the remaining DSS funds and parent engagement as part of the annual federal monitoring process.

As part of the annual planning process, Louisiana school systems will identify strengths and weaknesses through a local needs assessment. Local school systems will expend Title I to address DSS programming activities which address weaknesses, identifying the specific courses and/or services they wish to provide based on identified student needs and articulating the manner in which they will involve parents and high-quality providers. Title I funds can support:

- A. Enrollment and participation in academic courses not otherwise available at a student's school, including advanced courses, career and technical education coursework, and dual enrollment courses to address developmental/remedial needs;
- B. Credit recovery and academic acceleration courses that lead to a regular high school diploma;
- C. Activities that assist students in successfully completing postsecondary level instruction and examinations that are accepted for credit at institutions of higher education (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses), which may include reimbursing low-income students to cover part or all of the costs of fees for such examinations;
- D. Components of a personalized learning approach, which may include high-quality academic tutoring; and
- E. Transportation to allow a student enrolled in a school identified for comprehensive intervention to transfer to another public school that has not been identified by the state as a struggling school.

Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

All local school systems will receive the newly authorized Title IV Student Support and Academic Enrichment (SSAE) formula grants in the same proportion as to the LEA's prior year's *Title I*, Part

A allocations. If the Department does not have sufficient funds to make allocations to any of its LEAs in an amount equal to the minimum of \$10,000 as required in the law, the Department will ratably reduce LEA allocations above \$10,000 to ensure all LEAs will receive allocation of at least the minimum amount. Downward adjustments will be proportional to LEA shares of Title I, Part A funds for the preceding fiscal year. If there are insufficient funds to provide every LEA with at least \$10,000, the LDE may run a competitive grant process to allow LEAs to submit plans to promote student health and safety, a well-rounded education, and the effective use of technology to support student learning and digital literacy.

These grants will, pursuant to ESSA, support local school systems in providing all students with access to a well-rounded education, improve school conditions for student learning, and improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students. Budgets for the SSAE grants will be added to the consolidated application for federal funds in the 2017-2018 school year (pending Congressional appropriation) and LEAs will be able to tailor investments based on the needs of their unique student populations, coordinate and integrate SSAE funded activities with other federally funded activities, and leverage these funds in combination with other dollars to improve outcomes for students. Specific allowable uses of funds include direct services to students, professional development for teachers, administrators, and other school professionals, salaries of school personnel to carry out identified programs and services, and supplemental educational resources and equipment.

If an SEA intends to use Title IV, Part A funds or funds from other included programs for the activities that follow, the description must address how the State strategies below support the State-level strategies in 6.1.A and B.

- C. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to improve school conditions for student learning, including activities that create safe, healthy, and affirming school environments inclusive of all students to reduce:
- i. Incidents of bullying and harassment;
 - ii. The overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and
 - iii. The use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

◆ Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

D No.

The LDE will use Title IV, Part A funding to support statewide work associated with student behavior and discipline. Specifically, the LDE will fund portions of the salaries of three LDE staff members who support the Advisory Council on Student Behavior and Discipline (pursuant to Act 522 of the 2016 Regular Legislative Session), supervise the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) regional consortia, and oversee implementation of the state's comprehensive bullying and harassment laws.

The LDE is committed to supporting LEAs in reducing incidents of both bullying and harassment. It publishes and promotes usage of a school system planning guide, released each spring, that is designed to support school systems as they create plans annually. The next edition of the school system planning guide will include guidance and a planning component to promote LEA review of student behavior and discipline data, which is disaggregated by reason code including bullying and harassment. The data will be reviewed by LEAs to determine training priorities for staff and educators related to classroom management, behavior intervention, and positive behavioral supports.

In the 2015-2016 school year, there were 634 reported incidents of bullying, 120 incidents of cyber bullying and 529 incidents involving harassment statewide. In addition to specific discipline data, recidivism rates for students suspended (2.46 times) and expelled (2 times) in the 2015-2016 term indicates current practice is not effective. The data suggest that additional supports and resources are needed for educators and school leaders to implement effective behavioral interventions and disciplinary practices, including but not limited to referrals to and interventions within alternative education sites. Beginning in Fall 2017, the LDE will provide training and technical assistance, for consortium and school staff, on effective discipline practices that promote orderly and healthy school climates. Training will include, but will not be limited to:

- Overview and introduction of school wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
- Understanding and Using Data: Data based Decision Making
- Principles of Conflict Prevention and Management
- Using Problem-Solving Approaches to Discipline
- Trauma-Informed Approaches and Trauma Specific Interventions
- Bullying Prevention Education
- Suicide Prevention Education
- School Climate Improvements that Foster and Sustain Safe and Supportive Schools

D. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to effectively use technology to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students?

◆ Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

DNo.

As sufficient Title IV, Part A funds are available, the LDE will use funds to support work with LEAs in effectively integrating technology into academic planning, delivery, and improvement. Technology is part of the LDE's annual collaborative priority setting and planning with LEAs, including for the purposes of budgeting. LDE staff work with LEA leaders to review annual technology indicators as reported in the LDE's annual technology footprint report, and in tandem with reviews of student achievement data. They also review and discuss readiness for online

assessments, although the primary focus is on the availability and effective integration of technology in classroom instruction. To assist with this planning, LDE staff provide information to LEAs about the state's reviews and ratings of technology rich curricula, identifying those that have been identified as aligning to state standards and meeting quality expectations in English language arts and mathematics, in particular. Many of those providers offer professional development for educators, which could be eligible uses of federal funds by LEAs. The LDE's instructional material reviews can be accessed [here](#).

- E. Does the SEA intend to use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support strategies to support LEAs to engage parents, families, and communities?

D Yes. If yes, provide a description below.

D  No.

Due to limited Title IV, Part A funds, the LDE will support this particular work using other sources of funding. The LDE has engaged in a robust effort to publish information that is easily understood by parents and the public, has released a number of resources for parents through its Family Support Toolbox, and has engaged several organizations that interact directly with students' parents and custodians.

6.2 Program-Specific Requirements.

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies

- i. Describe the process and criteria that the SEA will use to waive the 40 percent schoolwide poverty threshold under section 1114(a)(1)(B) of the ESEA that an LEA submits on behalf of a school, including how the SEA will ensure that the schoolwide program will best serve the needs of the lowest-achieving students in the school.

The LDE recognizes the benefits of operating Title I, Part A programs through a schoolwide program model, which provides great fiscal flexibility in targeting resources to meet the needs of schools serving the most at-risk students. Over 97 percent of Title I schools in Louisiana implement the schoolwide model.

The LDE proposes to automatically grant waivers to the 40 percent poverty threshold for any school with a poverty percent of at least thirty five percent poverty that has operated as a targeted assistance school (TAS) model for at least one year. Operating as a TAS model provides the school with experience in identifying and serving the most at-risk students to ensure that strategies and interventions will continue to be in place for those students that are at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards as required under Section 1008(b)(7)(A)(iii) of the ESSA. Louisiana currently has twenty-three schools implementing the Title I Targeted Assistance model.

If an LEA requests to serve a school with less than 40 percent poverty with a schoolwide model, the LEA will be required to submit a written request within its consolidated application to waive the 40 percent threshold. The LEA must include a description of the following:

1. How its decision to implement the schoolwide program model was derived.
2. How the school generated its Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and how the areas of need were identified.
3. How the results of the CNA will be utilized to drive how the schoolwide program will serve the needs of all students in the school, in particular the students that are most at risk of failing.

B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children.

The LDE will address the identified unique educational needs of migratory children through the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, state, and federal education programs. Joint planning will occur among local, state, and federal education programs, including language instruction education programs under Part A of Title III and the integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs. The LDE will also address the unique needs of preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school. These things will occur throughout the agency's planning, implementation, and evaluation activities, as described below.

- i. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will establish and implement a system for the proper identification and recruitment of eligible migratory children on a statewide basis, including the identification and recruitment of preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and how the SEA will verify and document the number of eligible migratory children aged 3 through 21 residing in the State on an annual basis.

In Louisiana, a two-tiered system is used to identify and recruit migratory children. First, local recruiters are hired and/or contracted by the local operating agencies that have Title I, Part C sub-grants. Second, a team of two regional recruiters covers the areas of the state that do not receive Migrant Education Program sub-grants. The regional recruiters coordinate recruitment of out-of-school youth and eligible migrant students in non-funded areas of the state. A third regional recruiter is planned for 2017-2018.

The Louisiana Migrant Education Program contracted the Research Foundation of SUNY for ESCORT/SUNY to help it manage its Migrant Education Program. As part of this contract, ESCORT coordinates all aspects of state-wide Identification and Recruitment (ID&R), including training and certifying all recruiters in accordance with the Louisiana Quality Control Policies and Procedures manual.

Re-Certification

For each year of eligibility, recruiters must re-certify all eligible migratory children for which they have active certificates of eligibility, typically on the anniversary of their qualifying arrival date. The recruiter has a family member sign the current electronic certificate of eligibility, thus verifying that they are still in area. If another qualifying move has occurred, a new certificate of eligibility is created.

Annual Counts:

Only students who meet the Migrant Education Program eligibility guidelines are counted, using several mathematical checks that ensure children are within the eligible age range and have a documented residency during the period. Louisiana's Migrant Education Program student database (MERIL2) calculates fields of LQM3 (last qualifying move date plus three years), twenty-second birth date (birth date plus twenty-two years), and third birth date (birth date plus three years). Children are not counted unless they have one or more of the following: valid qualifying move date, new residency date, or enrollment date (residency enrollment for non-attendees or a school enrollment for attendees) during the period in question.

MERIL2 assures that students are counted only once per child count category by assigning each child a student sequence number. If a child has multiple school history lines that fit the funding criteria, MERIL2 only counts the student sequence number once.

- ii. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will identify the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school.

Louisiana's Migrant Education Program assesses the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, through the following methods.

1. **Tri-annual update of the state's major Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA).** This process is coordinated by a steering committee, consisting of major stakeholders, including state and local Migrant Education Program staff, and parents. Data are gathered from various sources (government agencies, research studies, and local needs assessments) in order to further illustrate the concerns. From the concerns and the supporting data, objectives for the program are developed for each age/grade group of children and youth: pre-K age, grades K-5, grades 6-8, grades 9-12, and Out-of-School Youth. The objectives are also designed to fall into the Seven Areas of Concern developed by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Migrant Education. The objectives are considered the measurable program objectives for the program. They are time limited, specific, and annually measurable. It is important to note that some of the objectives may be directed toward implementation and others toward outcomes.

2. **Annual evaluation of each sub-grantee.** A yearly evaluation is completed for each sub-grantee that has had a Migrant Education Program for a minimum of one year. Provision and effectiveness of services are components of this evaluation through the use of a Fidelity of Strategy Implementation (FSI) form, which is a self-assessment tool used to measure implementation of each strategy outlined in the Service Delivery Plan, performance against measurable program outcomes and objectives, and aggregate reports detailing services provided. Data collected during these evaluations is used to both measure the effectiveness of local migrant programs and to inform the CNA process. Results of the previous year's evaluation are given to local coordinators at the beginning of the next year so that improvements can be made.
3. **Independent evaluation of State's Migrant Education Program.** An independent evaluation is completed before beginning of CNA update process.
4. **Student needs assessment.** A needs assessment is completed for every eligible migratory student to determine priority of service ranking of each student and to provide data needed on a local level to plan for service delivery. Risk factors assessed include:
 - a. Not passing or proficient on state assessments;
 - b. English learner;
 - c. D or F in English language arts, math, science, or social studies;
 - d. Not on track to graduate;
 - e. Below grade level on K-3 reading diagnostic;
 - f. Prekindergarten below proficient on kindergarten readiness evaluation;
 - g. Special needs;
 - h. Experiencing homelessness or in foster care;
 - i. Drop out;
 - j. Age 0-5 not enrolled in early childhood programs; and/or
 - k. Excessive absences (under age 15).
- iii. Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, are addressed through the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs.

Below are the methods Louisiana uses to ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school are met:

1. **Service delivery Plan:** The foundational document for provision of services to all eligible migratory children is the state's Service Delivery Plan. The Service Delivery Plan outlines strategies to meet the needs documented through the Comprehensive Needs Assessment update process; and Measurable Program Outcomes designed to measure the effectiveness of

the strategies in the following areas: literacy, numeracy, school readiness, and graduation and career readiness.

2. **Sub-granting process:** As part of the yearly funding cycle, any LEA in Louisiana that has a sufficient number of eligible migrant children needed to generate a minimum of \$25,000 is eligible to receive a sub-grant. For planning for provision of services, each sub-grantee must sign assurances that it will provide services to eligible migrant students in accordance with the Service Delivery Plan and priority of need. In addition, the sub-grantee must describe the services and programs it will implement to achieve each of the measurable program outcomes and describe any collaboration with other programs, including Title I, Part A and Title III. One question specifically addresses the services that will be developed to facilitate enrollment of migratory children in early childhood programs.
LEAs with a migrant eligible child population generating less than \$25,000 are placed in a consortium, with cumulative funding going to a designated fiscal agent. As the recipient of funds, the fiscal agent signs an assurance that it will coordinate services to eligible migrant students in consortium LEAs, including services funded through other sources such as Title I, Part A and Title III.
3. **Program Evaluation:** A yearly evaluation is completed for each sub-grantee that has had a Migrant Education Program for a minimum of one year. Provision and effectiveness of services (as measured by measurable performance objectives), is a component of this evaluation. Louisiana's Title I, Part C director conducts a minimum of two meetings per year (fall and mid-spring) with local Migrant Education Program coordinators. In the fall meeting, participants review the measurable program outcomes and key strategies to guide their planning and provision of services for the year.
4. **Non-funded districts:** Traditional and charter LEAs with a migrant eligible child population generating less than \$25,000 are placed in a consortium, with cumulative funding going to a designated fiscal agent. As the recipient of the funds, the fiscal agent signs assurance that it will coordinate services to eligible migrant students in consortium districts, including services funded through other sources such as Title I - Part A and Title III.
5. **Services for drop-outs and out-of-school youth:** Louisiana uses a need assessment process uniquely designed to assess the needs of its out-of-school migratory youth and to categorize the youth as either a drop-out (have attended and dropped out of U.S. high schools) or as "here-to-work." Depending upon the needs identified, services are coordinated through the either through the LEA in which the youth resides or through the sub-grantee charged with coordinating "here-to-work" out-of-school youth services. An August 2017 planning meeting of Louisiana's Migrant Education Program will be used to identify specific needs and services to be delivered.
6. **Preschool Children:** Home/School liaisons in local operating agencies provide a variety of services to preschool migratory students and their families including provision of early-childhood learning resources, assistance in registering for early childhood programs, in-home support, and referral to health and community services.

7. **Sub-grantee monitoring:** Louisiana monitors its sub-grantees on a three-year cycle and includes evaluation of districts' compliance with provision of services in accordance with the Service Delivery Plan and priority of need.

Local Planning and evaluation: Joint planning with other programs is critical to ensure that the full range of services that are available for migratory children are provided, and Louisiana's Migrant Education Program is committed to such collaboration on both the local and state level. Local MEP coordinators are housed in the districts' federal program offices and are typically charged with the responsibility of other programs, thus allowing for ease of planning and collaboration with other federal programs. This is particularly true of Title III, which is increasingly important as the number of migratory English learners steadily increases. In addition, local sub-grantees collaborate with educational agencies such as early childhood and adult education programs, health education programs, and social welfare agencies.

The annual sub-grantee evaluation (including FSI) and monitoring are used to evaluate the implementation of joint planning at the local level.

State level joint planning: The Migrant Education Program state director is housed within the LDE's Federal Programs office. The group holds weekly planning meetings, thus allowing for timely and meaningful planning and collaboration between federal programs, including Title I, Part A and McKinney-Vento. In addition, the Migrant Education Program state director is state coordinator for Title III and REAP, thus ensuring joint planning among these programs. The state director also has regular collaborative meetings with the State's English learner academic director.

The CNA and SDP update process is also used as an opportunity to plan jointly with other local and state programs. All major stakeholders who share responsibility for migratory children are invited to attend CNA and SDP meetings, including a representative from Louisiana's high school equivalency program, staff members from the State's early childhood and graduation pathway offices, local MEP staff, and teachers.

Integration of services: Services available under Title I, Part C are most commonly integrated with services provided through Title I and Title III. As part of the annual application process, all sub-grantees must describe the services and programs it will provide to achieve each of the MPOs and describe any integration of services with other programs, including Title I, A, Title III, and REAP. In addition, sub-grantees sign an assurance that it will coordinate with other programs to provide services to eligible migrant students. Sub-grantees serving as fiscal agent for a consortium of low-incident LEAs must have an agreement with each LEA that outlines how services will be provided to the migratory children and what programs will be used to fund the services, sources Title I, A and Title III.

Effective integration of services with other programs is evaluated through the annual sub-grantee evaluation and through monitoring.

- iv. Describe how the State and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will use funds received under Title I, Part C to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year (*i.e.*, through use of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX), among other vehicles).

The Louisiana Migrant Education Program maintains student data (including for Prekindergarten and OSY) in its Migrant Education Records in Louisiana (MERIL) database. Local data specialists are provided training each year on protocols used for activating local operating agency's procedures for transfer of school records when a migrant child changes schools or district within Louisiana, whether that move occurs during the regular school year or between school years.

In addition, the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) national database is used to research students' consolidated records from both within Louisiana and in other states. Records provide for educational continuity, including information on health. Extracts are uploaded nightly from the MERIL database to the MSIX server. MSIX has a notification feature that enables communication with other states about the movement of students; the LDE is able to notify others when a student arrives to or leaves one school system (either intra- or interstate). In addition, notifications are received from other states, which enhance the ability to recruit and enroll students in a timely fashion.

- v. Describe the unique educational needs of the State's migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, based on the State's most recent comprehensive needs assessment.

The following educational areas of concern were used as the organizing framework for the Louisiana Migrant Education Program's current CNA:

- Educational Continuity;
- Instructional Time;
- School engagement;
- English Language Development;
- Educational support in home;
- Health; and
- Access to services.

Analysis of each area of concern showed the following to be the primary unique educational needs of the State's migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school:

1. Low English language proficiency: Data shows that 53 percent of migratory children are identified as English learners (ELS), an increase of 34 percent since 2007. Over 36 percent of these scored at the beginning or low intermediate level in English language proficiency on the state language proficiency assessment;
 2. Migrant students scored 12 percent and 8 percent percentage points lower than their non-migrant counterparts on English Language Arts and Mathematics state assessments respectively;
 3. Migrant students, including preschool aged, are more apt to limited access to technology and educational materials needed to support in-home learning and academic progress;
 4. Many migrant parents (especially non-English dominant) reported having limited understanding of graduation requirements; and
 5. Out-of-school youth are under-identified and those identified receive limited services.
- vi. Describe the current measurable program objectives and outcomes for Title I, Part C, and the strategies the SEA will pursue on a statewide basis to achieve such objectives and outcomes consistent with section 1304(b)(1)(D) of the ESEA.

Literacy

1. 50 percent of the students participating in a migrant-funded literacy-development intervention during the regular school year will improve their performance on state ELA assessments administered during that same year.
2. 10 percent of migrant students without a previous score on a state ELA assessment who participate in a migrant-funded literacy-development intervention for at least 50 percent of the regular school year will score proficient or above on the state ELA assessments administered during that same year.
3. 50 percent of Limited English Proficient migrant students who participate in a migrant-funded English proficiency development intervention during the regular school year will increase their English proficiency level as measured by norm-based proficiency assessment.
4. 50 percent of migrant students who participate in a migrant-funded ELA-focused summer educational program for at least 90 percent of the programs' duration will improve.
5. 80 percent of migrant parents who participate in a migrant-sponsored or co-sponsored parental involvement activity will report being more engaged in their child's academic progress.
6. The achievement gap between migrant students and regular education students on state ELA assessments will decrease.

Numeracy

1. 50 percent of the students who participate in a migrant-funded numeracy intervention during the regular school year will improve their performance on state numeracy assessments administered during that same year.
2. 10 percent of migrant students without a previous score on a numeracy state-assessment who participate in a migrant-funded intervention for at least 50 percent of the regular school year will score proficient or above on the state assessments administered during that same year.
3. 50 percent of migrant students who participate in a migrant-funded numeracy-targeted summer educational program for at least 90 percent of the programs' duration will improve.
4. 80 percent of migrant parents who participate in a migrant-sponsored parental involvement activity will report being more engaged in their child's academic progress.
5. The achievement gap between migrant students and regular education students on state mathematics assessments will decrease.

School Readiness

1. 50 percent of migrant families with children 0-5 years of age will receive resources to help the children develop school-readiness skills before entering for Pre-K.
2. 100 percent of parents with 3-5 year-old migrant students will receive assistance in registering their children in pre-k programs.
3. 80 percent of migrant parents who participated in migrant-sponsored parental involvement activity will report being more knowledgeable about early-childhood resources.

Graduation and Career Readiness

1. 50 percent of migrant students in grades 9-12 with demonstrated academic risk factor who participate in a migrant-funded intervention will see academic improvement.
2. 50 percent of migrant students entering 12th grade during reporting year who have participated in a migrant-funded intervention program over the course of two regular school years will graduate.
3. 80 percent of migrant parents who participated in migrant-sponsored parental involvement activity will report being more engaged in their child's' academic success and more knowledgeable about graduation requirements and college and career readiness programs.
4. 50 percent of identified OSY report receiving information regarding educational services and career options.

Statewide Strategies

1. Comprehensive approach for the planning delivery of services based upon on-going cycle plan of plan, implement, and evaluate;
2. Completion of needs assessment on eligible migrant children to plan service delivery;
3. Priority given to students who are failing, or most at risk of failing and who have experience an educational interruption due to migratory lifestyle;
4. Effective implementation *Quality Control Policies and Procedures Manual*;
5. Implementation of strategies outlined in current Service Delivery Plan;

6. Centralization of ID&R, including recruiter training and evaluation;
 7. Targeted approach to recruiting and serving OSY and drop-outs;
 8. Strong parental involvement plan, including a Parental Advisory Committee to provide families with information and resources to help them support the academic success of their migratory children; and
 9. Strong collaborative relationship with other programs such as Title I, IDEA, and Title III.
- vii. Describe how the SEA will ensure there is consultation with parents of migratory children, including parent advisory councils, at both the State and local level, in the planning and operation of Title I, Part C programs that span not less than one school year in duration, consistent with section 1304(c)(3) of the ESEA.

The Louisiana Migrant Education Program has contracted Research Foundation of SUNY for ESCORT/SUNY to help it manage its Migrant Education Program. As part of this contract ESCORT will help ensure consultation with parents of migratory children by:

- A. Providing technical assistance to local programs to help increase parental attendance and participation on local and state migrant parent advisory councils and to ensure that:
 - i. Applicable local programs hold a minimum of three migrant parent advisory council meetings per year; and
 - ii. Each local migrant parent advisory council designates at least one representative to serve on the State migrant parent advisory councils.
 - B. Coordinating activities of state migrants parent advisory council, including strategies to increase parental attendance and participation on the state migrant parent advisory council, including planning of annual meeting(s); and
 - C. Strategies to involve parents in the design, implementation, and evaluation of Migrant Education Program services, including updates of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Service Delivery Plan.
- viii. Describe the SEA's priorities for use of Title I, Part C funds, specifically related to the needs of migratory children with "priority for services" under section 1304(d) of the ESEA, including:
1. The measures and sources of data the SEA, and if applicable, its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will use to identify those migratory children who are a priority for services; and
 2. When and how the SEA will communicate those determinations to all local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, in the State.

To meet the unique educational needs of migratory children, the Louisiana Migrant Education Program will focus on the following priorities in the use of its Title I, Part C funds:

- Timely and effective identification and recruitment of all eligible migratory students in the state;

- Timely identification of migratory students who are a priority for service;
- Strong parental involvement and support programs, including family literacy resources for parents who have limited academic achievement levels;
- Planning and carrying out processes for effective identification of migratory students who have dropped out of school and implementation of service delivery systems to address their unmet educational needs;
- Planning and carrying out early childhood programs to meet unmet educational needs of preschool migratory children; and
- Planning and carrying out high-quality and comprehensive educational programs and services that address the unique educational needs of migratory students to ensure they have opportunities to meet the same challenging state academic standards that all children are expected to meet.

Below is the needs assessment completed for every eligible migrant student to determine level of priority. To be considered “Priority for Service,” a student must meet criterion #1 and have a least one risk factor checked under criterion #2.

Migrant Student Priority for Service Criteria
Criterion # 1 – Migratory children who have:
1. Made a qualifying move within previous 1-year period of based on current qualifying arrival date; or
2. Have dropped out of school
Criterion #2 – Migratory children who are failing, or at most risk of failing, to meet the State’s challenging State academic content standards and challenging state student academic achievement standards.
1. Migrant students not scoring at level considered proficient or passing on state-administered assessment; or
2. Limited English Proficient migrant students with a demonstrated language proficiency level below advanced in any domain; or
3. Migrant students who have D or F in a course; or
4. Migrant students not on track to graduate; or
5. Migrant student below grade level on K-3 reading diagnostic; or
6. Pre-K migrant student scoring below proficient on a school-readiness evaluation; or
7. Migrant students who are overage for grade or who have been retained; or
8. Migrant students with an Individual Education Plan (IEP), or
9. Migrant students who are experiencing homelessness; or
10. Migrant out-of-school youth who are recovery youth; or
11. Migrant child 0-5 years of age who has not been enrolled in early childhood program

To ensure timely identification of migratory children with priority for service:

- a. The needs assessment should be completed within two weeks of the student entering a Migrant Education Program;
- b. Existing needs assessment should be reviewed at the end of each grading period throughout school year to determine if there are any changes in risk-factors.

Local programs have immediate access to the priority ranking of the eligible migratory students in its area through reports available in MERIL. Reports are also available to track services provided to students.

C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

- i. Describe the SEA's plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.
- ii. Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program, including the knowledge and skills needed to earn a regular high school diploma and make a successful transition to postsecondary education, career and technical education, or employment.

The goals of the SEA's Title I, Part D plan are to:

- Improve educational services to children in local and state institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth so that such children and youth have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state content standards and challenging state student academic achievement standards that all children in the state will be expected to meet;
- Provide such children and youth the services needed to make a successful transition from institutionalization to further schooling or employment; and
- Prevent at-risk youth from dropping out of school and providing dropouts and youth returning from institutions with a support system to ensure their continued education.

The LDE will accomplish these goals by assuring that state and local agencies fulfill the following requirements.

State and Local Agencies will:

- Submit an annual count of eligible students to Louisiana Department of Education in December of each year;
- Submit program applications for approval to Louisiana Department of Education in June with the Consolidated Plan;
- Use multiple appropriate measures of student progress;
- Submit an annual Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) to the Louisiana Department of Education capturing student progress results; and
- Use evaluation results to plan and improve subsequent programs.

SEA requirements:

- A state agency is eligible for assistance if it is responsible for providing a free education for children and youth in an institution for neglected and delinquent children; attending community day programs for neglected and delinquent children and youth; or in adult correctional institutions.
- The state agency will concentrate on providing participants with the knowledge and skills needed to successfully transition to secondary school completion, vocational or technical training, further education or employment.
- The state agency must use at least 15 but not more than 30 percent of its annual allocation to support transitional services that support (1) projects that facilitate transition of children and youth from state operated institutions to schools served by the LEAs, or (2) successful reentry of youth offenders, who have received a secondary school diploma or its equivalent, into postsecondary education, or vocational and technical training programs, through strategies to expose the youth to those various programs and training.
- Provide the opportunity for students to meet the same challenging state content standards and student academic achievement standards that all children in the state will be expected to meet
- A state agency must use its federal allocation to supplement, not supplant, its state or local education funding.

LEA requirements:

- Local agencies should design transitional and supportive programs to meet the needs of children and youth returning to schools within the LEA or other alternative educational programs and assist them in completing their education.
- Services to students at risk of dropping out of school will not have a negative impact on meeting the transitional and academic needs of students returning from correctional facilities.
- Provide support programs that encourage student dropouts to re-enter school when released from correctional facility or provide skills to gain employment, or seek a high school diploma or equivalent.
- Provide opportunity for students to meet the same challenging state content standards while in correctional facility.
- Promote programs that use technology to assist in coordinating educational programs between the correctional facility and home school.
- Encourage correctional facilities, if appropriate; to work with local businesses to develop training and curriculum-based youth entrepreneurship education and mentoring programs.

The state and local agencies will track the number of youth who are enrolled in school, enrolled in HiSET preparation classes, enrolled in a post-secondary program, and entering the workforce and earning a wage. The LDE may monitor through an on-site visit or desk audit, on an alternating basis, the state agencies and LEAs with neglected and delinquent facilities for compliance. Technical assistance concerning program guidelines, allowable expenditures, and data collection will be provided through a program coordinator or designated staff.

Transitions Between State Agencies and Local Programs:

During the June 2017 meeting of the Louisiana State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and following several meetings with diverse stakeholders and site visits to alternative education settings, the board approved changes to its regulations in order to implement a specialized accountability system for schools operated within Louisiana Office of Juvenile Justice (OJJ) secure care centers. While these educational sites will continue to be subject to accountability in terms of a performance score, letter grade, and reporting in the same manner as traditional schools, additional expectations have been added to ensure that the needs of this unique student population are addressed.

The regulations address transitions, identification of student needs, accountability, and improvement in a comprehensive manner, with required monitoring, interventions, and a designated liaison between the Office of Juvenile Justice and the Louisiana Department of Education. The regulations require the OJJ to maintain and transmit educational records, including enrollment and attendance records, high school coursework and diploma planning documentation, records associated with pursuing industry-based certificates, local transcripts, student grades, TABE scores, state assessment scores, and any other assessments identified. This information will assist in a student's transition into and out of an OJJ facility and will help to ensure that a student is continuing academic progress.

The regulations also require the creation of interview protocols to assist with students transitioning into OJJ schools. The information gathered will be used to develop individual learning plans for students which shall be maintained with the student's academic records. The information will be used to assure that students are assigned to appropriate educational programs, to collect interests to inform the assignment or transfer of students to other programs or schools, and to verify consultation and consent of parents if a student is removed from a high school diploma pathway.

The regulations further emphasize the requirement of OJJ to request cumulative records from a student's home school upon the student's entry to the OJJ school. Similarly, OJJ shall send cumulative records to receiving local education agencies within two business days of receiving a request for records.

Program Objectives and Outcomes:

The above-mentioned state regulations detail program objectives and outcomes that will be used to assess the effectiveness of education services in OJJ schools in the state. They create a specialized school and district report card in addition to the traditional report card for OJJ schools beginning with the 2017-2018 academic year. The specialized report card will include the following:

1. Growth measures from TABE
2. Percentage of students earning a high school diploma
3. Percentage of students earning a high school equivalency diploma (HiSET)
4. Percentage of students in grades 11 and 12 who earn a state approved industry-based credential

5. Percentage of students in high school grades who earn a minimum of 2.5 Carnegie credits per semester
6. Percentage of students who participate in and meet the program requirements of Jobs for America's Graduates (JAG)
7. Subgroup performance for students with disabilities for all measures

In addition to the specialized report card, the LDE will:

- Incorporate an evaluation component in the Electronic Grants Management System (EGMS) for the 2018-2019 school year. This will assist with the monitoring process by allowing the LDE to track the progress of activities from the previous year.
- Coordinate the work of the Title I, Part D unit in the Federal Programs office with that of the Office of Student Opportunities, which is focused on the needs of junior high and high school students, within the agency. This will include conducting periodic meetings with the educational staff of OJJ to discuss program objectives and intended student outcomes.
- Review Data and Monitoring results to provide technical assistance to OJJ regarding activities that include transitional services, data collection, career and technical education, and other activities to improve the overall education programs to meet the needs of students.

The above enhancements specific to OJJ secure care schools will also inform related improvements in the educational accountability of non-secure care schools and alternative education in LEAs. The Department has finalized a Memorandum of Understanding with OJJ based on the results of monitoring in order to improve the educational outcomes of youth placed in secure care facilities.

D. Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students.

- i. Describe the SEA's standardized entrance and exit procedures for English learners consistent with section 3113(b)(2) of the ESEA. These procedures must include valid and reliable, objective criteria that are applied consistently across the State. At a minimum, the standardized exit criteria must:
 1. Include a score of proficient on the State's annual English language proficiency assessment;
 2. Be the same criteria used for exiting students from the English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability purposes; and
 3. Not include performance on an academic content assessment.

The LDE will administer a new English language proficiency assessment in 2017-2018 based on the state's English proficiency standards, referred to as the Louisiana Connectors for English language learners. Protocols for the new assessment will include statewide implementation of standardized entrance and exit procedures.

A Home Language Use Survey is the first step in the entrance procedure; it is used to identify

potential ELs at the time of their initial enrollment in school. The second step is to administer the English Language Proficiency Screener to determine an initial English proficiency level, confirm eligibility for enrollment in a specialized language program, and inform initial placement. The English language proficiency screener and language proficiency assessments are part of the Louisiana Connectors for English Language Learners. Increasing the expectations for the academic content that students must master in grades K-12 requires a parallel increase in expectations for English language acquisition.

The Louisiana Connectors for English Language Learners, to which the English language proficiency assessments align, describe these higher expectations by integrating language development with appropriate academic content matter. The screening assessment developed from the same item bank as the summative assessment for each of the six grade bands helps schools assess the baseline English language proficiency of incoming ELs and inform placement and instructional decisions.

Since Louisiana will administer a new English Language Proficiency assessment, exit criteria have not been established. However, the exit criteria will be standardized, will be the same criteria used for exiting students from the English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability purposes, and will not include performance on an academic content assessment. Refer to section 1.C. for more information about supports for English learners.

E. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

- i. Describe how the SEA will use its Title IV, Part B, and other Federal funds to support State-level strategies that are consistent with the strategies identified in 6.1.A above.

The LDE utilizes Title IV, Part B funds to support sub-recipients in the creation of 21st century community learning centers that:

- Provide opportunities for academic enrichment to particularly students who attend high poverty and low-performing schools, to meet the challenging state academic standards;
- Offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities; and
- Offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children's education.

Title IV, Part B funds are used to:

- Establish and implement a rigorous peer review process for subgrant applications;
- Award funds to eligible entities;
- Monitor and evaluate programs and activities;
- Support capacity building, training, and technical assistance;
- Conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of programs and activities;

- Provide training and technical assistance to eligible entities that are applicants for or recipients of awards;
- Ensure that any eligible entity that receives an award from the state aligns the activities provided by the program with the challenging state academic standards;
- Ensure that any such eligible entity identifies and partners with external organizations, if available, in the community; and
- Work with teachers, principals, parents, the local workforce, the local community, and other stakeholders to review and improve state policies and practices to support the implementation of effective programs.

Louisiana currently has 38 sub-recipients that serve approximately 15,000 students. In addition to providing academic support in the areas of math, literacy and science that are aligned to the state academic standards, 21st Century Community Learning Centers programs also provide high quality afterschool programming in areas such as STEM, youth development, art, music, dance, theatre, entrepreneurial education, video/media services, service learning, and character education. The majority of Louisiana’s sub-recipients serve all students, including English learners and children with disabilities.

- ii. Describe the SEA’s processes, procedures, and priorities used to award subgrants consistent with the strategies identified above in 6.1.A. above and to the extent permitted under applicable law and regulations.

Competitive Process Background

Louisiana awards Title IV, Part B (21st Century Community Learning Center) funds to eligible entities through a competitive grant process. Eligible entities include local educational agencies, community-based organizations, faith based organizations, other public or private entities, or a consortium of such agencies. The competitive process will be conducted as a Request for Application (RFA). Proposers will submit applications, and those applications will be read, reviewed, and scored by external reviewers. The awards from this competitive grant process will result in a grant allocation that will be fiscally administered through the agency electronic grants management system (eGMS).

Louisiana’s 21st CCLC program will have a minimum grant award of \$50,000 as stated in Section 4204(d)(h) and a maximum award of \$1,200,000.

Priority for Awards

The RFP grants priority status to proposals based on those outlined in Section 4203(a)(3), which states, “*State educational agencies will make awards under this part to eligible entities that serve students who primarily attend schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111(d); and other schools determined by the local educational agency to be in need of intervention and support; and the families of such students.*” Furthermore, priority is also given to those that propose a program focusing on Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math (STEAM) and those that target “D” and “F” rated schools.

Peer Review Process

Section 4202(c)(B) requires the establishment and implementation of a rigorous peer review process for subgrant applications. The 21st CCLC Request for Proposal includes an evaluation rubric that peer reviewers utilize to read, rate and score the proposals. The technical review of applications consists of three parts — the application screening, the individual review and the funding review. The application screening process involves an overview of each application to determine its adherence to RFP selection criteria and guidelines. The individual review involves external reviewers (with expertise in 21st CCLC, afterschool, extended learning, youth development and mentoring, etc.) who read and assign points to applications. The peer reviewers have diverse expertise, represent educational and non-educational entities, and represent equitable gender, ethnic, and geographic diversity. The final funding review is conducted by LDE prior to determination of final awards. Final approval is granted by BESE. Applicants that wish to appeal a grant award decision or disqualification must adhere to La. R.S. 39:1671 and submit the proper documentation to the Louisiana Office of State Procurement.

Noting that Louisiana is unique in its treatment of 21st CCLC proposals as social services and its use of the procurement system to make awards, the LDE engaged stakeholders to gauge their interest in possibly requesting a change to this requirement. While they acknowledged that some aspects of the system do present occasional challenges, stakeholders indicated that they value it because of its consistency and fairness. As a result of those discussions, no changes to the process will be pursued at this time. Stakeholders did, however, offer recommendations on targeting programs and funding toward critical needs, particularly in middle schools, and more effectively evaluating programs for positive outcomes.

F. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program.

- i. Provide the SEA's specific measurable program objectives and outcomes related to activities under the Rural and Low-Income School Program, if applicable.

The Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program goal is to assist Louisiana's rural LEAs having a disproportionately high rate of poverty among its population in meeting the state's challenging academic standards. Each eligible rural LEA will conduct an annual needs assessment and identify the specific program objectives where it will focus its RLIS funding. The LDE expects LEAs to meet RLIS standards by utilizing the flexible funds provided by the program to:

1. Improve teaching and learning in the classroom by:
 - a. Providing rich professional development to teachers and administrators in schools
 - b. Providing learning tools and resources that engage children and assist them in obtaining the knowledge necessary to succeed in postsecondary education or employment
2. Improve equity in the classroom for students, especially for subgroups that are typically disadvantaged in education, such as students in poverty, minority students, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities.

Allowable uses of RLIS funds to improve teaching and learning as well as equity in the classroom include:

1. Using RLIS funds to augment Title I services provided by the LEA
2. Using RLIS funds to increase professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators in the LEA (activities allowable under Title II A)
3. Using RLIS funds to increase services for English Language Learners (Activities allowable under Title III)
4. Using RLIS funds for allowable purposes under Title IV A of ESSA such as:
 - a. Activities to support safe and healthy students such as drug and violence prevention programs, school-based mental health programs and programs on nutrition and healthful living;
 - b. Activities to support the effective use of technology in the classroom;
 - c. Activities to support a well-rounded education, such as providing greater access to STEM programming, college and career counseling and guidance, and programs that include art and/or music as tools to support student success; and
 - d. Parental engagement activities to promote school/family collaboration and student success.

Each LEA identifies the amount of RLIS funding dedicated to meeting the program objectives in its ESSA Consolidated Application. The specific measurable program objectives and outcomes for each participating LEA related to the RLIS program will be driven by the needs and key planning decisions identified in each LEA's plan for educating its students, as well as requirements, as applicable, of Louisiana's school and LEA accountability system.

The LDE Federal Programs and Statewide Monitoring Divisions will approve the Rural and Low-Income LEA grants and the monitor recipients to ensure that 100 percent of the grant implements activities allowed under the applicable title program regulations by spring 2018. In addition to activities determined and directed by LEAs, the LDE provides assistance to RLIS-eligible LEAs through various state activities, provided in part, although not necessarily exclusively, by ESSA consolidated administration provisions. Currently, the LDE is partnering with rural LEAs to expand equitable access to effective educators and increase student achievement in these LEAs by:

1. Building an aligned assessment and goal-setting system;
 2. Improving and extending LEA/teacher preparation program partnerships;
 3. Strengthening and expanding a school principal fellowship; and
 4. Designing differentiated compensation plans based on both performance and demand for educators in rural areas.
- ii. Technical Assistance (ESEA section 5223(b)(3)): Describe how the SEA will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to help such agencies implement the activities described in ESEA section 5222.

The LDE will, through the RLIS coordinator and other state education agency resources, provide technical assistance to LEAs throughout the grant process, as needed. Technical assistance topics may include navigating the grant application and budget process, eligibility of costs under the

program, and assistance in determining the needs of the district in coordination with the accountability plan. Upon request by the LEA and as needs are identified through the LDE's ongoing planning processes with LEAs, the LDE will provide technical assistance on the implementation of RLIS funded LEA programs, based on the allowable use(s) of funds the LEA selects to use for its RLIS program.

G. McKinney-Vento Act.

- i. Consistent with section 722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act, Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youths in the State and assess their needs.

The LDE requires that all LEAs identify and assess the needs of homeless children and youth in the state, using the Louisiana Referral Form and the Louisiana Residency Questionnaire. These are completed and the student data is transferred from the Referral and Residency forms to the LDE's Student Information System (SIS) in real time. Using the referral form, LEA contacts, known as "homeless liaisons," then update student counts and input additional data about such students into the LDE's Homeless Tracking System (HTS) in addition to SIS. Reports are pulled from SIS regularly for the tracking of students from all LEAs and charters in the state. The LDE is required to report the data collected and found in SIS and HTS to the USDOE annually. These reports include the number of homeless children and youth identified in the state, the nature and extent of the problems homeless children and youth encounter in gaining access to public preschool programs and public schools, and the difficulties in identifying special needs and barriers to participation, achievement, and progress made by the LDE and LEAs in addressing the problems facing homeless children and youth. Enrollment disputes are mediated in accordance with the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Act.

In compliance with the McKinney-Vento Act, homeless children and youth are identified and tracked through the system described above. These students are ensured enrollment in public or charter schools in Louisiana, have access to and receive educational services for which they are eligible, including services through Head Start programs, early interventions under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and other preschool programs administered by LEAs. Homeless families, children, and youth in Louisiana also receive referrals to health, dental, mental health, substance abuse, housing, and other appropriate services. Parents and guardians of homeless children and youth are informed of educational and related opportunities available to their children and are provided meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children. Public notice of the educational rights of homeless students is made by disseminating such information in various locations, such as schools, shelters, public libraries, and soup kitchens, in a manner and form accessible to parents and guardians.

Additionally, the Louisiana Education of Homeless Children and Youths (LA-EHCY) Program, which is a competitive sub-grant, was awarded to 30 LEAs in the 2014-2015 academic year. The new cohort of sub-grantees will begin in the 2017-2018 academic year. This program provides additional funding for LEAs to support their homeless student population, and as such, sub-grantees are required to complete an annual evaluation of the homeless program, attend trainings on student

homelessness and provide a record of attendance, and collaborate with local community groups and other state agencies, such as the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program, Louisiana Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

- ii. Describe the SEA's programs for school personnel (including liaisons designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Act, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youths, including such children and youths who are runaway and homeless youths.

The LA-EHCY program and LEAs provide training activities to principals, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and pupil services personnel to heighten the awareness concerning the specific needs of runaway and homeless youth. This is done through a variety of brochures, posters, documents, workshops, and PowerPoint presentations at scheduled trainings and conferences along with other collaborative efforts. When training local liaisons, state coordinators direct them to the National Center for Homeless Education's Local Homeless Liaison Toolkit, brochures, posters, live and taped trainings and the LDE's toll free homeless hotline number. Posters and family brochures designed to convey information in an easily understood format are distributed for placement in locations such as schools, shelters, public libraries, and places that serve free meals, to educate the public about the educational rights of homeless children and youth. Training of local liaisons will continue to include strategies for the identification of homeless children and youths and potential approaches to conducting needs assessments using the National Center for Homeless Education's Evaluation toolkits.

The LA-EHCY program requires grant applicants to describe procedures that will be implemented to ensure that all school personnel are sensitive to the needs of homeless children and youths, including the special needs of runaway students. At conferences, workshops, and training sessions, the LA-EHCY presents information about runaway students and offers strategies for working effectively with those students. The LA-EHCY program administrators work closely with local liaisons who are in contact with local shelters that serve the special needs of runaway and homeless youths in Louisiana.

The LA-EHCY also coordinates with other federal program divisions within the LDE to ensure that homeless children receive all services for which they are eligible (i.e. Early Head Start, Head Start, English Language Acquisition, Literacy Programs, Migrant, Nutrition Services, Publicly Funded Day Care Programs, Parenting, Preschool Services, Special Education, and Transportation).

The LDE's [website](#) includes materials and statistics regarding homeless children and youth as well as contacts of homeless liaisons throughout the state who serve as child advocates for homeless children, youths, and runaway youths.

- iii. Describe the SEA's procedures to ensure that disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths are promptly resolved.

The establishment of effective mechanisms for complaint resolution was one of the earliest priorities for LA-EHCY. The LA-EHCY has provided LEAs with training regarding the provisions of the McKinney-Vento Act. Starting in 1990, considerable coordination began between the LDE's legal services division and the Office of Child Welfare and Attendance related to disputes concerning the education of homeless children and youths.

The LA-EHCY operates a homeless hotline number that serves to provide immediate response to questions and complaints regarding the education of homeless children and youths. Posters, brochures, workshops, and conferences are used to advertise this toll-free telephone number. These materials are disseminated statewide to homeless service providers, school districts, and school campuses. The LDE's [website](#) offers additional information. Homeless parents or unaccompanied homeless youths who wish to appeal a school or district's decision related to the identification, enrollment, placement or provision of services for homeless students may engage in the homeless dispute resolution process.

The LA-EHCY implemented procedures to resolve disputes when mediation fails. These procedures were approved by BESE and exist in state regulations in Bulletin 741, Section 341. All districts in the state of Louisiana use the same dispute process to ensure consistency across the state in the event that students move across district lines. Most of the activities regarding complaint resolution are ongoing. Future activities will involve further dissemination of the homeless hotline number and training Louisiana's educators and support staff about the laws and policies regarding the education of homeless children and youths. Through conferences, workshops, training of local homeless liaisons, and education of service providers, homeless parents, students, and advocates will become increasingly proficient at resolving disputes without the intervention of the LA-EHCY as specified by ESSA.

- If a dispute arises over school selection or enrollment, the child/youth must be immediately enrolled to the school in which the parent or unaccompanied homeless youth is seeking enrollment, pending resolution of the dispute (five days). Enrollment must continue in the school until the dispute and appeals are resolved at all levels (local, state, national) when necessary. The student must be provided with all services to which McKinney-Vento eligible students are entitled (e.g. transportation, Title I services, free meals).
- The parent/guardian/unaccompanied youth must be provided with a written explanation of the LEA's decision on the dispute, including the right to appeal further.
- The parent/guardian/unaccompanied youth must be referred to the homeless liaison for assistance with the appeal process, who will carry out the state's grievance procedure as expeditiously as possible after receiving notice of the dispute.
- Training of local liaisons to enforce the dispute resolution process will continue by the state coordinator. It is the responsibility of the local liaison to educate others, carry out the dispute

resolution process, and advocate for unaccompanied youths in this process. Local liaisons should maintain a record of all complaints.

- The state coordinator will receive a copy of all dispute resolutions from LEAs and maintain a “complaint log” for possible intervention. If a dispute reaches the state level, the standard procedures for a dispute appeal will be followed. The SEA will provide written notice of its position and inform the parent/guardian/unaccompanied youth of the right to appeal further.

iv. Describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that the youths described in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Act and youths separated from the public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youths described in this paragraph from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies.

While homeless youths are identified using Louisiana’s uniform homeless identification procedure, greater outreach to homeless youths, especially those separated from the public schools is needed. This can be inferred from the significant decrease in students identified as homeless from elementary to secondary schools in the last count estimate. Access to before and after-school care programs was identified as a great need, especially for those students living in shelters with few resources. LA-EHCY is networking with the Continuum of Care for the Homeless and other state agencies to raise their awareness to the need for programs to help house and counsel our older homeless youths. There is very little housing assistance for youths statewide.

Current resources include tutoring and outreach services by some LEA subgrantees to shelters that service runaway teens and abused teens. The homeless hotline number is disseminated statewide to assist parents, school personnel, state agencies, and community partners. The LA-EHCY collaborates at the LDE with Title I, Part D - Neglected and Delinquent coordinator that works with juvenile correctional facilities to help provide information and technical assistance on transitional services for youths upon their exiting the juvenile system. The LA-EHCY continues to work with the LDE’s federal programs: Title I, Part A, including foster care and parental involvement; Title II, Part A – Teacher Quality; Title III – English Learners; Title VI, Part A – Rural Education; and Migrant Education - to ensure that the consolidated application includes appropriate references to homeless students. Information related to this new requirement will be included in Louisiana’s McKinney-Vento Liaison training efforts.

LEAs are expected to review a student’s prior school to calculate, award and receive partial credits, as well as make necessary adjustments to a student’s schedule to permit students to complete courses started elsewhere and participate in credit recovery opportunities. Louisiana does not currently have a specific, uniform procedure in place to ensure that all McKinney-Vento students, including those who have been out of school, can receive appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school.

LA-EHCY will continue to work with other state and federal programs within the agency to evaluate existing state laws regarding partial credit and credit retrieval and to develop guidance for LEAs with language that reflects an increase in current practices and incorporate new requirements for separated youths to ensure that homeless children and youths separated from public schools are identified and afforded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services. This work will include identifying and removing barriers that prevent youths described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with state, local, and school policies.

v. Describe the SEA's procedures to ensure that homeless children and youths:

1. Have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State; The state coordinator, in collaboration with the Early Childhood Education Office ensures that LEAs, the LDE staff, and other entities are provided with trainings on Louisiana homeless identification procedures, McKinney-Vento requirements, current resources, and information from national legislation or meetings regarding policies for all public preschool programs. The state coordinator collaborates with Louisiana's Early Steps Program, Infants and Toddlers – IDEA, Part C, and IDEA, Part B to ensure that homeless children with special needs also have access to all programs throughout the state. Other collaborative opportunities with Head Start, LA 4 and Title I preschool programs ensure access by eligible three and four-year old homeless students.

LEAs, through collaborative efforts, ensure that homeless students have access to preschool programs if they qualify for these programs. Supplemental services to homeless students in preschool program with funds from the McKinney-Vento Act are allowed, provided the use of such funds facilitate the enrollment, retention, and educational success. Homeless preschool children data and the availability of preschool programs have been disseminated at workshops, conferences, and through special training. Through the LA-EHCY participation in Louisiana's Early Childhood Collaboratives, Early Childhood Education, Head Start and Early Head Start Directors have been made aware of the need to include homeless children in their programs, in developing a working relationship with local homeless liaisons, and in matriculating preschoolers in homeless situations with appropriate access to Head Start and other Early Childhood Education programs.

2. Who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities; and

Louisiana school systems are required to provide written assurances that they have policies that remove all barriers to the enrollment and retention of children and youth in homeless situations. They must demonstrate that students are enrolled in school and have full and equal opportunity to participate and succeed. The LDE fosters collaboration among local education agencies through quarterly regional collaboration meetings and technical assistance visits with other LEAs that have programs to address the unique needs of struggling student populations, including those served through the McKinney-Vento program. This allows LEAs the opportunity to discuss enrollment and

retention policies under different programs and how those policies may need to be revised to ensure the immediate enrollment and participation of homeless children and youth. The LA-EHCY provides guidance, training, and public display information to other local and state programs about available federal and state resources in school systems. The LA-EHCY ensures that all LEAs, including McKinney-Vento sub-grantees, provide qualifying programs for homeless children and youth by providing monitoring on a cycle. The LA-EHCY also provides all LEAs, including McKinney-Vento sub-grantees, assistance with addressing access for homeless students to before-school, after-school, extended day, and/or summer programs by providing a toll-free hotline.

Each homeless child or youth to be assisted is provided services comparable to services offered to other students in school, including educational services for which the child or youth meet the eligibility criteria, including but not limited to programs in career and technical education, programs for gifted and talented students, before- and after-school programs, and online learning programs. LEAs conduct intake interviews with each family to ensure that the educational needs of each student are being addressed.

Several LEAs provide in-class tutoring during the school day as well as provide services to at-risk students that are at risk of dropping out of school. LEAs follow-up on academic activities of homeless students and allow for increase in the participation in programs that strengthen academic success. Title I set asides provide funding which increases these additional academic programs.

3. Who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, are able to participate in Federal, State, and local nutrition programs.

The LA-EHCY, in cooperation with the Louisiana Director of School Lunch/Child Nutrition Programs, develops and disseminates guidelines to schools and homeless service providers that ensure that homeless children and youths have proper access to school meals. Information about the Summer Nutrition Programs is disseminated to all shelters. In collaboration with the Food and Nutrition Section the LA-EHCY ensures homeless liaisons and school personnel are provided with current food and nutrition guidelines so that homeless students participate in Federal, State, or local nutrition programs.

The activities regarding homeless children and school nutrition programs are ongoing. Future activities will involve continual dissemination of school lunch/nutrition program guidelines and various outreach efforts to educate homeless service providers and educators about homeless children and school nutrition programs.

State level identification of resources, including information shared at U.S. Department of Education State Coordinator's Meeting in Washington, D. C. and recent information shared via the homeless education listserv is summarized and disseminated to local homeless liaisons and other entities via newsletter articles, website updates, and training sessions.

The LA-EHCY collaborates with community partners to learn about other programs that might meet

the nutritional needs of homeless students and their families. The LA-EHCY coordinates efforts to distribute materials donated by the Feed the Children Foundation annually to two LEAs to serve a regional area.

- vi. Describe the SEA's strategies to address problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays and retention, consistent with sections 722(g)(1)(H) and (I) of the McKinney-Vento Act.

Problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems caused by transportation issues and enrollment delays that are caused by immunization requirements; residency requirements; lack of birth certificates; school records or other documentation; or guardianship issues; and uniform or dress code requirements have been addressed by the LA-EHCY through training and continuous outreach to homeless liaisons with a variety of materials and documents. These materials have included letters from the Director of Federal Programs that address school enrollment issues; brochures with information covering strategies to approach these problems in educating homeless children and youths; points of contact and Network Leaders that help ensure that homeless children and youths enroll, attend, and succeed in school. LEAs are charged with reviewing and regularly updating their policies to eliminate barriers to the enrollment of homeless children and youth in order to ensure immediate access to educational programs and support services. This includes consideration and written procedures to address any barriers associated with required fees, supplies, equipment, etc., that may prevent any students with limited financial means from accessing basic instruction, supplies, rigorous courses, and enrichment activities. The need for services is determined on a case by case basis. Additionally, in accordance with state regulations, no student may be retained due to outstanding fees or fines.

To further strengthen these expectations, during the 2017 Louisiana legislative session, the legislature passed House Resolution 183, urging and requesting all public school governing authorities to adopt formal regulations with regard to student fees charged to all students. The resolution requests the inclusion of hardship waivers for economically disadvantaged students and a comprehensive report by the LDE to certify that all school systems have adopted such regulations by January 1, 2018.

BESE state regulations (*Bulletin 741*, Section 341) incorporate the McKinney-Vento language that address immediate enrollment, immunizations, guardianship issues, transportation policies, school of origin language, dispute resolution and nutrition assistance policies.

The materials that have been disseminated by the LA-EHCY includes information regarding a toll-free hotline operated by the LDE to assist with barriers that homeless children and youths encounter. The hotline number also serves as a state and national referral service for homeless issues.

The LA-EHCY conducts training sessions throughout the state to inform educators, school district employees, parents, homeless advocates, service providers, social workers, and other interested

parties of various strategies in addressing the problems in educating homeless children and youths. These training sessions include a discussion of prior school records, immunizations and screening, residency, transportation; guardianship requirements; and or uniform or dress code requirements. In addition to preparing and disseminating materials, the LA-EHCY continually reviews the policies of (BESE) that relate to the enrollment and placement of homeless children and youths to ensure that these policies comply with the federal and state laws regarding the education and enrollment of homeless students.

All LEAs, including McKinney-Vento sub-grantees, ensure that activities are conducted to inform LEA personnel (specifically, attendance officers, secretaries, at-risk coordinators, counselors, and principals) of requirements and best practices related to the enrollment and identification of homeless children and youths. The LA-EHCY continues its ongoing activities to address these issues in accordance with previous reauthorization. The LA-EHCY updates previously developed documents and develop new ones to address changes in the law.

The LA-EHCY continues to seek input from homeless parents, students, advocates, shelter directors, and other service providers to identify new and/or continuing issues concerning enrollment delays, and actively works with LEAs to develop reasonable solutions to enrollment-related problems. School uniforms for homeless children and youths are provided by several sources such as: Title I, Part A, McKinney-Vento, state general funds, civic and church groups, and other local donations. Efforts to facilitate enrollment when immunizations may cause delays have been addressed through collaborative efforts with the Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals and BESE regulations.

Sub-grantees are required to submit information regarding the review and revision of local policies in their annual evaluation report as well as their signed assurances. However, all LEAs are required to review and revise local policies in accordance with the McKinney-Vento requirements as well as their signed assurances. In addition to preparing and disseminating materials, the LA-EHCY continually reviews the regulations of BESE that relate to the enrollment and placement of homeless children and youths to ensure that these policies comply with the federal and state laws regarding the education and enrollment of homeless students. All LEAs are recommended to set aside funding and required to design a plan to enroll and serve homeless children and youths as part of assurances to implement McKinney-Vento requirements.

vii. Describe how youth will receive assistance from counselors to advise and prepare for college under the McKinney-Vento Education for Homes Children and Youths program.

Two Louisiana laws, enacted through Act 704 (2010) and Act 643 (2014), set forth expectations regarding the purpose and components of a student Individual Graduation Plan for all students enrolled in Louisiana public schools. By the end of the eighth grade, every student, working with the school counselor or IEP team (when applicable) must develop an Individual Graduation Plan (IGP). An IGP guides the next academic year's coursework, assisting students in exploring

educational and career possibilities and in making appropriate secondary and postsecondary education decisions as part of an overall postsecondary transition plan.

By the end of the tenth grade, each student's Individual Graduation Plan will be updated to include the recommended sequence of courses for successful completion of his/her chosen pathways, leading either to a university preparatory diploma or a career diploma that requires the attainment of a state-approved industry-based certificate. This updated Individual Graduation Plan will be based on the student's academic record, talents and interests and shall outline high school graduation requirements relevant to the student's chosen postsecondary goals. Each student, with the assistance of the school counselor, will be allowed to choose the high school curriculum framework and related graduation requirements that best meets his/her postsecondary goals. Each student's Individual Graduation Plan will continue to be reviewed annually and updated or revised as needed.

Students selecting the university pathway will continue to pursue core academic credits that mirror the college preparatory core curriculum. Having completed all core course credits, students may graduate from high school early, or pursue Advanced Placement®, International Baccalaureate®, CLEP®, or dual enrollment credits.

Students pursuing a career and technical education pathway may earn basic or advanced credentials in statewide or regional career areas or equivalent credentials earned through dual enrollment coursework (Certificates of Applied Sciences, Certificates of Technical Studies, or Technical Diplomas). Students graduating with a Career Diploma will be required to attain state approved Jump Start (career and technical education) statewide or regional credentials.

The LDE will continue to ensure that ongoing training and outreach to school counselors include guidance and support relative to meeting the unique needs of homeless students in completing the Individual Graduation Plan.

With regard to financial aid, Louisiana recently enacted regulations guaranteeing students with access to support in applying for federal financial aid to support their post-secondary education. Most Louisiana high school graduates are eligible for some form of state or federal financial aid – either merit-based or need-based. Louisiana requires, pursuant to state board regulations, public school students graduating spring 2018 and beyond to take one of the following steps as part of their Individual Graduation Plan:

1. Complete the FAFSA; or
2. Complete the application for state-based aid; or
3. Submit a waiver request.
 - a. A parent or legal custodian, or a student legally emancipated or of the legal age of majority, may certify a waiver in writing to the LEA (sample: non-participation LEA form/Letter); or
 - b. Receive a waiver through a local school system hardship waiver process.

The LDE will continue to train and support school counselors in ensuring that the unique needs of homeless students are addressed as they carry out these expectations. This includes guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Education regarding the ability of homeless students to complete and submit the FAFSA.

Consolidated State Plan Assurances

Instructions: Each SEA submitting a consolidated State plan must review the assurances below and demonstrate agreement by selecting the boxes provided.

- ☐ **Coordination.** The SEA must assure that it coordinated its plans for administering the included programs, other programs authorized under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Rehabilitation Act, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the Head Start Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002, the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act, and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.
- ☐ **Challenging academic standards and academic assessments.** The SEA must assure that the State will meet the standards and assessments requirements of sections 1111(b)(1)(A)-(F) and 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA and applicable regulations.
- ☐ **State support and improvement for low performing schools.** The SEA must assure that it will approve, monitor, and periodically review LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans consistent with requirements in section 1111(d)(1)(B)(v) and (vi) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(e).
- ☐ **Participation by private school children and teachers.** The SEA must assure that it will meet the requirements of sections 1117 and 8501 of the ESEA regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.
- ☐ **Appropriate identification of children with disabilities.** The SEA must assure that it has policies and procedures in effect regarding the appropriate identification of children with disabilities consistent with the child find and evaluation requirements in section 612(a)(3) and (a)(7) of the IDEA, respectively.
- ☐ **Ensuring equitable access to Federal programs.** The SEA must assure that, consistent with section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), it described the steps the SEA will take to ensure equitable access to and participation in the included programs for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs as addressed in sections described below (e.g., 4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools, 5.3 Educator Equity).

Each of Louisiana's LEAs applies for ESEA/ESSA federal funds through the agency's Consolidated Application process. As a part of the application process, each LEA is asked to verify a list of general assurances, as well as individual program assurances. The provisions in Section 427 of GEPA are a part of the general assurances that LEAs agree to when applying for federal funds. In addition, ensuring equitable access to and participation in federally funded programs for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs are a part of our statewide monitoring protocols. If during the review a barrier to access is identified, the LEAs is required to submit a corrective action plan to remove the barrier and provide evidence that the corrective actions are being implemented. Lastly, Louisiana has a complaint procedure in place that provides program beneficiaries an avenue to report any concerns relative to having equal access to federally assisted program provisions.

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX LETTER	PAGE NUMBER	DOCUMENT TITLE
A	129	Measurements of Interim Progress
B	131	Educator Equity Differences in Rates Tables
C	133	Educator Equity Extension Plan and Differences in Rates Tables
D	135	Monitoring Report Card
E	142	Summary of State Plan Amendments and Stakeholder Consultation as of December 13, 2024

APPENDIX A: MEASUREMENTS OF INTERIM PROGRESS

Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency consistent with the long-term goals described in Section 1 for all students and separately for each subgroup of students (except that measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency must only be described for English learners), consistent with the State's minimum number of students. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the State's measurements of interim progress require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower-achieving or graduating at lower rates, respectively.

A. Academic Achievement

Reading/Language Arts: Percent Mastery or Above

Subgroups	Reading/ Language Arts: Baseline (2016)	Reading/ Language Arts: Interim Goal (2018)	Reading/ Language Arts: Interim Goal (2022)	Reading/ Language Arts: Long-term Goal (2025)	Reading/ Language Arts: Avg. Annual % Gain
All students	41	46	56	63.5	2.5
Economically disadvantaged students	33	39.8	53.3	63.5	3.4
Children with disabilities	12	23.4	46.3	63.5	5.7
English learners	15	25.8	47.3	63.5	5.4
White	53	55.3	60.0	63.5	1.2
Black or African American	28	35.9	51.7	63.5	3.9
Hispanic/ Latino	38	43.7	55.0	63.5	2.8
Homeless (reporting begins 2017-2018)	25	33.6	50.7	63.5	4.3
Military-affiliated (reporting begins 2017-2018)				63.5	

Mathematics: Percent Mastery or Above

Subgroups	Mathematics: Baseline (2016)	Mathematics: Interim Goal (2018)	Mathematics: Interim Goal (2022)	Mathematics: Long-term Goal (2025)	Mathematics: Avg. Annual % Gain
All students	34	39	49	56.5	2.5
Economically disadvantaged students	27	34	47	56.5	3.4
Children with disabilities	12	23	46	56.5	5.7
English learners	20	31	52	56.5	5.4
White	47	49	54	56.5	1.2
Black or African American	21	29	45	56.5	3.9
Hispanic/ Latino	33	39	50	56.5	2.8
Homeless (reporting to begin in 2017-2018)	19	28	45	56.5	4.3
Military-affiliated (reporting begins 2017-2018)				56.5	

B. Graduation Rates

Subgroup	Baseline (2014-15) (A = 75%)	Interim Goal: 2018	Interim Goal: 2022	Long-term Goal: 2025 (A = 90%)	Avg. Annual % Gain
All students	77.5	80.3	85.8	90	1.4
Economically disadvantaged students	70.8	75.1	83.6	90	2.1
Children with disabilities	44.3	54.5	74.8	90	5.1
English learners	50.2	59.0	76.7	90	4.4
White	82.7	84.3	87.6	90	0.8
Black or African American	71.4	75.5	83.8	90	2.1
Hispanic/Latino	74.9	78.3	85.0	90	1.7
Homeless (reporting to begin in 2017-2018)	59.8	66.5	79.9	90	3.4
Military-affiliated (reporting to begin in 2017-2018)	TBD			90	

C. English Language Proficiency

Because Louisiana recently finalized its English language proficiency standards, and because the aligned exam will be administered for the first time in 2017-2018, Louisiana will begin reporting on the percentage of students making progress towards English language proficiency using the new standards beginning in 2019-2020, based on 2018-2019 results. After an initial baseline year of results is available, Louisiana will work with stakeholders, the state's Accountability Commission, and BESE to define student annual targets and the progress to English language proficiency accountability indicator. The long-term and interim goals will be updated as needed.

Louisiana currently defines progress towards English language proficiency as improving at least one proficiency level in a particular year. In the most recent year, 45 percent of English learners with at least two years of proficiency results demonstrated progress of improving at least one proficiency level from the prior year. Louisiana is establishing a long-term goal of 63 percent of English learners demonstrating progress, a two percentage point average annual increase. This goal, which is based on trends seen in other states and the advice of national experts, is ambitious but necessary in a state that has seen a nearly 80 percent increase in the number and proportion of students who are English learners over the last eight years.

Baseline: 2016	Interim: 2018	Interim: 2022	Long-term: 2025	Avg. Annual Growth
----------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------	--------------------

45%	49%	67%	63%	2%
-----	-----	-----	-----	----

APPENDIX B: EDUCATOR EQUITY DIFFERENCES IN RATES

Instructions: Each SEA must complete the appropriate table(s) below. Each SEA calculating and reporting student-level data must complete, at a minimum, the table under the header “Differences in Rates Calculated Using Student-Level Data”.

DIFFERENCES IN RATES CALCULATED USING STUDENT-LEVEL DATA

STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by an ineffective teacher	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an out-of-field teacher	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by and inexperienced teacher	Differences between rates
Low-income students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	31.41%	-8.98%	40.99%	5.7%	22.76%	5.46%
Non-low-income students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A	40.39%		35.29%		17.30%	
Minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	31.48%	-9.43%	44.00%	7.98%	25.22%	7.66%
Non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A	40.91%		36.02%		17.56%	

If the SEA has defined other optional key terms, it must complete the table below.

Not Applicable.

STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 1	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 2	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 3	Differences between rates
Low-income students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box A: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box A) – (Box B)	Box E: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box E) – (Box F)	Box I: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box I) – (Box J)
Non-low-income students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box B: enter rate as a percentage		Box F: enter rate as a percentage		Box J: enter rate as a percentage	
Minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box C: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box C) – (Box D)	Box G: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box G) – (Box H)	Box K: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box K) – (Box L)
Non-minority students enrolled in schools not receiving funds under Title I, Part A	Box D: enter rate as a percentage		Box H: enter rate as a percentage		Box L: enter rate as a percentage	

APPENDIX C: EDUCATOR EQUITY EXTENSION

Instructions: If an SEA requests an extension for calculating and reporting student-level educator equity data under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(3), it must: (1) provide a detailed plan and timeline addressing the steps it will take to calculate and report, as expeditiously as possible but no later than three years from the date it submits its initial consolidated State plan, the data required under 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(3)(i) at the student level and (2) complete the tables below.

Not Applicable

DIFFERENCES IN RATES CALCULATED USING DATA OTHER THAN STUDENT-LEVEL DATA

STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by an ineffective teacher	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an out-of-field teacher	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an inexperienced teacher	Differences between rates
Low-income students	Box A: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box A) – (Box B)	Box E: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box E) – (Box F)	Box I: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box I) – (Box J)
Non-low-income students	Box B: enter rate as a percentage		Box F: enter rate as a percentage		Box J: enter rate as a percentage	
Minority students	Box C: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box C) – (Box D)	Box G: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box G) – (Box H)	Box K: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box K) – (Box L)
Non-minority students	Box D: enter rate as a percentage		Box H: enter rate as a percentage		Box L: enter rate as a percentage	

If the SEA has defined other optional key terms, it must complete the table below.

Not Applicable.

STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 1	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 2	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by ENTER STATE-IDENTIFIED TERM 3	Differences between rates
Low-income students	Box A: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box A) – (Box B)	Box E: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box E) – (Box F)	Box I: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box I) – (Box J)
Non-low-income students	Box B: enter rate as a percentage		Box F: enter rate as a percentage		Box J: enter rate as a percentage	
Minority students	Box C: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box C) – (Box D)	Box G: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box G) – (Box H)	Box K: enter rate as a percentage	Enter value of (Box K) – (Box L)
Non-minority students	Box D: enter rate as a percentage		Box H: enter rate as a percentage		Box L: enter rate as a percentage	

APPENDIX D: MONITORING REPORT CARD

		SAMPLE	
Division of Statewide Monitoring – ESSA Monitoring Rubric SY2016-2017			
LEA NAME:		Site Code:	
Monitoring Risk Indicators	Point Value	Assigned Points	
RISK 1 – Academic Achievement - Local Education Agency Letter Grades			
Letter grades (A-F) show the quality of school performance based on student achievement data. For elementary schools (K-6), 100% of the grade is based on student achievement on annual assessments in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies. For middle schools (7-8), 95% of the grade is based on student achievement on annual assessments with the final 5% based on credits earned through 9th grade. For high schools (9-12), half of the grade is based on student achievement (25% ACT and 25% EOC) and half is based on graduation [25% graduation index rewards AP and IBC exam credit and 25% cohort graduation rate]. Schools may also earn points for significant improvement with students who are academically behind.			
LEA Letter Grade	Point Value	2014-15 Actual	
Grade A or B	15	C	10
Grade C	10		
Grade D	5		
Grade F	0		
RISK 2 – Statewide Assessment Proficiency - English Language Arts			
Measurement: Two consecutive years of statewide assessment data are compared to determine the percent of change in assessment proficiency for the economically disadvantaged subgroup in all tested grades. Cut scores are established using actual assessment results. Ranges are defined by dividing data sets into quartiles. The difference in percentile change for the LEA is then calculated and applied to determine the percentage of growth or decline. Growth falling into Q3 and Q4 are eligible to earn points during monitoring selection. A decline or significant decline in performance for a Q1 or Q2 ranking results in no points earned.			
Cut Scores - Economically Disadvantaged Students All Tested Grades	2013-2014 Actual	Percentile	2014-2015 Actual
Quartile 4 = 9 to 50	4	65.2%	70
Quartile 3 = 1 to 8	2		
Quartile 2 = 0 to -5	0		
Quartile 1 = -6 to -60	0		
Percentile Change			
8			
2			
RISK 3 – Statewide Assessment Proficiency - Mathematics			
Measurement: Two consecutive years of statewide assessment data are compared to determine the percent of change in assessment proficiency for the economically disadvantaged subgroup in all tested grades. Cut scores are established using actual assessment results. Ranges are defined by dividing data sets into quartiles. The difference in percentile change for the LEA is then calculated and applied to determine the percentage of growth or decline. Growth falling into Q3 and Q4 are eligible to earn points during monitoring selection. A decline or significant decline in performance for a Q1 or Q2 ranking results in no points earned.			
Cut Scores - Economically Disadvantaged Students All Tested Grades	2013-2014 Actual	Percentile	2014-2015 Actual
Quartile 4 = 12 to 66	4	65.4%	76
Quartile 3 = 2 to 11	2		
Quartile 2 = 1 to -5	0		
Quartile 1 = -6 to -57	0		
Percentile Change			
8			
2			

Risk 4- Program Compliance					
Measurement: Two factors are weighted in the Program Compliance category: (1) Findings in Title I and Title II programs from single audits and fiscal monitoring reports during 2013-2014 and 2014-2015; and (2) Findings from ESSA program compliance reviews for 2014-2015 and 2015-2016.					
Findings of Program Non-compliance	Point Value	2014-2015 Actual			2
No program findings	3	2			
1 - 2 findings of non-compliance	2				
3 - 4 findings of non-compliance	1				
5 or more findings of non-compliance	0				
LEA Total Points					16
Low Risk - (19-26 points)	☐		Quartile Descriptors		ML
Moderate Low Risk - (15-18 points)	☒				
Moderate High Risk - (9-14 points)	☐		Q4 = Significant Growth	Q2 = No Change, Decline	
High Risk (0-8 points)	☐		Q3 = Growth	Q1 = Significant Decline	

APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS TO THIS PLAN AS OF MARCH 1, 2019

Louisiana's ESSA State Plan Amendments As of March 1, 2019

Amendment and Page Number in State Plan	Description and Rationale	Stakeholder Engagement	Date Approved as Notice of Proposed Rule	Public Comment Period	Effective Date of Final Rule
Assessment Index, Progress Index, and 2018-2019 Science Scores Pages 44, 52, 60	On August 15, 2017, the United States Department of Education (USDOE) approved the Louisiana state education plan pursuant to the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). In order to implement the Louisiana plan pursuant to the new federal law, revisions to the following bulletins were required. During the meeting in which the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) considered these proposed regulations, based on stakeholder input, the board voted to make further revisions. Those meeting minutes are recorded here (committee minutes) and here (main board meeting minutes). The revisions were: 1. For purposes of calculating a K-8 assessment index and a 9-12 assessment index on LEAP 2025 and LEAP Connect assessments, a score of “Basic” will be awarded 80 index points. 2. For purposes of calculating an elementary/middle or a high school progress index, schools will be awarded up to 150 points for students scoring Mastery in the current year, but no fewer than 85 points, including for students whose results fall within the first through 39th percentiles of the value-added model approved by BESE. 3. When calculating the K-8 assessment index for the 2018-2019 school year, either the 2016-2017 or 2018-2019 science assessment index, whichever yields the higher school performance score (SPS), will be used as the science component of the overall assessment index and will be weighed by the 2018-2019 science assessment index tested population in order to limit the impact of population changes from prior years.	Accountability Commission Meetings: 9/18/2017 10/20/2017 Webinars with School System Leadership Teams: 9/6/2017 11/1/2017 Superintendents' Advisory Council Meetings: 7/13/2017 9/22/2017 Special Education Advisory Panel: 9/28/2018 Numerous Meetings between State Superintendent, BESE members, advocates, and school leaders: September-October 2017 BESE Meetings: 10/17/2017-10/18/2017	10/18/2017	12/20/2017-1/9/2018	3/20/2018
Timing of Identification of Schools and Plan Submission Page 71	In response to feedback received from school system leaders and BESE members, and in accordance with timelines set forth in ESSA, the LDOE agreed to delay publishing the list of schools identified as Urgent Intervention Required (UIR – Louisiana's identification for Targeted Support and Intervention) and Urgent Intervention Needed (UIN) and requiring improvement plans until the 2018-2019 school year. Identifications based on 2016-2017 data were given to LEAs for planning purposes in the 2017-2018 school year, and the Department invited early, optional improvement plans if those LEAs chose to submit.	Miscellaneous communications between State Superintendent, BESE members, and school leaders: October 2017 Email from State Superintendent to School Leaders: 11/3/17	N/A (matter of policy interpretation, not policy wording)	N/A	N/A

		Call with BESE members: 11/6/17 Webinar with Local School Superintendents and Charter School Leaders: 11/7/17 Email Newsletter to School Leaders: 11/7/17			
K-3 School Accountability, Subgroup Performance, and 5th Year Graduates Pages 44, 47, 59	In response to requests from local school leaders, BESE revised accountability regulations as follows: 1. State regulations had already provided for K-3 schools to receive a School Performance Score and school letter grade; however, it did not address growth. To address that need, BESE enacted a regulation to pair such schools with the school that most of their students attend next in order to calculate a progress index (similar to how K-2 schools are paired with 3-5 schools). 2. The board clarified the methodology for including the dropout/credit accumulation index when calculating subgroup performance scores to align with Louisiana's approved ESSA state plan, which establishes a minimum n-size of 10 students for subgroups. 3. The board voted to award 150 points in the high school index for students who earn a high school diploma and an associate's degree within five years.	Accountability Commission Meeting: 2/2/2018 Webinar with School System Leadership Teams: 6/13/2018 BESE Meetings: 6/19/18-6/20/18	06/20/2018	08/20/2018-09/09/2018	11/20/2018
English Learner Growth Measures Pages 53, 55-57	Louisiana implemented a new English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT) in the 2017-2018 school year. In accordance with the requirement set forth in ESSA and as outlined in Louisiana's approved ESSA state plan, the LDOE worked with experts to define how English language proficiency progress should be scored within the accountability formula. Following extensive stakeholder consultation, BESE approved the following regulations: 1. An A-rated school is one in which English learners are, on average, on track to English language proficiency in the expected time frame. Louisiana has set a goal that all students reach proficiency within seven years of first identification, though the trajectory will vary by grade and proficiency level at initial identification. Using a clear and simple table with an expected trajectory from an initial level, the accountability formula will reward meeting or exceeding the expected trajectory. 2. All progress, even if not sufficient to exit in the expected time frame, will be recognized and rewarded in the accountability formula.	Accountability Commission Meeting: 5/18/2018 8/20/2018 Webinar with Local School System Leadership Teams: 8/1/2018 Calls with Local Superintendents, Charter School Leaders, and Advocates: May-September 2018 BESE Meetings: 10/16/18-10/17/18	10/17/2018	11/20/2018-12/9/2018	2/20/2019

	3. Due to the transition to a new ELP assessment in 2017-2018, initial proficiency levels were reset for all students beginning with the administration of the ELPT in the 2017-2018 school year.				
Modified Accountability Formula for Alternative Education Schools Pages 61-64	Following a year of study and extensive stakeholder engagement, BESE approved regulations establishing a new rating formula for alternative education (AE) schools that is more closely aligned to the unique mission of serving students referred to AE for long-term behavior, academic intervention, and other services. For AE elementary and middle schools, the rating formula is based 100 percent on state assessment progress, and for AE high schools, the formula is based on state assessment progress, core credit accumulation, dropout/credit accumulation, and credential attainment (25 percent each).	Accountability Commission Meeting: 5/18/2018 6/22/2018 8/20/2018 9/19/2018 Webinar with Local School Superintendents and Charter School Leaders: 3/22/2018 Superintendents Advisory Council: 3/22/2018 9/21/2018 Special Education Advisory Panel: 9/26/2018 Advisory Council on Student Behavior and Discipline: 12/12/2017 2/6/2018 4/13/2018 8/24/2018 10/12/2018 Council of Juvenile Court Judges: 1/11/18 3/23/18 9/7/2018 Louisiana School Psychological Association Meeting: 3/15/2018 Numerous Other Meetings with Stakeholders and Study Groups: Summer 2017-Fall 2018 BESE Meetings:	10/17/2018	12/20/2018-1/9/2019	3/20/2019

		10/16/2018-10/17/2018			
Minimum School N-Size to Receive School Performance Score and School Letter Grade Pages 48-49, 69	In response to local school system leaders, BESE approved a revision to the maximum number of students (accountability “units”) required for a school to receive a school performance score (SPS) and school letter grade. The previous policy required a minimum of 10 students or 40 accountability units, which led to several extremely small schools receiving an SPS and school letter grade in some years, but not in others, as small school enrollment fluctuates. ESSA allows states to set a threshold of 30 students, which recognizes the challenges of reporting performance for extremely small sites and provides for greater stability over time. BESE approved the use of 30 students, which federal law allows and several other states use, for assignment of an SPS and school letter grade. BESE further approved an additional revision to clarify that alternative education schools subject to the newly approved modified accountability formula will receive a school performance score and school letter grade when they have 10 students or 40 units.	BESE Meeting (where issue was first raised): 1/24/2018 BESE Study Group Meetings: 2/8/2018 2/26/2018 8/15/2018 Accountability Commission Meeting: 8/20/2018 9/19/2018 Superintendents Advisory Council Meeting: 9/21/2018 Communications Between State Superintendent, BESE Members, and Advocates: November 2018-January 2019 BESE Meetings: 10/16/2018-10/17/2018 1/22/2019-1/23/2019	10/17/2018 and 1/23/2019	12/20/2018-1/9/2019 and 3/20/2019-4/9/2019	3/20/2019 and 6//20/2019
Title IV. Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Pages 112-114	Revision increases the rate at which the agency can allocated 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds to eligible recipients by conducting the competitive funding process as a Request for Application (RFA). This aligns the process to adhere to Louisiana procurement law.	Consultation with Louisiana Office of Procurement December 2021 Notice on LDOE website and in agency newsletter: January 8-28, 2022	N/A	N/A	N/A
Challenge 5 – Support for Struggling Schools: Direct Student Services Pages 27, 93-94	Revision discontinues reserving funding for Direct Student Services programming activities. Funding will be part of the Title I funding formula. The revision aligns with statutory requirements regarding the use of Title I funds and provides school districts more flexibility for use of funding. Consultation was made with the Office of the Governor, local federal program directors, business managers, and special education directors, all of whom were amendable to the revision.	Consultation with the Governor’s office: 4/5/2022 Notice on LDOE website and in agency newsletter: April 6-26, 2022	N/A	N/A	N/A
Identification	Revision amends the plan to no longer identify, as a	Consultation			

of Schools Pages 27, 31, 32, 65, 70	separate statewide category of schools, schools that exhibit persistent, excessive out-of-school discipline.	with the Governor's office: 5/20/2024 Notice on LDOE website and in agency newsletter: May 24-June 14, 2024			
Revised school, district, and state accountability formula; Minimum N-size Pages 13, 31, 34, 37-41, 43-47, 49-55, 59-60, 62	Revision amends the accountability system to include the following equally-weighted components: <u>K-12:</u> • The percent of students growing in English Language Arts • The percent of students growing in Mathematics • English Language Arts growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students • Math growth for the lowest twenty-five percent of students • The percent of English Learners students growing in English Language Acquisition • The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in English Language Arts • The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in Mathematics • The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in Science • The percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in Social Studies <u>High School Only:</u> • The graduation rate • Student performance on nationally recognized assessments • Student preparedness for college and career acceleration	BESE Meetings: 1/17/2024 4/9/2024 6/12/2024 Public Input Portal: April 1-11, 2024 Accountability Council: 5/6/2024 Teacher Advisory Council: 5/15/2024 Superintendents Advisory Council: 6/6/2025 Consultation with the Governor's office: 8/27/2024 Notice on LDOE website and in agency newsletter: August 6-28, 2024	6/12/2024	7/20/2024 – 8/10/2024	11/20/2024
Comprehensive examinations Page 76	Revision reduces total time spent in testing as well as the overall cost of the assessment program by shifting from end-of-course examinations in high school mathematics and English to a comprehensive exam in each subject.	BESE Meeting: 10/15/2025 Accountability Council: 9/22/2025 Superintendents Advisory Council: 9/18/2025 Consultation with the Governor's	10/15/2025	11/20/2025 – 12/10/2025	2/20/2026

		office: 1/12/2026 Notice on LDOE website and in agency newsletter: January 13 – February 6, 2026			
--	--	--	--	--	--